OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND - - - - - - - - - - - X : : PETITION OF COSTCO WHOLESALE : Case No. S-2863 CORPORATION : OZAH No. 13-12 : A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on September 16, 2013, commencing at 9:34 a.m. in the Rita Davidson Memorial Hearing Room, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rockville, Maryland. Martin L. Grossman Hearing Examiner

Page	2 Page 4
APPEARANCES	1 PROCEEDINGS
	2 MR. GROSSMAN: A litany with which you may all be
Michele Rosenfeld, Esq. The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld, LLC	3 familiar by now. This is the 13th day of the public hearing
11913 Ambleside Drive	4 in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Board of
Potomac, Maryland 20854	5 Appeals No. S-2863, OZAH No. 13-12, a petition for a special
301-201-0913, (f) 301-990-0924	6 exception pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 59-G-2.06 to
rosenfeldlaw@verizon.net	<ul><li>7 allow the petitioner to construct and operate an automobile</li></ul>
Patricia Harris, Esq.	8 filling station which would include 16 pumps. The subject
Michael Goecke, Esq.	9 site is located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silver Spring,
Lerch, Early & Brewer	10 Maryland. That's Lot N-631, Wheaton Plaza Parcel 10, also
3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460	11 known as the Westfield Wheaton Mall. And it is zoned C-2,
Bethesda, Maryland 20814 paharris@learchearly.com	12 general commercial.
panarriserearchearry.com	13 The hearing was begun on April 26, 2013, and
Larry Silverman, Esq.	14 resumed on May 1, May 6, May 23, June 4, June 17, June 19,
	15 July 8, July 30, July 31, August 2 and September 9, 2013.
	<b>16</b> It was noticed to resume again today. The next session has
CONTENTS	17 been noticed for Friday, September 20, in this room, that is
	18 the second floor, OZAH Board of Appeals Hearing Room in this
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recro	
Kenneth Chase	20 This hearing is conducted on behalf of the Board
By Mr. Goecke 24	21 of Appeals. My name is Martin Grossman. I'm the Hearing
By Mr. Adelman: 75	22 Examiner which means I will take evidence and write a report
By Ms. Rosenfeld: 145	23 and recommendation to the Board of Appeals which will make
	24 the decision in the case. Will the parties identify
	25 themselves for the record please?
Page	3 Page 5
Page Ехнівітs	<ul><li>3 Page 5</li><li>1 MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li></ul>
-	
-	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS Exhibit No. Marked/Receive	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS Exhibit No. Marked/Receive	1MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.2MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.3MR. GROSSMAN: All right.4MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>5 behalf of Costco.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine 273 Mr. Silverman's response to 13	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine 273 Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine 273 Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiver 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine 273 Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution 274 Disk with Sullivan 16	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receive 272 Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine 273 Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Received         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> </ol>
E X H I B I T S         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings         276       EPA February 2011 air quality 161	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas</li> <li>Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas</li> <li>Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> <li>Civic Association.</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings         276       EPA February 2011 air quality 161 guide for nitrogen dioxide	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas</li> <li>Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> <li>Civic Association.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings         276       EPA February 2011 air quality 161	<ul> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And</li> <li>SHEARD: Virginia Sheard, Kensington View.</li> </ul>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings         276       EPA February 2011 air quality 161 guide for nitrogen dioxide	<ol> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> <li>Civic Association.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. SHEARD: Virginia Sheard, Kensington View.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Anybody else in the audience</li> </ol>
EXHIBITS         Exhibit No.       Marked/Receive         272       Applicant's response to the 9 opposition's motion in limine         273       Mr. Silverman's response to 13 the Hearing Examiner's question re small increments of air pollution         274       Disk with Sullivan 16 Environmental data         275       IARC of June 2012 on 147 carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine exhaust and some nitro airings         276       EPA February 2011 air quality 161 guide for nitrogen dioxide	<ul> <li>MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Good morning, Michael Goecke on</li> <li>behalf of Costco.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry, Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld, Kensington</li> <li>Heights.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman, Coalition to Stop</li> <li>Costco Gas. Good morning, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Dr.</li> <li>Mark Adelman for the Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And</li> <li>SHEARD: Virginia Sheard, Kensington View.</li> </ul>

	Page 6		Page 8
1	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Other than witnesses	1	don't believe that I am empowered by, at least the current
	who are going to be called by the parties, I see no other		state of the rules, to grant a summary disposition.
	hands. So let me proceed with some preliminary matters.	3	
4	Since our last meeting, there were various filings	4	specifically asked that question and Vice Chair Perdue, who
5	and exchanges. Exhibit 267 was Kensington Heights Civic	5	was acting as a chairman, said a record that no, if there
6	Association's reply to the applicant's opposition to	6	were to be a final decision on those motions, it would have
7	Kensington Heights's motion before the Board of Appeals for	7	to be rendered by the Board of Appeals.
8	summary disposition. Exhibit 268 were Ms. Cordry's filings	8	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
9	on September 10, 2013, and they are parts, subparts A	9	2
10	through N. Then Exhibit 269 was an e-mail from Mr. Goecke	10	5 5
	attaching 269(a), was Dr. Chase's September 10, 2013 letter,		would proceed as we were here on the assumption that if
	the amended report, in effect; and (b) Dr. Chase's		those motions come back, I would not be able to if I were
	references used in the letter. Exhibit 271, addition		to act on them, I would have to deny them as being something
	filings by Ms. Cordry. And that's the last e-mail I have on		beyond my powers at this juncture.
	my list.	15	<b>0</b> <i>i i i</i>
16	As I understand it, the witnesses scheduled for		was not what they said. What they said was you can make a
	today are Dr. Kenneth Chase and possibly Ms. Cordry		report and recommendation to them on those motions
	testifying out of order on a community need issue if there	18	5
	is space in the day. And Mr. Sullivan is scheduled to be	19	<b>,</b>
	the applicant's last witness on September 20th. That's this Friday.	20	appropriate to, whatever, but that you make a report and recommendation and they would then make the final decision
21	Does anybody wish to state for the record what the		on them.
	Board of Appeals did? I have not received any formal	22	
	information in that record and I'm talking about with the		formally do in their resolution. But in any event, I'm just
	two summary disposition motions that were filed with them.		speaking about the nature of what my assignment is as
	Page 7		Page 9
1	Page 7 Ms. Rosenfeld?	1	, and the second s
1			Page 9 Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed
2	Ms. Rosenfeld?	2	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in
2 3	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0	2 3	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed
2 3 4	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two	2 3	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So
2 3 4 5	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a	2 3 4 5	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So
2 3 4 5	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two	2 3 4 5	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up?
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the motion was. I'm sure Ms. Freeman can get that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the temperature and get it a little bit cooler. All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the motion was. I'm sure Ms. Freeman can get that. MR. GROSSMAN: I would assume that they will issue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the temperature and get it a little bit cooler. All right. Exhibit 272 and that is applicant's response to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the motion was. I'm sure Ms. Freeman can get that. MR. GROSSMAN: I would assume that they will issue a formal resolution stating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up? MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for MR. GOECKE: I do. MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the temperature and get it a little bit cooler. All right. Exhibit 272 and that is applicant's response to the opposition's motion in limine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the motion was. I'm sure Ms. Freeman can get that. MR. GROSSMAN: I would assume that they will issue a formal resolution stating MS. ROSENFELD: I would assume so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the temperature and get it a little bit cooler. All right. Exhibit 272 and that is applicant's response to the opposition's motion in limine.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: The Board of Appeals voted 4 to 0 unanimously. There were four Board members present. Two remand the motions back to you for fact finding and a recommendation to them on proper disposition of the two motions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't received a resolution to that effect. MR. GOECKE: I think that's a bit of a mischaracterization of what happened. They voted to 4 to nothing not to hear the motion themselves and they said that you retained the authority to weigh in if you so choose, but they were not instructing you to decide the motion or to give a written report. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with Mr. Goecke's MS. ROSENFELD: I MR. GROSSMAN: re-characterization? MS. ROSENFELD: I believe I do. We can certainly get a copy of the transcript and see precisely what the motion was. I'm sure Ms. Freeman can get that. MR. GROSSMAN: I would assume that they will issue a formal resolution stating	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Hearing Examiner, which is not to make final decisions in these kinds of cases. We do in some cases that are filed with us, but in this kind of case it's a Board of Appeals decision. So</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And I think that's consistent with their view of it as well.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So, in any event, as to their there is, of course, the motion in limine that's still before me and I will await any response from the applicant on that. Okay. That's</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: May I bring this up?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely. Thank you. Do you have a copy for</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: the opposition?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This will be Exhibit 272. It's a little warm in here today. Did we if my staff is monitoring this, I would ask them to adjust the temperature and get it a little bit cooler. All right.</li> <li>Exhibit 272 and that is applicant's response to the opposition's motion in limine.</li> <li>(Exhibit No. 272 was marked for identification.)</li> </ul>

	Page 10		Page 12
1	MR. GROSSMAN: I get that there?	1	over them to make sure they were in good shape and so forth.
2	MR. GOECKE: I will submit to you an electronic		So I don't, I don't think there's been a particular
3	copy of that in Word version by Friday.		violation in the spirit of that, but I do want to be clear
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.		that this area continues to develop.
5	MR. GOECKE: I'll transfer the file.	5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
6	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you very much. Appreciate	6	
7	that. Okay. I'll just remind everybody that I have to		can't comply with it, I understand, but I also have to
	complete the hearing today by sometime between 4:30 and		retain fairness to both sides and give them an opportunity
	4:45. Any other preliminary or procedural matters? Well,		to sufficiently prepare for cross-examination, so we'll have
	let's take the applicant first.		to adjust it as we did. And I'm not, I try not to be
11	MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, I thought we had		doctrinaire about these things because I think my role is to
12	addressed this at the beginning of the last hearing session,	12	make sure we have a fair hearing that everybody has an
13	the issue of receiving data and reports from the opponents	13	opportunity to present their points and that the other side
14	in a timely manner, and this is especially important now as	14	in each case has the opportunity to fairly examine those
15	they start with their case and we would just ask and that,	15	points. So that's my goal in all of this. All right.
16	again, an understanding that reports should be provided 10	16	MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman.
17	days prior to their witnesses going on. I mean we did	17	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir?
18	receive information prior, within that 10-day period from	18	MR. SILVERMAN: Another, I hope it's a preliminary
19	Ms. Cordry. We're not going to make an issue of it today,	19	matter.
	but I don't want to be in this constant state where we're	20	
	getting things, you know, three days before one of our	21	
22	witnesses going.		question about how EPA deals with small increments of air
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Let's, since we're spread		pollution. I have prepared a short memo on that subject
	out over a long enough period of time in this hearing, let's		which I would like to give you and give the other parties,
25	endeavor to comply with that.	25	completed this morning.
	Page 11		Page 13
1		1	-
1	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note,	1	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you.
2	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right.
	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note,		MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning.
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided.	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition?
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well-	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day period for the, supporting our case, we're not precluded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution. (Exhibit No. 273 was marked for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day period for the, supporting our case, we're not precluded from using it. Well, one of the exhibits I submitted was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution. (Exhibit No. 273 was marked for identification.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day period for the, supporting our case, we're not precluded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution. (Exhibit No. 273 was marked for identification.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day period for the, supporting our case, we're not precluded from using it. Well, one of the exhibits I submitted was a news article that came out on September 10th, so it's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution. (Exhibit No. 273 was marked for identification.) MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Any other preliminary matters?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. ROSENFELD: We will do that and just to note, these aren't, this isn't a report from Ms. Cordry. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: It is material that she reviewed in preparation for her testimony which we've provided. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And I know that she has written extensively. I've read any number of submissions that she has made to various bodies regarding the needs issue and other issues. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you have a pretty fair but I understand your point and I think your point is well- taken. MS. HARRIS: And so it's not just reports, though. It's just anything that they may rely on? MR. GROSSMAN: They're going to rely on. Right. So you'll have an opportunity to look at it before. MS. CORDRY: I would request that if, for instance, an exhibit as one did come out within the 10-day period for the, supporting our case, we're not precluded from using it. Well, one of the exhibits I submitted was a news article that came out on September 10th, so it's a little difficult to provide it to them 10 days in advance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: That would be great. Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: I saw that you had e-mailed me something this morning. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't have a MR. SILVERMAN: it's been e-mailed all around. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be Exhibit 273. Mr. Silverman, is this an individual filing or is this something on behalf of the Coalition? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I was trying to get to it earlier. I haven't had a chance to review it with the Coalition, so at this point it's an individual filing MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: I hope the Coalition will endorse. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman's response to the Hearing Examiner's question regarding small increments of air pollution. (Exhibit No. 273 was marked for identification.) MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Any other preliminary matters? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, Mr. Grossman.

	Page 14		Page 16
1	MS. ROSENFELD: At the last hearing I told you I	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit 274, disk with Sullivan
2	was going to provide for the record a copy of the NOT disk	2	Environmental Data. Okay.
	that we received from Costco on August 13th. I had it with	3	
4	me, but didn't hand it in. I'm handing this in now. I have	4	providing the disk on 8/26, I neglected to also provide you
5	previously provided a copy of this to Ms. Harris and Mr.	5	a copy of it. So I
6	Goecke, so	6	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Is this a copy of the disk	7	MS. HARRIS: need to do that and I'll bring
8	that I already have received from the applicant, Mr. Goecke?	8	that on Friday.
	It's entitled duplicate copy of Sullivan Environmental	9	· · · ·
10	Consulting, 8/13/13.		don't have in other words, the updated disk that has all
11	MR. GOECKE: It should be a duplicate. I think, I		of the information that has been sent. Okay. So you'll
	don't want to speak for Ms. Rosenfeld, but I think she's		provide that? All right.
	giving it to you because this is a disk that we circulated	13	
	and then a week or 10 days later she e-mailed and said it		things.
	doesn't contain the data that we're looking for and then we	15	
	provided another disk. So I don't know what is or is not on	16	
	the disk. I know the urban data for NOT was supposed to be		on the motion for summary, in the motion in limine. Do you
	on there. They're saying it wasn't and then we submitted another disk that apparently satisfied them.		have a sense for when you might rule on that just so we know in preparation for Mr. Sullivan on Friday?
20	MS. ROSENFELD: Which we got on, I believe, the	20	
	26th which did have the data we were looking for.		Wednesday
22	MR. GOECKE: So the answer to your question is,	22	
	yes, you should have this disk already.	23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
24	MR. GROSSMAN: And so if you got it on the 26th,		I'm not sure that I will issue a written order, but I would
25	all the data that you were looking for, and we're now on		notify people by e-mail of what my ruling will be and then
	Page 15		Page 17
1	Page 15 September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with	1	Page 17 I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on
			-
	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with		I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing.
2 3	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you?	2 3	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing.
2 3 4	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we	2 3 4	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity
2 3 4 5 6	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr.	2 3 4	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not
2 3 4 5 6 7	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report,	2 3 4 5 6 7	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. So it's not an issue with me in terms of acting on your motion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm, you know, unless you want me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated Sullivan report that was filed on August 16th, you may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm, you know, unless you want me to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated Sullivan report that was filed on August 16th, you may recall that he provided to Planning Staff a detailed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm, you know, unless you want me to? MS. ROSENFELD: I would like it in the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated Sullivan report that was filed on August 16th, you may recall that he provided to Planning Staff a detailed analysis in response to their health-related issues. Staff
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	September 16, is there an issue in your mind still with regard to how this affects you? MS. ROSENFELD: There was a question as to why we waived, why we filed our motion in limine at the time we did and we had to have the data that's on that disk in order to determine what the base numbers were at the time that Mr. Sullivan prepared his original December 2012 report, November 2012 report. It's just in there for the record to show what it was and we actually had received in the middle of August. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll exhibitize it for you if that's what you want me to do. You know, we'll say that I don't have, I didn't have an issue as I think I stated at the last hearing. I said I wasn't thrilled at getting them two days before the hearing, but I understood given the timing of when the Sullivan reports were amended that I could understand the timing of your filing your motion. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm, you know, unless you want me to? MS. ROSENFELD: I would like it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. So this will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'll enter something formally, announce it more formally on the record at the next hearing. MS. ROSENFELD: And after we've had an opportunity to look at this, we would like an opportunity to file it by tomorrow if appropriate, if you're not MR. GROSSMAN: Then you're really squeezing the time. MS. ROSENFELD: I haven't looked at it, so I don't, I don't know if we choose to. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm not going to tell you you can't, but let's say if you're going to do that, then I may not be able to act until Thursday, depending on what time. If you filed it by noon tomorrow, then I guess I could act, or Wednesday. I also have some Council business I have to, committee business I have to attend to tomorrow, so I'm not sure what my schedule is going to be. MS. ROSENFELD: We'll certainly keep the, all those time constraints in mind. There is also one other question, a preliminary matter. With respect to the updated Sullivan report that was filed on August 16th, you may recall that he provided to Planning Staff a detailed analysis in response to their health-related issues. Staff recommended denial of his special exception for health reasons.

	Page 18		Page 20
1	MS. ROSENFELD: Two out of the five Board members	1	changing the plans here in some way, usually I think that
	agreed with Staff on that point. And if his updated report		the, it may be that the zoning ordinance talks in terms of
	is going to be accepted in part or in whole, then I view		change of the plans. I can't recall an amendment to the
	that as a material change in the evidence that was provided		plan and I'm not sure that the additional data from Mr.
	in this case and that the updated report should be remanded		Sullivan fits squarely within that, but I would certainly
	or sent on to the Planning Staff for its review and		require in any event, given the nature of this case, that a
	consideration as happened with the amended plans. So I just		copy of that be furnished to staff and that they have the
	would like you to keep that in mind as a procedural point		opportunity reply. So that's
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	9	
10	MS. ROSENFELD: when you consider the motion in	_	specifically to plans and evidence in support of the
	limine.		application. But either way, if they're going to receive a
12	MR. GROSSMAN: I think I've actually asked Ms.		copy, that satisfies my request.
	Harris to send a copy of to make sure that a copy I	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely.
	either did that or I asked Ms	14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
15	MS. HARRIS: It was the landscaping plans.		after Mr. Sullivan's last report went in, there was no
16	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I was also I may have asked		formal response by staff. There was some discussion at the
			public hearing before the Planning Board
	materials from Mr. Sullivan and had intended that they be	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
	supplied to Staff. I think that minimally should be done	19	MS. CORDRY: but I would want to be able to
	under the zoning ordinance. So if that has not been done,		file the response to that updated data that said their
	then certainly they should be supplied that and they have		initial analysis was wrong, so
	the opportunity to comment on it.	22	
23	MS. HARRIS: Okay. We will do that.		they did file something, maybe it was in response to
24	MR. GROSSMAN: What I don't quite understand, the		something that the opposition filed after their
	connection between, yes, I recall that after Technical Staff	25	
23		23	No. Condition in a many mod
	Page 19		Page 21
1	-	1	-
	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from	1	was when I submitted my need report
2	-		was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from	2 3	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the	2 3	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process
2 3 4 5	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody	2 3 4 5	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process
2 3 4 5 6	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from	2 3 4 5	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't
2 3 4 5 6	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their	2 3 4 5 6	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report.	2 3 4 5 6 7	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report	2 3 6 7 8 9	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and	2 3 6 7 8 9	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff. MR. GROSSMAN: I totally agree with that, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on it. And I think in my e-mails, I thought of this issue and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff. MR. GROSSMAN: I totally agree with that, but that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on it. And I think in my e-mails, I thought of this issue and e-mailed them and they came in just to ask if she had received a copy and tendered that she had not and asked that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff. MR. GROSSMAN: I totally agree with that, but that's MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on it. And I think in my e-mails, I thought of this issue and e-mailed them and they came in just to ask if she had received a copy and tendered that she had not and asked that a copy be supplied. So that has now been accomplished</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff. MR. GROSSMAN: I totally agree with that, but that's MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: independent of whether or not there was something done way back when the initial Technical Staff report was filed and then was, and there were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on it. And I think in my e-mails, I thought of this issue and e-mailed them and they came in just to ask if she had received a copy and tendered that she had not and asked that a copy be supplied. So that has now been accomplished today. It's not there. MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman, just for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	had issued its report, there were, there was a response from the applicant and then there was a further response from Technical Staff or maybe there was, maybe it was after the opposition. I'm trying to remember back. Somebody responded. And then there was a further response from Technical Staff to something that was filed after their report. MS. ROSENFELD: That may be. The supplemental report MR. GROSSMAN: And I don't see the connection, and I didn't see the connection between that and the further obligations supplied Technical Staff with any amendments that happened recently. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, the zoning code requires that if there's a change to, if the applicant seeks to amend the petition for special exception or if there is a material change in the evidence provided in support of that, that it should be referred on to the Planning Staff. MR. GROSSMAN: I totally agree with that, but that's MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: independent of whether or not there was something done way back when the initial Technical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>was when I submitted my need report MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I had a lot of attachments and somehow the attachments did not get put into the process there. So they actually filed a supplemental piece dealing with the need issue. I don't MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I think it went to Mr. Sullivan's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I couldn't remember off the top of my head whether, but I remember that they filed something.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right. Right. I think it was on the needs issue.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Some supplement. Okay. Well, in any event, the bottom line here, as we say, is that a copy of the updated report from Mr. Sullivan will be supplied to Technical Staff and they will, they're invited to comment on it. And I think in my e-mails, I thought of this issue and e-mailed them and they came in just to ask if she had received a copy and tendered that she had not and asked that a copy be supplied. So that has now been accomplished today. It's not there.</li> </ul>

	Page 22		Page 24
1	your mind, is there ever a point in which the Planning Staff	1	we do, dealing with work-related issues, fitness for duty,
	would be required to respond?		return to duty, as well as environmental issues, air, ground
3	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I don't the code requires that	3	water, surface water, et cetera.
	they respond, but they are, they have the opportunity to	4	Q Just so the record is clear, when you use the term
	respond. The point is that if there are changes in the	5	boarded, what does that mean?
	plans, that Staff be given the opportunity, okay? All	6	A Board-certified by the American Board of
	right. Any other preliminary matters?	7	Preventative Medicine.
8	(No audible response.)	8	Q All right.
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Hearing none, we'll happily turn to	9	A That's the particular board that administers board
10	our next witness.	10	certification in the fields of occupational and
11	MR. GOECKE: And Costco would like to call Dr.	11	environmental medicine.
12	Chase.	12	Q All right. And a moment ago you mentioned about
13	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Dr. Chase.	13	seeing if people are fit to return to duty. Can you
14	MR. GOECKE: Chase, rather, I'm sorry. Would you	14	elaborate on what that means exactly?
15	step up here please, sir?	15	A A man or woman may sustain an injury at work or
16	MR. GROSSMAN: And, Mr. Chase, will you state your	16	outside the workplace and not be able to perform their full
17	full name and business address for the record please?	17	duties for a period of time and eventually they may feel
18	MR. CHASE: Kenneth H. Chase, M.D., and I work at	18	ready to return to duty and the employer may ask us to
19	1140 19th Street, N.W., in Washington, D.C.	19	confirm that he or she is ready to assume the full duties of
20	MR. GROSSMAN: Would you raise your right hand	20	whatever job it is.
21	please?	21	Q Okay. And you testified that you work for some
22	(Witness sworn.)	22	Federal agencies. Can you identify what agencies those are?
23	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may proceed, Ms.	23	A The Army Corps of Engineers on a worldwide basis;
24	Harris.	24	the FBI on a worldwide basis at times; Fannie Mae; the U.S.
25	MS. HARRIS: I'm going to	25	Capitol, in particular the architect of the Capitol; GSA and
	Page 23		Page 25
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, Mr. Goecke, okay.	1	others.
2	MS. HARRIS: defer to Mr. Goecke.	2	Q Thank you. Let's back up a bit. Where did you go
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION	3	to school?
4	BY MR. GOECKE:	4	A UCLA.
5	Q Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you tell us what you	5	Q And what degree did you obtain at UCLA?
6	do for a living?	6	A Bachelor's of mathematics with honors in 1964.
7	A I have a, I'm a physician, originally boarded in	7	Q Did you attend any other schools besides UCLA?
8	internal medicine and I still have a small clinic with three	8	A Well, I went to medical school at UCLA. I did my
9	or four exam rooms, chest x-ray, treadmill, et cetera, at my	9	internship and first year residency at University of
10	office on 19th Street in D.C. The larger part of what we do	10	Michigan. I then spent two years at NIH and then I
11	is consulting work to the Government and to the private	11	completed my third year medical residency at Georgetown
12	sector on a nationwide basis and occasionally outside of the	12	University following which I joined the full-time faculty at
13	United States.	13	George Washington University. I also had a part-time
14	Q What's the name of your company?	14	employment for a 3-year period overlapping what I just
15	A Washington Occupational Health Associates.	15	described at University of Maryland.
16	Q And what's your role at Washington Occupational Health Associates?	16	Q Have you ever testified as an expert witness before?
17		17	A Yes.
18	<ul><li>A I'm the founder and the president.</li><li>Q When did you found the company?</li></ul>	18 19	Q Where?
	Q When did you found the company? A July 1, 1980.	20	A I couldn't name all the, all the states, but all
19			over the country.
20	-		
20 21	Q In addition to being a practicing physician, can	21 22	-
20 21 22	Q In addition to being a practicing physician, can you elaborate a bit more on what else it is you do?	22	Q Could you estimate how many times you've been
20 21 22 23	<ul><li>Q In addition to being a practicing physician, can</li><li>you elaborate a bit more on what else it is you do?</li><li>A The, in addition to being boarded in internal</li></ul>	22 23	Q Could you estimate how many times you've been qualified as an expert witness?
20 21 22	Q In addition to being a practicing physician, can you elaborate a bit more on what else it is you do?	22	Q Could you estimate how many times you've been

	Page 26		Page 28
1	MR. GOECKE: In testifying before a trial or	1	A AMA?
2	MR. GROSSMAN: No, of, in what field of expertise?	2	Q American Medical Association.
3	MR. GOECKE: In, oh sure, in the fields of	3	A I know who they are, but I don't know the intent
4	internal medicine let's start with internal medicine.	4	of that qualified general.
5	THE WITNESS: More often in occupational and	5	Q Well, how about the American Board of Medical
6	environmental mostly.	6	Specializations, the categories general certificates and
7	MR. GOECKE: Okay.	7	subspecialty certificates, are you familiar with those?
8	THE WITNESS: And I would say it's average of five	8	A Yes, ADMS.
9	times a year for 30 years.	9	Q ADMS, yes.
10	BY MR. GOECKE:	10	A I'm familiar with them.
11	Q And your educational and work history is listed on	11	Q All right. And
12	your CV, is that correct?	12	A Occupational and environmental medicine, there are
13	A Yes.	13	only 3,000 physicians in the country
14	MR. GOECKE: And I think that's been submitted to	14	Q Okay.
15	the record as Exhibit 17(h). May I at this time, Mr.	15	A at the most 4,000 who are
16	Grossman, I'd like to offer Dr. Chase as an expert, a	16	Q Okay.
17	medical expert in the field of occupational environmental	17	A board-certified in the field and that makes it
18	medicine, as well as internal medicine.	18	a pretty small segment of the medical field
19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So occupational and is it	19	Q Absolutely, exactly
20	environmental?	20	A as opposed to internal medicine
21	MR. GOECKE: Yes.	21	Q what my point
22	MR. GROSSMAN: And environmental and internal	22	A where there are hundreds of thousands.
23	medicine. All right. Any voir dire of Dr. Chase?	23	Q My question is do you agree that both of areas in
24	MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh.	24	which you have board certification are general medical
25	MR. GROSSMAN: Would you like to go first, Ms.	25	specialties?
	Page 27		Page 29
1	-	1	
1	Rosenfeld?	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where
1 2 3	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.)	1 2 3	
2	Rosenfeld?	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman?
2 3	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine.	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have,
2 3 4	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman.	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area
2 3 4 5	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to
2 3 4 5 6	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me?	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q A general medical specialty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whether or not he's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q A general medical specialty A I'm not sure what you mean by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whether or not he's already answered your question, I let him answer your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q A general medical specialty A I'm not sure what you mean by Q is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whether or not he's already answered your question, I let him answer your question and he wasn't familiar with what that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q A general medical specialty A I'm not sure what you mean by Q is that correct? A general. As opposed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whether or not he's already answered your question, I let him answer your question and he wasn't familiar with what that characterization of a general specialization that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Rosenfeld? (Discussion off the record.) MR. ADELMAN: Go first, fine. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll defer to Dr. Adelman. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Yes. Good morning, Dr. Chase. Can you hear me? A Yes. Q Good. So I understand from your statement that you're board-certified in internal medicine and occupational and environmental medicine. Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, both of those are termed what? MR. ADELMAN: Both of those are termed general medical specialties, is that correct? THE WITNESS: No, I don't think so. Occupational, internal medicine has become almost equivalent to general medicine in some ways, but occupational and environmental medicine is considered a specialty. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q A general medical specialty A I'm not sure what you mean by Q is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what I'm not sure where does that get us? What is that, what impact does that have, Dr. Adelman? MR. ADLEMAN: I'll proffer that the specialty area in which Dr. Chase is certified is largely not relevant to the medical issues that are before you, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can establish that if you want, but I'm just saying whether you call it in general or special or a sub-category of general, what they're called in that regard, how does that affect us? MR. ADELMAN: It affects my logical progression of demonstrating what areas Dr. Chase is or is not board- certified in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's move to that and get away from whether or not they're called general or special because I just don't think that makes a difference to our consideration. MR. ADELMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Grossman, I think it does make a difference. It makes asking the questions more difficult, but I'll defer to you. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whether or not he's already answered your question, I let him answer your question and he wasn't familiar with what that

	Page 30		Page 32
1	MR. ADELMAN: Fine. Thank you.	1	Q Which half?
2	BY MR. ADELMAN:	2	A Cardiology, pulmonary, allergy and I think
3	Q Are you board-certified in any other general	3	MR. ADELMAN: Would it be appropriate, Mr.
4	medical specialty or sub-specialty and, if so, which?	4	Grossman, to ask as a supplement to the file we see those
5	A No.	5	certifications?
6	Q To be clear, so that there's no misunderstanding,	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's appropriate to ask
7	this avenue that you are not board-certified in any of the	7	anything you want and I think that is it required that he
8	following, and please correct me if I'm wrong, but to an	8	produce them? No, I wouldn't require him to produce them.
9	upwards of certified in allergy and immunology, in geriatric	9	MR. ADELMAN: Understood.
10	medicine, in adolescent medicine, in cardiovascular disease	10	MR. GROSSMAN: I think his you can certainly
11	and pulmonary disease, and internal and feral medicine or in	11	question him as you are, questioning him now about his
12	pediatric cardiology, is that correct?	12	qualifications
13	A It's correct that I'm not board-certified in those	13	MR. ADELMAN: Okay.
14	fields. Nevertheless, most of the areas you just named are	14	MR. GROSSMAN: and about the extent to which
15	part of the practice of general internal medicine.	15	his qualifications are applicable to issues here, you're
16	Q In the have you in the last two years taken any	16	doing a good job of inquiring about, but I think his resume
17	continuing medical education courses and if so in what	17	and what he's testifying to here is sufficient to establish
18	areas?	18	his view of the credentials.
19	A Yes, I continue obtaining continuing medical	19	MR. ADELMAN: Understood. Thank you.
20	education in a number of areas, most often in occupational,	20	BY MR. ADELMAN:
21	environmental and preventative medicine. I didn't say it	21	Q Dr. Chase, you spoke to the fact that you maintain
22	before, but preventative medicine is considered by most of	22	an operational clinic. Have you in the last two years
23	my colleagues to be part of occupational and environmental medicine.	23	treated any patients? If so, without reaching any aspect of
24 25	MR. ADELMAN: Just a moment, Mr. Grossman.	24 25	patient confidentiality, could you indicate what areas or what health problem you treated patients for?
2.5		25	what health problem you realed patients for a
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31 THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in	1	Page 33 A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little
1	-	1	
	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in		A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little
2 3	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits.	2	A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from
2 3	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds	2 3	A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all	2 3 4	A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas,	2 3 4 5	A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars	2 3 4 5 6	A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions. Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately? A 300.
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or gotten any CME credits for the following topics or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories? First of all, with respect to children, have you treated any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or gotten any CME credits for the following topics or information you received recently in two years, in allergy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories? First of all, with respect to children, have you treated any children?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or gotten any CME credits for the following topics or information you received recently in two years, in allergy and immunology, in geriatric medicine, in adolescent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories? First of all, with respect to children, have you treated any children?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or gotten any CME credits for the following topics or information you received recently in two years, in allergy and immunology, in geriatric medicine, in adolescent medicine, in cardiovascular medicine, in pulmonary disease,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories? First of all, with respect to children, have you treated any children?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the last two years? MR. ADELMAN: Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: And I spent a week in Orlando in April getting CME's, continuing medical education, credits. I occasionally attend grand rounds at, medical grand rounds at George Washington University where the topics are all over the map. And there are other, there are other areas, sometimes one-day seminars in the District or lunch seminars on a particular topic that I attend to various organizations. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Are those the grand rounds and lunch seminars do not, of course, qualify as continuing medical education courses, would you agree? A I think you asked me if they qualify and the answer is yes. Q As continuing medical education? A Yes, you're typically given a piece of paper when you leave the seminar that says this was good for one CME or three CME's, depending on the length. Q Okay. Thank you. Have you taken specifically or gotten any CME credits for the following topics or information you received recently in two years, in allergy and immunology, in geriatric medicine, in adolescent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes. My answer to your question depends a little bit on the time frame and the end of 2002 I stopped doing general internal medicine, but that didn't stop us from seeing patients for travel and immunization services, minor injury management and a variety of other conditions.</li> <li>Q What do you estimate approximately how many patients you saw in the last two years approximately?</li> <li>A 300.</li> <li>Q 300? And the majority were for occupational health and safety related issues, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yes. In some instances treatment was provided certainly for minor injury management. In other cases, that number 300, by the way, is probably low because I wasn't including all the pre-employment and onboard or in-service physical exams that we do so many of.</li> <li>Q Understood. Understood. Thank you. To be clear, I have a long list here. Have you treated any patients, any of the patients that you treated, do they fall into was the need for treatment in one of the following categories? First of all, with respect to children, have you treated any children?</li> </ul>

	Page 34		Page 36
1	MR. ADELMAN: Yes, precisely. Thank you.	1	BY MR. ADELMAN:
2	THE WITNESS: Certainly not as an ongoing treating	2	Q With respect to adults that you've treated, have
3	physician like a pediatrician would.	3	you treated an adult for any of the following lung diseases,
4	MR. ADELMAN: Well	4	including COPD, emphysema, asthma, lung cancer or with
5	THE WITNESS: But we've administered	5	respect to other systems within the respiratory system, have
6	immunizations, vaccinations to children who are traveling	6	you treated any adults for arterial sclerosis,
7	with their parents abroad.	7	cardiovascular disease, diabetes or any of the various
8	MR. ADELMAN: Okay.	8	components?
9	THE WITNESS: And that could be for either	9	A I, yes is the answer.
10	vacation or a change in work assignment, the FBI being a	10	Q Could you elaborate?
11	good example of people who get assigned overseas.	11	A Like I said in 2002, I terminated the traditional
12	BY MR. ADELMAN:	12	practice of internal medicine, but for over 30 years I
13	Q I'm sorry, I couldn't understand that.	13	treated all of those conditions on both inpatient and
14	A The FBI would be a good example of workers who end	14	outpatient basis and in emergency rooms and ICU's.
15	up with overseas assignments and they take their families	15	Q To clarify, my question went to the patients that
16	with them.	16	you have treated in the last two years.
17	Q Okay. And those would fall into the category, the	17	A If you restrict it to the last two years, no.
18	general category I mean, of preliminary evaluation,	18	MR. GROSSMAN: And what relevancy is the
19	preventative medicine, is that correct?	19	distinction between the last two years or the last 10 years,
20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Specifically, have you treated any children for</li> </ul>	20 21	Dr. Adelman: MR. ADELMAN: Medicine, as you know, Mr. Grossman,
22	any of the following: Depression, anxiety, acute	22	is a rapidly changing field. Treatments at five years ago
22	bronchitis, asthma or chronic productive cough?	22	were considered to be the state-of-the-art are frequently,
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Where does depression and anxiety	24	completely irrelevant and no longer considered in any way
25	fit into what we're looking at in this case?		valid.
	Page 35		Page 37
1	MR. ADELMAN: Those are conditions that are known	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, how about you made the cut-
1 2	or thought to arise from exposure to the various pollutants	2	off the last two years, so you're talking about anything
3	in automobile, automobile exhaust, excuse me.	3	before 2011. I
4	MR. GROSSMAN: You may answer the question. Have	4	MR. ADELMAN: I would be happy to amend that to
5	you treated children for any of the disorders that were	5	three years.
6	listed by Dr. Adelman? Do you want him to list them again?	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm just I don't know
7	THE WITNESS: No. No. Anxiety and depression in	7	that I just wanted to know what the basis is for that
8	children is something I'm familiar with. My wife is in the	8	particular cut-off and your question, so that I can evaluate
9	field of special ed and so we've had many chats about ADHD	9	whether it really makes a difference in terms of this
10	and related conditions she's seen, but that's not no, I	10	witness's qualification.
11	haven't done that in my office. Have I ever been asked to	11	MR. ADELMAN: The number two was picked
12	help understand a child's asthma, on occasion, or other	12	arbitrarily based on the assumption that if I said recently,
13	allergies?	13	you would immediately question what did recently mean.
14	BY MR. ADELMAN:	14	MR. GROSSMAN: That's a fair observation.
15	Q The question was not what you were asked to	15	MR. ADELMAN: So I picked two years and if you
16	evaluate. The question was have you treated a child as a	16	feel that three is a better number, I'll pick three.
17	patient for asthma, chronic productive cough	17	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't have an opinion on whether
18	A No.	18	it's two or three, I just wanted to know on what you based
19	Q acute bronchitis.	19	your distinction of two years versus his overall experience.
20	A I didn't hear the last thing you said.	20	Let me
21	Q Acute bronchitis.	21	MR. ADELMAN: Well, I can clarify the point a bit
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Acute bronchitis, have you treated	22	further. As you know, I taught medical students for roughly
23 24	a child for asthma THE WITNESS: No. No, we typically refer them to	23 24	40 years and so I had to keep current on the sorts of information they needed to know
24 25	their personal pediatrician when we feel that's warranted.	24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I can't have you testify now,
40	anon personal pediatrician when we reel that's warranted.	40	with Grooowan, well, i can't have you testily now,
L		I	

	Page 38		Page 40
1	but	1	issue. All right. Go ahead, Dr. Adelman.
2	MR. ADELMAN: Sorry.	2	MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman, according to his CV,
3	MR. GROSSMAN: but when you have an opportunity	3	according to his CV, Dr. Chase is an M.D. with
4	to testify, you can certainly elaborate whatever you think	4	certifications only in the general specialties of internal
5	is relevant to this case.	5	medicine and occupational medicine. A reading of his CV has
6	MR. ADELMAN: Fine.	6	revealed no evidence he has conducted any research or has
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Let me ask you Dr. Chase, you	7	any, or very little, experience in treating patients for the
8	list on your curriculum vitae, that's Exhibit 17(h), that	8	variety of conditions which are of concern to the opposition
9	you're an associate clinical professor of medicine,	9	as being in principle caused by automotive exhaust fumes.
10	Department of Medicine, George Washington University School	10	Furthermore, the answers to our questions indicate
11	of Medicine from 1995 and it's blank. To the present, I	11	that he's not an expert. He's judged by a board
12	presume? Are you still in that position?	12	certification in almost any of the areas that are relevant
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, and I still teach medical	13	to the medical concerns raised in this case. Furthermore,
14	students who rotate through our clinic and residents and	14	it appears that his testimony from reading his testimony is
15	fellows on a periodic basis. One of them is sitting in the	15	based primarily, if not exclusively, on Mr. Sullivan's
16	room, room right now sitting in and we've got, he's, he has	16	reports. And we will question Dr. Chase in detail as to
17	an MD, but he doesn't done a residency yet and starting next	17	whether or not he's actually read those reports in detail.
18	month, pardon me, November 5th, we'll have a woman with us	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's something that goes
19	full-time for several months who is board-certified in	19	beyond the question right now is the voir dire as to his
20	internal medicine, has practiced internal medicine and	20	expertise.
21	she's	21	MR. ADELMAN: Well, then in conclusion we object
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me cut you off because I	22	to having Dr. Chase accepted as an expert witness in the
23	don't think that that that goes beyond my question to	23	various areas of medicine that are relevant to this case.
24	you. Let me ask you if you keep current on current	24	MR. GROSSMAN: We being the
25	developments in occupational, environmental and internal	25	MR. ADELMAN: The Coalition.
	Dage 20		Dage 41
	Page 39		Page 41
1	Page 39 medicine?	1	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All
1 2	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.	1 2	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this
2 3	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness?
2 3 4	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I
2 3 4 5	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert
2 3 4 5 6	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified
2 3 4 5 6 7	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years. THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years. THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years. THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	medicine? THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. THE WITNESS: Are you a physician? MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me? MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician. MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years. THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> <li>reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> <li>reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the conclusions set forth in Sullivan's environmental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> <li>reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years</li> <li>minimum.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean the reason I asked those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the conclusions set forth in Sullivan's environmental consulting air quality, air and noise analysis,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> <li>reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years</li> <li>minimum.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean the reason I asked those</li> <li>questions is the voir dire seemed to go to the question of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the conclusions set forth in Sullivan's environmental consulting air quality, air and noise analysis, the filling station will not adversely affect the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I</li> <li>didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if</li> <li>you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical</li> <li>students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add</li> <li>or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of</li> <li>Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of</li> <li>Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been</li> <li>reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years</li> <li>minimum.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean the reason I asked those</li> <li>questions is the voir dire seemed to go to the question of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the conclusions set forth in Sullivan's environmental consulting air quality, air and noise analysis, the filling station will not adversely affect the health, safety or general welfare of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>medicine?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Are you a physician?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Pardon me?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman, I think he's asking if you're a physician.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm a Ph.D. I taught medical students for many, many years.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Understood. No problem.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Maybe it's relevant for me to add or, that I get the, I still read the New England Journal of Medicine every week, hard copy, along with the Journal of Occupational Environmental Medicine. I guess I've been reading the New England Journal of Medicine for 40 years minimum.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean the reason I asked those questions is the voir dire seemed to go to the question of whether or not you kept up-to-date on medical developments and so I was further inquiring about that and whether or not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: the Coalition? Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, do you have any questions of this witness? MS. ROSENFELD: I would join with Dr. Adelman. I also would like to object to his admission as an expert witness, but on different grounds. He was never identified as such. If you look at the pre-hearing submission which is hearing Exhibit 3(a), and reviewed a number of the witnesses that were identified. Mr. Stephen Gang will testify as an expert in land planning in Montgomery County. Mr. Joe Russell, certified expert, certified architect, will testify as an expert in the field of architecture. Mr. Mark Willard will testify as an expert in the field of landscape architecture. Thomas Flynn as an expert in the field of market analysis. It goes on and on. Dr. Kenneth Chase, on the other hand, was identified as follows. "Dr. Chase will testify that based on the conclusions set forth in Sullivan's environmental consulting air quality, air and noise analysis, the filling station will not adversely affect the health, safety or general welfare of the residents, visitors or workers in the area of the filling station."

	Page 42		Page 44
1	MR. GROSSMAN: You didn't consider that sufficient	1	add my expertise to the Costco team. That was hardly to
2	to identify him as an expert	2	limited to reading Sullivan's reports. I read everybody's
3	MS. ROSENFELD: I did not. Not what we have	3	reports that were given to me.
4	MR. GROSSMAN: along with his resume, his	4	Q So when you say everybody's reports, who are you
5	curriculum vitae in Exhibit 17(e)?	5	referring to?
6	MS. ROSENFELD: We have, we have one, two, three,	6	A That were given to me, Dr. Jison, Dr. Breysse,
7	four, five, six, seven, eight witnesses who were	7	David Sullivan and there may have been one or two other
8	specifically identified as experts. We have two who are	8	ones, but I didn't limit myself to reviewing their reports.
9	not, Mr. Brann and Mr. Agliata, were not identified as	9	I reviewed, extensively reviewed the medical and scientific
10	experts. And certainly at no point in his submission was he	10	literature that applies to the questions on this case, both
11	identified as an expert in, quote, occupational and	11	domestic and otherwise.
12	environmental medicine and internal medicine. So I would	12	Q How many I'm sorry.
13	object to him being admitted as an expert and I would ask	13	A I also went back to some, re-reviewed some similar
14	that his testimony be limited to the scope of Mr. Sullivan's	14	cases that my organization has been involved in in years
15	noise, air quality, odor and noise analysis reports.	15	past looking for parallels.
16	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, did you know he was	16	Q Could you find any?
17	going to testify as an expert? The truth now.	17	A None identical, no.
18	MS. ROSENFELD: I would not know the scope of his	18	Q Were there any prior projects you worked on that
19	testimony.	19	were helpful in forming your opinions in this case?
20	MR. GROSSMAN: But to answer my question, you knew	20	A Yes. I mean you could take noise, for example.
21	he was going to testify	21	I'm the person who designed the Hearing Conservation Program
22	MS. ROSENFELD: To answer your question	22	for Amtrak. I'm the guy who designed the Hearing
23	MR. GROSSMAN: as an expert?	23	Conservation Program for Conrail and numerous printing
24	MS. ROSENFELD: I knew he would be proffered as	24	companies throughout the metropolitan, Washington, D.C. area
25	an expert, yes, I did.	25	and a few Government agencies as well. My company is the
	Page 43		Page 45
1	MP CPOSSMAN: I think that that's guite apparent	1	only organization in the metropolitan Washington area that
1	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that that's quite apparent from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted	1	only organization in the metropolitan Washington area that
2	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted	2	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing
2 3	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have	2 3	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.
2 3 4	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the	2 3 4	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course.
2 3 4 5	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think	2 3 4 5	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.
2 3 4	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that	2 3 4	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr. Chase. There's an objection pending.
2 3 4 5 6	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think	2 3 4 5 6	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.
2 3 4 5 6 7	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in	2 3 6 7 8 9	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr. Chase. There's an objection pending. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections. Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr. Chase's report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr. Chase. There's an objection pending. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections. Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr. Chase's report. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a potential adverse health effect and that would fall under</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Dr. Chase, what was your role in this case? What	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a potential adverse health effect and that would fall under that umbrella.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Dr. Chase, what was your role in this case? What did Costco hire you to do?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: conservation course.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a potential adverse health effect and that would fall under that umbrella.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And if I may just respond? His</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Dr. Chase, what was your role in this case? What did Costco hire you to do? A Costco asked me to review the situation, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke? MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a potential adverse health effect and that would fall under that umbrella. MS. ROSENFELD: And if I may just respond? His report says it's it addresses air quality, adverse</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from the filings here and the discussions and if you wanted to raise this procedural point, you certainly could have done so months, many months ago, so I inject that as the ill-founded. And as to the witness's expertise, I think he's been amply demonstrated as an expert in the fields that were proffered, occupational, environmental and internal medicine and I accept him as an expert as such. And I'll reiterate the standard, of course, for experts is not that they necessarily have to have a degree in something, although this expert is certainly highly degreed, it is that they have, they can offer evidence beyond the can of laymen in a particular area that will be of assistance to the fact finder. And he certainly qualifies as an expert in that area. You can certainly cross-examine him on the substance of his testimony, but he's qualified as an expert. All right. And I accept him as an expert in those fields. Okay. Do you wish to begin your examination on the substance? MR. GOECKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Grossman. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Dr. Chase, what was your role in this case? What did Costco hire you to do?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>puts on a hearing conservation course, a 3-day hearing MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. THE WITNESS: conservation course. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on one second, Dr.</li> <li>Chase. There's an objection pending. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I have two objections.</li> <li>Number one, I certainly don't see the relevance. And, number two, there's no discussion of noise whatsoever in Dr.</li> <li>Chase's report. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's, well, do you want to respond, Mr. Goecke? MR. GOECKE: He's responding to my question of did he draw from any prior experience that have helped him form his opinions in this case, in this case, rather. And he's identifying some and it's true that he doesn't identify noise specifically in his report, but he does testify that there's going to be no adverse health effects to the general neighborhood, visitors or workers at the site which purportedly would include noise if we consider loud noises a potential adverse health effect and that would fall under that umbrella.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And if I may just respond? His</li> </ul>

	Page 46		Page 48
-	-	1	
1	report whatsoever about noise.	1	Federal Register. I reviewed regulatory documents, mostly
2	MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman, can I add a	2	EPA, occasionally a few others.
3	complication?	3	Q And in reviewing these studies and doing these
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Of course, Dr. Adelman.	4	reports, did you form any opinions about whether or not the
5	MR. ADELMAN: The opposition has never raised	5	proposed Costco gas station may adversely affect the health
6	noise as a health issue. It is a nuisance issue, but we	6	of the residents, workers and neighbors of the proposed
7	have never raised noise as a matter of health impact.	7	special exception?
8	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I think actually Dr.	8	A Yes.
9	Adelman's complication is a helpful clarification and I do	9	Q And what is your opinion?
10	think that Ms. Rosenfeld raises a fair point that your, that	10	A No effect.
11	the report filed on behalf of Dr. Chase doesn't give them	11	Q And what is that based on?
12	notice that he will be testifying regarding health impacts	12	A The none of the criteria pollutants that are
13	of noise. I certainly didn't take it to mean that when I	13	regulated by EPA that have been discussed in this case
14	read it. So I think it's fair to say that even though his	14	already will be exceeded by the proposed Costco gas station.
15	answer may be responsive to your question, your question is	15	Q And when you say criteria pollutants, what are you
16	legitimately objectionable to the extent it goes to that.	16	referring to?
17	MR. GOECKE: Okay. I'll move on.	17	A Carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, what's
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Sustained is the ruling on that.	18	called PM2.5, which is an abbreviation for airborne
19	BY MR. GOECKE:	19	particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in diameter and I
20	Q Dr. Chase, you testified that you read numerous	20	don't think I mentioned CASAC yet, but I've CASAC is
21	scientific reports or articles related, or as part of your	21	actually independent of EPA and CASAC is the committee
22	preparation for this case. Can you estimate how many	22	that's responsible for recommending what are called NAAQS
23	articles you think you've read?	23	for short, that's National Ambient Air Quality Standards,
24	A I didn't finish answering the previous question.	24	that do have the force of law.
25	Q We're going to, we're going to move on	25	Q And I take it that CASAC is an acronym also. What
	Page 47		Page 49
1	-	1	-
1	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on	1	does that stand for?
	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question.		does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,
2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and	2	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may
2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question.	2 3 4	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did?	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>does that stand for?</li><li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,</li><li>Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li><li>Q That's the general idea?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>does that stand for?</li> <li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,</li> <li>Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q That's the general idea?</li> <li>A But that's the general idea.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>does that stand for?</li> <li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,</li> <li>Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q That's the general idea?</li> <li>A But that's the general idea.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>does that stand for?</li> <li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,</li> <li>Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q That's the general idea?</li> <li>A But that's the general idea.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke,</li> <li>when you asked your question about who would be affected by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>does that stand for?</li> <li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory,</li> <li>Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q That's the general idea?</li> <li>A But that's the general idea.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke,</li> <li>when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ' ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Vell, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ' ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ' ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Vell, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a case, so I had to get up to speed on, again, on carbon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station adversely affect the health or general welfare of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a case, so I had to get up to speed on, again, on carbon monoxide, that it dealt with carbon monoxide for decades	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, visitors or workers to the area?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a case, so I had to get up to speed on, again, on carbon monoxide, that it dealt with carbon monoxide for decades both in occupational and non-occupational settings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>does that stand for?</li> <li>A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q That's the general idea?</li> <li>A But that's the general idea.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure weMR. GOECKE: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that.</li> <li>BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, visitors or workers to the area?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a case, so I had to get up to speed on, again, on carbon monoxide, that it dealt with carbon monoxide for decades both in occupational and non-occupational settings. Q Are there any other things you did to prepare your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, visitors or workers to the area? A No. MR. GROSSMAN: No? Thank you. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to move on MR. GOECKE: from that question. MR. GROSSMAN: because they objected to it and I sustained that objection to that question. THE WITNESS: You did? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Oh. 80 to 100. MR. ADELMAN: Clarification. Were those read in preparation for this case, 80 to 100? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's let him MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: ask his questions and then you can cross-examine on any points that are raised. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I shouldn't have been so quick before. If there are other examples from your past that do not relate to noise that helped you form your opinions or helped you conduct your analysis in this case, please talk about those. A I testified in Oakland less than a year ago on a case, so I had to get up to speed on, again, on carbon monoxide, that it dealt with carbon monoxide for decades both in occupational and non-occupational settings.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	does that stand for? A The Committee for it is the Committee Advisory, Council Advisory Scientific Air Quality Committee. I may have botched that a little bit. I'm sorry. Q That's the general idea? A But that's the general idea. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By the way, Mr. Goecke, when you asked your question about who would be affected by the, by the proposed gas station, you asked, I think, about workers and residents. You asked about visitors? MR. GOECKE: I thought I did. I'll ask it again though just to be sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's, yes, let's make sure we MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: find out what the doctor's opinion, Dr. Chase's opinion is on all of that. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let me ask you this question again, Dr. Chase. In your professional opinion, will a proposed gas station adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, visitors or workers to the area? A No.

	Page 50		Page 52
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	pollutants will exceed the EPA standards. Tell us what significance the EPA national ambient air quality standards have in this case. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to, once again, interrupt for one second to ask what about, will the proposed gas station have any health impact on students attending schools in the area or people at play or whatever, or attending a local swimming pool? THE WITNESS: No, I've been to that school and what I noticed was the paths leading up to the front door is, it was littered with cigarette butts. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's, that's not really responsive to my THE WITNESS: I've taken photos of it. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not responsive to my question. I just want to make sure that I know your opinion as to health impacts of all the people who might be in this area and I'm just not sure that the description of residents, visitors or workers covers everybody who might be subjected to this. So that's why I ask whether or not in your opinion the proposed gas station based on your review would have any health impacts on the students in nearby schools or those in other and nearby recreation areas. THE WITNESS: Well, I know there's a pool and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	
	THE WITNESS: Well, I know there's a pool and		-
25	tennis courts and I know about the I've been to the	25	intended to protect the public health. Does that include
	Page 51		Page 53
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 51 school. No, I put them in the same category. They won't have any impact and that's actually based on CASAC's standards and comparing CASAC standards to the modeling done by the Sullivan Group and the measurements taken at a relatively similar station in Sterling, Virginia. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you I'm going to let Mr. Goecke continue. And I do, I want to remind you that I want to hear Dr. Chase's opinions both with regard to Mr. Sullivan's original assumptions as well as with regard to the assumptions he modified in his August 16 report, okay? MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. We'll get to the Stephen Knolls School a bit more specifically in a moment, but you were testifying about the significance of CASAC and their role with EPA and the development of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Can you elaborate on that? What are those standards? Why are they important? A They're the only standards that apply to air quality in Montgomery County or Maryland Q Okay. A for that matter.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 53 sensitive populations? A Yes, they're designed there's a wide margin of safety for the general population, but wide enough that it's, they're intended to protect vulnerable populations that would include the elderly, persons with emphysema, COPD, chronic constructive pulmonary disease, asthma Q What about asthma? A children, any vulnerable subset and that's called out in the statute and has been there for decades. Q And when you say spelled out in the statute, what do you mean? A There's a paragraph, well, there's a parenthetical that says, "Including vulnerable members of the population such as individuals with asthma," et cetera, all the conditions listed as good examples. Q So the EPA is required to set standards that protect those types of conditions or that A And that requirement derives from the Clean Air Act originally adopted in 1963. Q And so as it pertains specifically to the Stephen Knolls School, is it your testimony that those standards are designed to protect children at that school?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>school. No, I put them in the same category. They won't have any impact and that's actually based on CASAC's standards and comparing CASAC standards to the modeling done by the Sullivan Group and the measurements taken at a relatively similar station in Sterling, Virginia.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you I'm going to let Mr.</li> <li>Goecke continue. And I do, I want to remind you that I want to hear Dr. Chase's opinions both with regard to Mr.</li> <li>Sullivan's original assumptions as well as with regard to the assumptions he modified in his August 16 report, okay?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Thank you.</li> <li>BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q All right. We'll get to the Stephen Knolls School a bit more specifically in a moment, but you were testifying about the significance of CASAC and their role with EPA and the development of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Can you elaborate on that? What are those standards? Why are they important?</li> <li>A They're the only standards that apply to air quality in Montgomery County or Maryland</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>sensitive populations?</li> <li>A Yes, they're designed there's a wide margin of safety for the general population, but wide enough that it's, they're intended to protect vulnerable populations that would include the elderly, persons with emphysema, COPD, chronic constructive pulmonary disease, asthma Q What about asthma?</li> <li>A children, any vulnerable subset and that's called out in the statute and has been there for decades.</li> <li>Q And when you say spelled out in the statute, what do you mean?</li> <li>A There's a paragraph, well, there's a parenthetical that says, "Including vulnerable members of the population such as individuals with asthma," et cetera, all the conditions listed as good examples.</li> <li>Q So the EPA is required to set standards that protect those types of conditions or that</li> <li>A And that requirement derives from the Clean Air Act originally adopted in 1963.</li> <li>Q And so as it pertains specifically to the Stephen Knolls School, is it your testimony that those standards are</li> </ul>

	Page 54		Page 56
1	be at an increased risk of developing asthma. Do you think	1	BY MR. GOECKE:
2	the potential emissions from the Costco gas station will	2	Q What portions of Mr. Sullivan's report were most
3	cause more children or local residents to develop asthma?	3	important to you in coming to your conclusions?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Let me broaden that question. You	4	A His estimates of what the, what the likely
5	say the emissions from the gas station. I take that	5	concentration levels of the criteria pollutants were likely
6	question to include anything, any emissions that may be	6	to be as a result of operating, building and operating the
7	generated as a result of the gas station whether it is cars	7	Costco gas station.
8	that are queued in line, cars that are at the pumps, action	8	Q Okay. Can you characterize the level of
9	at the pumps, trucks that are delivering gasoline, they're	9	anticipated emissions from Costco gas station and all of the
10	delivering the fuel, or cars that are on the ring roads	10	uses associated with that gas station?
11 12	attending it. I'm taking that question as a broad question to include all of those.	11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: What does that question, when you characterize, what do you mean by that?
13	THE WITNESS: I'm taking it the same way and my	13	MR. GOECKE: What I mean by characterize? In
14	answer is no.	14	terms of the significance of those contributions.
15	BY MR. GOECKE:	15	MR. GROSSMAN: You mean individually, by
16	Q You've reviewed Mr. Sullivan's reports in this	16	individual pollutant or what exactly are you asking?
17	case, is that correct?	17	MR. GOECKE: The quantity of emissions that are
18	A Yes.	18	likely to come from the proposed special exception and the
19	Q And do you remember how many reports you	19	related uses, are they significant.
20	submitted?	20	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21	A I think five, one, a draft in 2011; a pretty	21	THE WITNESS: Can I refer to a document?
22	complete one in November of 2012; and then there were, that	22	MR. GROSSMAN: If you can't answer it without
23	was followed by three supplements, two in January, or maybe	23	referring to the document, yes. If you need to refer to a
24	one was December or one in January of 2013; and the latest	24	document, you may.
25	one which was mentioned earlier, August 16th of 2013.	25	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll answer it without
	Page 55		Page 57
1	Q And you heard Mr. Grossman mention a moment ago	1	referring to the document. The calculated emissions are so
2	about whether your opinion had changed between the Sullivan	2	much lower than background. For example, for PM2.5, it's
3	reports that were done before the August 16, 2013, report	3	known that the background levels are around 10.8 micrograms
4	and the most recent supplement that he submitted. Did his	4	per cubic meter. The Costco gas station would contribute about 1/10,000 of that amount to background. And the other
5	most recent submission cause your opinions in this case to change at all?	5	about 1/10.000 of that amount to background. And the other
		6	_
		6	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say
7	A No.	6 7 8	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are
8		7	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say
8	A No. Q And why do you say that?	7 8	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based
8 9	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was	7 8 9	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise
8 9 10	<ul> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q And why do you say that?</li> <li>A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was</li> <li>caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels.
8 9 10 11	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise.
8 9 10 11 12	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay. A But other than that, no.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. It's GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air
8 9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q And why do you say that?</li> <li>A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was</li> <li>caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for</li> <li>NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But other than that, no.</li> <li>Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay. A But other than that, no. Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least in part, on Mr. Sullivan's reports, is that correct?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: For air quality.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay. A But other than that, no. Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least in part, on Mr. Sullivan's reports, is that correct? A Correct.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: For air quality. THE WITNESS: I stand by my answer.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay. A But other than that, no. Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least in part, on Mr. Sullivan's reports, is that correct? A Correct. Q And, specifically, the finding that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: For air quality. THE WITNESS: I stand by my answer. MR. GROSSMAN: And, Dr. Chase, would you please
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q And why do you say that?</li> <li>A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was</li> <li>caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in</li> <li>the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for</li> <li>NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it,</li> <li>divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by</li> <li>188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies</li> <li>that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what</li> <li>background NO2 levels are.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But other than that, no.</li> <li>Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least</li> <li>in part, on Mr. Sullivan's reports, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And, specifically, the finding that MR. GROSSMAN: Let's try not to lead this witness.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: For air quality. THE WITNESS: I stand by my answer. MR. GROSSMAN: And, Dr. Chase, would you please speak up a little bit because there's no loud speaker in
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A No. Q And why do you say that? A Well, I'm aware that an arithmetic error was caught I'm guessing by a Dr. Cole. I don't know if he's in the room or not, but it was buried in the calculation for NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The Sullivan, as I understand it, divided a number by 188 when he should have multiplied it by 188. And his August 16th supplement or revision clarifies that and gives us, I guess, more accurate estimates of what background NO2 levels are. Q Okay. A But other than that, no. Q Your conclusions in this case are based, at least in part, on Mr. Sullivan's reports, is that correct? A Correct. Q And, specifically, the finding that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pollutants are typically 100th of background. I can't say that for noise, but again the Costco noise levels are based MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise levels. MR. GOECKE: Let's not talk about noise. THE WITNESS: We're not? MR. GROSSMAN: We're not talking about noise. It's just MR. GOECKE: We're not going to talk about noise. MR. GROSSMAN: just air quality. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Just the criteria for the air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: For air quality. THE WITNESS: I stand by my answer. MR. GROSSMAN: And, Dr. Chase, would you please

1	Page 58			Page 60
-	BY MR. GOECKE:	1	A 1	Fhey did.
2	Q Dr. Chase is the amount of emissions important	2		How do you know that?
3	then to your conclusions?	3		can't remember which document transcript I read,
4	A Yes.	4		SAC considered everything under the sun is what I can
5	Q And why is that?	5	tell.	
6	A Dose makes the poison.	6		Okay. Are you familiar with the EPA Integrated
7	Q What do you mean does makes the poison?	7		formation System known as IRIS?
8	A Something that Paris Health just said in the 15th	8		RIS?
9	Century, but it stuck. The almost anything, virtually	9		Yes.
	any substance at a high enough dose can be harmful and,	-		Yes, at least to a degree. I don't have it
10 11	conversely, if the dose is low, low enough, it's not going	10 11		ized, but
	to make any difference.			Can you tell us what that system is?
12	-	12		-
13	Q Thank you.	13		They identified particular chemicals and assigned
14	A And when I say that, I will go a step further on	14		tors to them, typically cancer risk factors.
15	that one. There's no way that anybody would be able to	15		And what type of contaminants do they analyze?
16	measure the health impacts of the Costco gas station because	16		don't know all of them, but I believe mostly
17	the emissions are going to be so low. It's like white	17		als that are considered to have carcinogenic potential
18	noise. You won't be able to separate it out from background	18	for hum	
19	from what's already there.	19		Do they include volatile organic compounds?
20	Q Okay. Members of the opposition are arguing that	20		Yes.
21	the EPA national ambient air quality standards are	21		And have you analyzed those numbers in comparison
22	insufficient to protect the public health. How do you	22		situation?
23	respond to that?	23		'm not sure what you
24	A I noticed that. It's the those are our	24		Sure. Sure.
25	national standards. Those are the only standards that apply	25	Αľ	'm not sure what you yes, I did.
	Page 59			Page 61
1	to the state of Maryland. And as far as I know, the states	-	<u> </u>	Let me try it this way. Did the IRIS database
		1	QI	Lot mo dy it and way. Did the inter database
2	are free to adopt stricter standards if they wish to and	1 2		nto your conclusions in this case at all?
	are free to adopt stricter standards if they wish to and California did to a degree and that's reported to, that		factor ir	
2		2	factor in A	nto your conclusions in this case at all?
2 3 4	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that	2 3	factor in A Q I	nto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes.
2 3 4 5	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the	2 3 4	factor ir A Y Q I A I	nto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way?
2 3 4 5	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air	2 3 4 5	factor in A N Q I A I Sullivar	nto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with
2 3 4 5 6	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA	2 3 4 5 6	factor in A Y Q I A I Sullivar Q A	nto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with n's conclusions.
2 3 4 5 6 7	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7	factor ir A Y Q I A I Sullivar Q / A T	nto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	factor ir A Y Q I A I Sullivar Q / A T	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? It was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? Fhat the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	factor ir A Y Q I A I Sullivar Q Z A T associa health r	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? It was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? Fhat the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	factor ir A Y Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? It was helpful in my reaching an agreement with n's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	factor ir A M Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	factor ir A M Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. //S. ROSENFELD: Objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M M did he c	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? It was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes? MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	factor ir A M Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he o	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes? MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	factor ir A M Q I A T Sullivar A T associa health r M did he o N witness	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes? MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he c M witness conclus	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Objection. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: Yes? <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this a is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he c M witness conclus	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. <i>IS.</i> ROSENFELD: Objection. <i>IR.</i> GROSSMAN: Yes? <i>IS.</i> ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. <i>IR.</i> GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he c M witness conclus can sta overrule	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. AS. ROSENFELD: Objection. AR. GROSSMAN: Yes? AS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. AR. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that have much worse air pollution problems than we do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	factor ir A M Q I A T Sullivar A T associa health r M did he d M witness conclus can sta overrule	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Objection. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: Yes? <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that have much worse air pollution problems than we do. Q Do you know whether CASAC or the EPA considered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he o M witness conclus can sta overrule Q I	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Objection. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: Yes? <i>I</i> S. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. <i>I</i> R. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed. BY MR. GOECKE: Did Mr. Sullivan's reports analyze whether or not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that have much worse air pollution problems than we do. Q Do you know whether CASAC or the EPA considered the WHO guidelines when forming the national ambient air	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he o M witness conclus can sta overrule Q I the VO	<ul> <li>nto your conclusions in this case at all?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In what way?</li> <li>t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with n's conclusions.</li> <li>And what were Sullivan's conclusions?</li> <li>That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks.</li> <li><i>I</i>S. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li><i>I</i>R. GROSSMAN: Yes?</li> <li><i>I</i>S. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health.</li> <li><i>I</i>R. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed.</li> <li><i>BY</i> MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Did Mr. Sullivan's reports analyze whether or not C levels, if it exceeded IRIS standards or the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that have much worse air pollution problems than we do. Q Do you know whether CASAC or the EPA considered the WHO guidelines when forming the national ambient air quality standards?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	factor in A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health n M did he o M witness conclus can sta overrule Q I the VOO A I	hto your conclusions in this case at all? Yes. In what way? t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with h's conclusions. And what were Sullivan's conclusions? That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks. <i>IS.</i> ROSENFELD: Objection. <i>IR.</i> GROSSMAN: Yes? <i>IS.</i> ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health. <i>IR.</i> GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed. BY MR. GOECKE: Did Mr. Sullivan's reports analyze whether or not C levels, if it exceeded IRIS standards or the Did you say VOC?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	California did to a degree and that's reported to, that organization is called CARB, C-A-R-B, the California Air Research Board. And in disputes like this one, often the experts will refer to the CARB standards, as well as the EPA standards. Though, Maryland Q I'm sorry, go ahead. A The proposed Costco station meets both sets of standards. Q Are you familiar with the World Health Organization guidelines for air quality? A Yes. Q Should those guidelines apply in this context? A No. Q Why not? A Well, they're only guidelines. They're not standards. They don't have the force of law. They're not enforced. And they're world guidelines for countries that have much worse air pollution problems than we do. Q Do you know whether CASAC or the EPA considered the WHO guidelines when forming the national ambient air	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	factor ir A A Q I A I Sullivar Q A A T associa health r M did he d M witness conclus can sta overrule Q I the VOO A I Q X	<ul> <li>nto your conclusions in this case at all?</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>In what way?</li> <li>t was helpful in my reaching an agreement with n's conclusions.</li> <li>And what were Sullivan's conclusions?</li> <li>That the proposed Costco gas station and the ated activities with it would not pose any human risks.</li> <li><i>I</i>S. ROSENFELD: Objection.</li> <li><i>I</i>R. GROSSMAN: Yes?</li> <li><i>I</i>S. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan was not proffered nor opine on health.</li> <li><i>I</i>R. GROSSMAN: I understand that. He's, this is stating his understanding of Mr. Sullivan's ions. So you can cross-examine on the point, but he te what his understanding is. So your objection is ed.</li> <li><i>BY</i> MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Did Mr. Sullivan's reports analyze whether or not C levels, if it exceeded IRIS standards or the</li> </ul>

	Page 62		Page 64
1	Q Okay. And based on Mr. Sullivan's conclusions	1	THE WITNESS: but I can say minimal. As I
2	about VOC levels, what is your conclusion about the	2	understand it, the design of the underground storage tank is
3	potential health effect to the residents, visitors, workers	3	state-of-the-art. You've got primary and secondary vapor
4	of the proposed Costco gas, excuse me, proposed Costco gas	4	recovery.
5	station site and the surrounding neighborhood?	5	BY MR. GOECKE:
6	MR. GROSSMAN: And that includes people in the	6	Q Well, I'm talking about diesel fuel here now, not
7	schools and recreation users too?	7	the unleaded fuel that will be sold at the gas station.
8	MR. GOECKE: Including	8	Some folks are saying that the emissions from diesel
9	THE WITNESS: Negligible.	9	delivery trucks, as Mr. Grossman mentioned, other diesel
10	BY MR. GOECKE:	10	vehicles that come to the site.
11	Q And why is that?	11	A I'm sorry, I got off track. Let me back up. It's
12	A They're too low.	12	my understanding that Costco is going to have fuel delivered
13	Q Let's talk about diesel fumes for a second. The	13	by trucks that were made, manufactured in 2010 or 2012,
14	opposition has complained that there's going to be fumes	14	certainly not older than 2010.
15	from diesel that will create an adverse health impact.	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Objection.
16	First of all, do you know if Costco intends to sell	16	THE WITNESS: And that makes a huge difference.
17	MR. ADELMAN: Objection. The opposition never	17	BY MR. GOECKE:
18	made such an assertion. We never raised a concern about	18	Q All right.
19	diesel.	19	MR. GROSSMAN: What's your objection, Mr.
20	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I think that's correct.	20	Silverman?
21	As far as I I mean there have been questions by the	21	MR. SILVERMAN: That was not, that was not the
22	opposition that may have led you to believe that that was an	22	testimony. Their testimony was about their delivery trucks
23	issue for them, but I don't know if they've asserted that	23	in the warehouse. They did testify that the trucks
24	per se. But the opposition, there were so many documents	24	delivering to the gas station were not in their control.
25	filed by the opposition that I can't say for sure that they	25	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think what they as I
	Page 63		Page 65
1	did or didn't. Why don't we, instead of characterizing what	1	recall the testimony, it is that they would require, Costco
2	the opposition has raised as a point, why don't you just ask	2	requires that they would be clean diesel trucks or the new
3	a question?	3	clean diesel technology for all the trucks that would be
4	MR. GOECKE: Sure. Sure. Sure.	4	delivering gas to that station. That's my recollection.
5	BY MR. GOECKE:	5	Mr. Brann, is that correct?
6	Q Do you know if Costco intends to sell diesel fuel	6	MR. BRANN: That's correct.
7	at the gas station?	7	MR. GROSSMAN: That's my recollection of Mr.
8	A They do not.	8	Brann's testimony.
9	Q Okay. Do you anticipate that there will be any	9	MR. SILVERMAN: That Costco requires the gas
10	emissions from these vehicles as a result of the proposed	10	trucks to be clean diesel?
11	gas station?	11	(Discussion off the record.)
12	A These vehicles?	12	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We can't that's my
13	Q Will there be any emissions from any diesel	13	recollection of Mr. Brann's testimony, but in any event, the
14	vehicle, yes.	14	witness your objection is not well-founded from a
		15	different standpoint. It's the witness's answer. It's his
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Are you talking when you say any		understanding that controls his secure. Very secure
15 16	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas	16	understanding that controls his answer. You can cross-
15 16 17	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that	16 17	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his
15 16 17 18	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel?	16 17 18	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination
15 16 17 18 19	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that.	16 17 18 19	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based
15 16 17 18 19 20	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	16 17 18 19 20	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based on his understanding.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And I've been trying to do it in a	16 17 18 19 20 21	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based on his understanding. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And I've been trying to do it in a non-leading way.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based on his understanding. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE:
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And I've been trying to do it in a non-leading way. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based on his understanding. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Dr. Chase, let's assume, whether it's true or
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	diesel, are you talking about vehicles visiting to get gas or are you talking, are you including the trucks that deliver the fuel? MR. GOECKE: I'm referring to all of that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And I've been trying to do it in a non-leading way.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examine if you can raise evidence that is contrary to his understanding, you can use that either in cross-examination or in your own testimony, but he's entitled to answer based on his understanding. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE:

	Page 66		Page 68
-	A Yes, I am.	1	vicitors, the workers, the neighbors of the Castee and
1	Q And what does that mean, tell us about clean		visitors, the workers, the neighbors of the Costco gas station, including occupants or visitors to the swimming
	diesel vehicles.	2	pool or the Stephen Knolls School?
3	A Well, I guess a watershed, the right time would be	3	A No.
5	2007 and the design of diesel engines, as well as diesel	5	Q And do you reach that conclusion with a reasonable
6	fuel, from about 2006 to 2007 forward are cleaner, they're a	6	degree of scientific certainty?
7	lot cleaner. They're about 100-fold cleaner than they were	7	A Yes.
8	10, 15 years ago and that's been true since about	8	Q One final question, Dr. Chase. Do you consider
9	certainly post 2007, it's the case and there are reasons for	9	yourself to be biased?
10	that.	10	A No.
11	Q And when you say cleaner, how are they cleaner?	11	Q Thank you.
12	A They're equipped with devices like high-efficient,	12	MR. GOECKE: No further questions.
13	catalyzed, high-efficiency diesel particulate filters in the	13	MR. GROSSMAN: That's a strange question.
14	exhaust system that trap the bad stuff and goes, filters out	14	MR. GOECKE: What, the biased question?
15	periodically themselves cleaned or regenerated is the term	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'll let it go. Let me just
16	used in the industry. And they have I forget what the	16	ask before I take a break and open this up to cross-
17	something or they have a couple of other devices too, but	17	examination, Dr. Chase, you mentioned when you were asked
18	that's the, probably the most important one that assures	18	about the change in the Sullivan reports, you mentioned the
19	cleaner fuel.	19	arithmetic correction, but it's my understanding of his
20	Q In terms of the bad staff that the filters catch,	20	August 16 report that he did more than make a mathematical
21	does that include particulate matter?	21	correction with regard to the, his arithmetic mistake
22	A Yes.	22	earlier on. He also relaxed certain assumptions in his,
23	Q Okay.	23	from his earlier report. Are you familiar with that, the
24	A Yes.	24	relaxation of the assumptions that he had that he had
25	Q And, again, there's been testimony in this case	25	characterized as very conservative and now he was giving in
	Page 67		Page 69
1	-	1	
1	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually	1	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was
	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean		his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more
2	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are	2	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you
2 3	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean	2 3	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard?
2 3 4	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept?	2 3 4	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you
2 3 4 5	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what	2 3 4 5	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm
2 3 4 5 6	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am.	2 3 4 5 6	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that.
2 3 4 5 6 7	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the	2 3 4 5 6 7	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Okay. So, Dr. Chase, just so we're clear, based	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so I wanted to get,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Okay. So, Dr. Chase, just so we're clear, based on your experience and training in the work that you've done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so I wanted to get, given those, that's the, those are the, based on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Okay. So, Dr. Chase, just so we're clear, based on your experience and training in the work that you've done in this case, in your professional opinion will the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so I wanted to get, given those, that's the, those are the, based on the original assumptions which I say were later modified in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and putting aside whether it's true or not, well, actually no. There's been testimony in this case about the clean diesel actually reducing particulate levels in an area. Are you familiar with this concept? A I am. Q And what MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. Again, well beyond the scope of anything that was even suggested as within his expertise. He is not here to testify as an expert on gasoline emissions equipment or diesel engine functioning or any other mechanical testimony. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to respond to that objection? MR. GOECKE: He's talking about air quality and this goes to the air quality in the area. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I sustain the objection. I think it is beyond the scope of what he's listed for in terms of health and besides which we've had ample testimony about this area from the people who are, that deal with those concepts. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Okay. So, Dr. Chase, just so we're clear, based on your experience and training in the work that you've done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his, I don't remember his exact language, but the idea was less conservative assumptions which still were, would more accurately portray the predicted circumstance? Are you familiar with the changes in his report in that regard? THE WITNESS: Not in detail, but I've been, I'm aware of that. I've been told that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess my question is you testified that under his modeling based on his November 2012 study as amended in January of 2013, that you didn't believe there would be any ill health effects because there were minimal contributions of background from the proposed Costco gas station, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Now there's been testimony in this case that if you applied the rural standard, EPA standard for measuring dispersion, meteorological dispersion of the pollutants, in and around the area of the proposed gas station that there might be an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for NO2 in certain areas, are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so I wanted to get, given those, that's the, those are the, based on the

	Page 70		Page 72
1	and what is your opinion as to whether or not these possible	1	difference. You may have an exceedance, but that doesn't
2	exceedances of the NO2 standards for National Air Quality,	2	equate to a clinical health effect.
3	Ambient Air Quality Standards would have on health impacts	3	MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, that's really my
4	for those residents, workers, visitors and so on in the	4	question.
5	area?	5	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear.
6	THE WITNESS: Again, a wide margin of safety was	6	MR. GROSSMAN: He said you may have had an
7	employed by the CASAC Committee in coming up with their	7	exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health
8	numbers. And the, and in fact the change of multiplying by	8	effect. I think I'm quoting you correctly.
9	188 instead of dividing by 188 didn't make that big of a	9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	difference in the NO2 levels.	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And in this case, in your
11	MR. GROSSMAN: When you say didn't make that big,	11	opinion, would it amount to a clinical health effect based
12	what if you applied the rural dispersion standards? It may	12	on those original assumptions?
13	have, it may, and I'm not going to conclude myself whatever	13	THE WITNESS: No.
14	it did, but it may have pushed the, as alleged by the	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Let's take a
15	opposition, it may have pushed the levels in certain areas	15	break now until 25 after 11:00 and then we'll come back with
16	over the NAAQ standards. Does that make a difference to you	16	cross-examination.
17	in terms of your analysis of the health impacts of those in	17	MS. CORDRY: Could it be a little longer, Your
18	that area?	18	Honor? This is a lot of new testimony that we're learning.
19	MR. GOECKE: Well, Mr. Grossman, if I may, are you	19	MR. GROSSMAN: No.
20	asking him to assume there's going to be an exceedance or	20	(Recess.)
21	are you asking him to opine of whether or not it should be	21	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are you ready to go
22	rural or urban analysis?	22	back on the record?
23	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm certainly not asking him to	23	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
24	determine whether it should be rural or urban analysis. I'm	24	MR. GROSSMAN: Before we begin the cross-
25	asking this is a, evolved from the point I asked you to	25	examination, I might mention I wasn't incorrect. On
	Page 71		Page 73
1		1	-
1	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both	1	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke
	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to		September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please
2	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of	2	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant
2 3	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to	2 3	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please
2 3 4	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set	2 3 4	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee
2 3 4 5	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that	2 3 4 5	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's
2 3 4 5 6	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is	2 3 4 5 6	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have
2 3 4 5 6 7	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there	2 3 4 5 6 7	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates,	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of the health impacts from this potential gas station if all of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So this may seem a bit illogical. The reason I say that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of the health impacts from this potential gas station if all of the assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan in his original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So this may seem a bit illogical. The reason I say that is that doctors and scientists like to try to be logical, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of the health impacts from this potential gas station if all of the assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan in his original reporting in November of 2012, as amended in January of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So this may seem a bit illogical. The reason I say that is that doctors and scientists like to try to be logical, but it may not work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of the health impacts from this potential gas station if all of the assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan in his original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So this may seem a bit illogical. The reason I say that is that doctors and scientists like to try to be logical, but it may not work. MR. GROSSMAN: That never stops lawyers, so don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	go into, that is I wanted him to hear his opinion under both sets of assumptions because I'm not sure how I'm going to rule on the motion in limine which governs the second set of assumptions. So if you have him testify under the first set of assumptions that were made, one could conclude from that that there were going to be exceedances of NO2 based on the air quality standards. MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: So your question then is MR. GOECKE: if there are exceedances MR. GROSSMAN: If they, if there MR. GROSSMAN: Right. If there are these exceedances based on the use of the rural dispersion rates, if there are exceedances, what if, how would that effect, if at all, your opinion on health, potential health impacts on those in the area? THE WITNESS: My understanding and my, based on personal observation, is that this is urban, not rural. MR. GROSSMAN: That's not my question. That's not my question. I'm trying to get at what your analysis is of the health impacts from this potential gas station if all of the assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan in his original reporting in November of 2012, as amended in January of 2013, were applied, except that the mathematical correction	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	September 6th, I sent an e-mail to Ms. Harris and Mr. Goecke with copies to everybody saying not only to send, please send an electronic copy of the corrected landscape and plant list plan you filed today, but also please forward to Renee Kamen of Technical Staff a copy of Mr. Sullivan's supplemental report of August 16, 2013. So you may have done it already. I don't know. MS. HARRIS: No, my apologies. I know I haven't done that because I MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. HARRIS: obviously did not focus on the second part of that e-mail, but I will. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All righty. So cross- examination. Who wishes to begin? Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Is that okay? MR. ADELMAN: Dr. Chase, I just have a number of things that I just, my questions are largely scripted based on my reading of the report, but in addition you said a number of things I would like to question you about. So this may seem a bit illogical. The reason I say that is that doctors and scientists like to try to be logical, but it may not work.

	Page 74		Page 76
1	going to be tricky.	1	cause cancer? In your mind is that the primary issue in
2	MS. HARRIS: I would think, Your Honor, that I	2	here?
3	have been criticized on occasion for being too logical at	3	A No, I think I just answered your question a moment
4	least when dealing with our political clients. So I try to	4	ago. At the time I assembled those articles, I was focusing
5	be logical. Thank you.	5	on, I was trying to get a better understanding of the
6	MR. GROSSMAN: I try, but often fail, but never	6	relevance of change of the new technology, in fact that's
7	admit it.	7	what they call it, NTDE, new technology diesel exhaust.
8	MR. ADELMAN: That said, I'm going to be jumping	8	Q I understand and it's admirable that you're
9	back and forth between notes I made and notes that I picked	9	attempting, you were attempting to understand new
10	up.	10	technology, but you filed a brief report and there's 15
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION	11	references.
12	BY MR. ADELMAN:	12	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think he answered your
13	Q You said that you ostensibly reviewed the medical	13	question so that's fine by me.
14	literature relevant to this case, is that correct?	14	BY MR. ADELMAN:
15	A Yes.	15	Q In your mind, you mentioned a number of sources of
16	Q And if I understood you, you said that you read some 80 to 100 articles that were relevant to that, this	16 17	standards the Federal Registry Case Act, in your mind do these all, do these groups all agree or do they always
17 18	case, is that correct?	18	accept one another's recommendations? If not, who takes
19	A I said 80 to 100, but I was including articles,	19	precedence?
20	reports and miscellaneous publications, mostly medical and	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Who takes what?
21	scientific articles, but not all.	21	MR. ADELMAN: Precedence. Which, if two agencies
22	Q Okay. Of the, your, your letter has as a	22	come up with different standards and they don't agree, how
23	supplemental list of some, I believe, 15 articles that you	23	does one decide which standard to accept in your opinion?
24	referenced. Are those part of the 80 or so, 100 articles	24	THE WITNESS: Well, I can give you an example.
25	that you read?	25	When CASAC proposed lowering the annual standard for PMQ.5
	Page 75		Page 77
	Page 75	-	Page 77
1	A Are they what?		from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the
2	<ul><li>A Are they what?</li><li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that</li></ul>	2	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA
2 3	A Are they what? Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?	2 3	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up,
2	<ul><li>A Are they what?</li><li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li><li>A Yes.</li></ul>	2	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I
2 3 4	<ul><li>A Are they what?</li><li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li><li>A Yes.</li></ul>	2 3 4	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up,
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain why given that you acknowledge that the proposed gas station</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact, what's the antecedent for it? Do you mean the regulation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain why given that you acknowledge that the proposed gas station won't be selling diesel fuel and that trucks delivering,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. ADELMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact, what's the antecedent for it? Do you mean the regulation? MR. ADELMAN: The regulation. For example, a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain why given that you acknowledge that the proposed gas station won't be selling diesel fuel and that trucks delivering, using diesel fuel to power themselves are probably not going</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. ADELMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact, what's the antecedent for it? Do you mean the regulation? MR. ADELMAN: The regulation. For example, a specific number not to be exceeded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain why given that you acknowledge that the proposed gas station won't be selling diesel fuel and that trucks delivering,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact, what's the antecedent for it? Do you mean the regulation? MR. ADELMAN: The regulation. For example, a specific number not to be exceeded. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Are they what?</li> <li>Q Are they a subset of the 80 to 100 articles that you read?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Were they selected and you felt they were particularly relevant to this case or particularly substantive, or were they a random selection of all the articles?</li> <li>A The ones you're asking me about</li> <li>Q The ones that you listed as references.</li> <li>A Correct. I don't recall assuming.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I think at the time I was trying to get my I'm not a truck driver. I was trying to get my arms around what the nature of the change in truck, diesel truck engine design was and how and why it might be relevant to this case. So there, I think there, the ones that are listed there tend to have that theme in common.</li> <li>Q And I can jump back to the, well, can you explain why given that you acknowledge that the proposed gas station won't be selling diesel fuel and that trucks delivering, using diesel fuel to power themselves are probably not going to be emitting much diesel fumes, why almost every article</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from 15 to 12, I believe Jonathan Sammit, because he was the chair, and he submitted it to Lisa Jackson who, EPA minister, and she didn't go along with it. And it ended up, CASC didn't sit still for that, so it ended up in, I believe, D.C. Court. And the judge told Ms. Jackson that he couldn't follow her reasoning very well, so sent her back to the drawing board. And the upshot of it was CASAC was looking for a lower level. They were looking for a 11, 12, 15 or 14 as I recall MR. ADELMAN: Uh-huh. THE WITNESS: and they ended up settling on 12. But that required the involvement of a court and a judge. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Precisely. Then would you agree that whatever standard is presented in this case, for example, is the product of a process in which different groups may disagree and, in fact, often is adjudicated. It's not in the scientific sense a fact, it's a consensus. MR. ADELMAN: Well, when you say it's not a fact, what's the antecedent for it? Do you mean the regulation? MR. ADELMAN: The regulation. For example, a specific number not to be exceeded. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to understand

	Page 78		Page 80
1	you asking whether the regulation is a fact? A regulation	1	MR. ADELMAN: I agree. Thank you for your
2	is a regulation, so I don't understand what you're asking.	2	additions.
3	So I'd ask you to rephrase that.	3	MR. GROSSMAN: So I take it that you ultimately
4	MR. ADELMAN: I will rephrase.	4	want me to be in the zone when I figure out what the
5	BY MR. ADELMAN:	5	standard is that is supposed to applied.
6	Q To what extent is the number stipulated by the	6	MR. ADELMAN: Precisely, Mr. Grossman, precisely.
7	regulation to which all adjudicating bodies agree?	7	BY MR. ADELMAN:
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Once again, I think I have to stop	8	Q I nabbed your quote of a (indiscernible) and your
9	you. I think that's more of a legal question than an expert	9	essential statement that almost anything at a high note
10	question. You're asking to what extent is any regulation a	10	level can be harmful. The adverse of that is at what point
11 12	fact to which all adjudicating bodies agree. That's a legal, that's calling for a legal conclusion, so I'm not	11 12	is something negligible because you said a number of effects, potential effects, risks will be negligible. How
13	going to let you ask that question.	13	do you as a doctor define negligible risk?
14	MR. ADELMAN: Fine. Well, then could I	14	A Well, it depends on what age you're talking about.
15	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand it's difficult to	15	In this case we have a mechanism in this country for setting
16	frame these questions. I'm just trying to make sure that	16	air standards and it's done through the process we've
17	when you ask the question that it elicits an answer that's,	17	already discussed. This CASAC Committee, which is
18	we can, that's cognizable in this kind of proceeding.	18	independent of EPA and they've proved that, gets together
19	BY MR. ADELMAN:	19	numerous times over a five, every five, and then every five
20	Q Dr. Chase, you just stated, did you not, that the	20	years makes a new recommendation.
21	standard that was set was reached by a process involving	21	MR. GROSSMAN: But I think his question was what,
22	judicial evaluation, is that correct? Am I paraphrasing you	22	how do you define negligible? You used the term as
23	properly?	23	something that was negligible, but I think that the question
24	A Probably, but don't leave out the five-year	24	went to what do you mean by negligible?
25	process during which the CASAC Committee was reviewing the	25	THE WITNESS: Oh, in my earlier testimony?
	Page 79		Page 81
1	-		-
1		1	
2	world's literature came up with the recommendation and for whatever reason. I don't know the reason, they then the EPA	1	MR. ADELMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant
2	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA	2	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant.
2 3 4	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was		THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN:
3	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA	2 3	<ul><li>THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant.</li><li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li><li>Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm</li></ul>
3 4	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN:
3 4 5	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What
3 4 5 6	whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court. Q Okay. A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that, but	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm</li> <li>sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What</li> <li>A Producing no lasting damage.</li> <li>Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is</li> <li>treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage?</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7	<pre>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.     Q Okay.     A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that, but     Q Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.         Q Okay.         A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that, but         Q Okay.         A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.     Q Okay.     A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that, but     Q Okay.     A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.     Q Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm</li> <li>sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What</li> <li>A Producing no lasting damage.</li> <li>Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is</li> <li>treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I mean. It might be</li> <li>transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a</li> <li>permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible.</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What</li> <li>A Producing no lasting damage.</li> <li>Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible.</li> <li>Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce</li> </ul>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct?
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.     Q Okay.     A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that, but     Q Okay.     A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.     Q Okay.     MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?     MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point</li> <li>you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can answer my question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point</li> <li>you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the</li> <li>sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups</li> <li>stipulate numbers to and in some cases, in fact, disagreed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person might detect an odor from the gas station, but it's not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point</li> <li>you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the</li> <li>sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups</li> <li>stipulate numbers to and in some cases, in fact, disagreed</li> <li>strongly and go to court over it to reach a quote,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person might detect an odor from the gas station, but it's not going to harm them.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups stipulate numbers to and in some cases, in fact, disagreed strongly and go to court over it to reach a quote,</li> <li>"Conclusion," which is then treated as a scientific fact.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person might detect an odor from the gas station, but it's not going to harm them. Q Thank you. You've just stated clearly a point I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can answer my question.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups stipulate numbers to and in some cases, in fact, disagreed strongly and go to court over it to reach a quote,</li> <li>"Conclusion," which is then treated as a scientific fact.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I don't know. I think</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What</li> <li>A Producing no lasting damage.</li> <li>Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage?</li> <li>A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible.</li> <li>Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct?</li> <li>A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others.</li> <li>Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize.</li> <li>A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person might detect an odor from the gas station, but it's not going to harm them.</li> <li>Q Thank you. You've just stated clearly a point I wanted answered. The standards, EPA standards, CASAC</li> </ul>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>whatever reason, I don't know the reason, they then, the EPA administrator didn't act on it and CASAC, I believe it was Dr. Sammick, took, I guess he took it to court. I was told it was D.C. Court.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A I didn't know D.C. Court did stuff like that,</li> <li>but</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A and it got resolved to CASAC's satisfaction.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sir, where are you going with this</li> <li>line of questioning? I don't quite what's the point you're trying to get to, Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no, no, I can't testify.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: There is no firm, white line in the sand. It's a zone, if you will, that different groups stipulate numbers to and in some cases, in fact, disagreed strongly and go to court over it to reach a quote,</li> <li>"Conclusion," which is then treated as a scientific fact.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I don't know. I think that's more in the area of an argument then. But I mean I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Clinically insignificant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q What does clinically insignificant mean? I'm sorry, I don't mean to be argumentative. What A Producing no lasting damage. Q So does that mean it could produce damage which is treatable, is that what you mean by no less than damage? A No, that's not what I mean. It might be transient. It might be temporary, but it doesn't produce a permanent health effect. That's what I meant by negligible. Q You are not suggesting that it does not produce mortality, correct? A Some people are more sensitive to odors than others. Q I'm not I'm talking about oh, I'm sorry, I forgot all these odors. I apologize. A So it's conceivable that a very sensitive person might detect an odor from the gas station, but it's not going to harm them. Q Thank you. You've just stated clearly a point I wanted answered. The standards, EPA standards, CASAC standards, whichever standards are set are for world

	Page 82		Page 84
1	MR. ADELMAN: World population	1	some point.
2	MR. GOECKE: A population?	2	Q Correct. I understand. The Hippocratic, in the
3	MR. ADELMAN: Or a population. For example, the	3	various versions says, does it not, that medicine is an art
4	population of the United States or the population of	4	and a science? The art is the judgment, are we agreed on
5	Maryland or the population of Montgomery County, therefore,	5	that?
6	a large number of people.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: So
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.	7	THE WITNESS: No.
8	BY MR. ADELMAN:	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. That's too philosophical for
9	Q There is variability in the sensitivity of people	9	this process.
10	to various pollutants, odors, et cetera, correct?	10	BY MR. ADELMAN:
11	A As I said earlier, under the Clean Air Act, the	11	Q Let me try to be. Well, as you said, I make it
12	CASAC Committee has to take into consideration the most	12	(indiscernible) sometimes. Let me go back to my I'm
13	vulnerable subset of populations and I gave it	13	attempting to understand how the document arose so I'm sure
14	Q In your mind how did CASAC in this case define	14	that I understand what you did to reach your conclusions.
15	most vulnerable to your mind, your expert opinion?	15	And some of these questions I will skip because you've
16	A Through the review of medical and scientific	16	already answered them, I believe. So when you were
17	literature and debate, discussion.	17	contacted by Costco, they were asking you for an assessment
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Are you getting more his answer	18	of the potential adverse impacts on air quality if this gas
19	went to the process of how they do it. Your question went	19	station was approved, is that correct?
20 21	to what the, definitionally? MR. ADELMAN: Precisely.	20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think that's what he,
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	he said health, health impacts. MR. ADELMAN: I'm just, I'm just quoting
22	MR. ADELMAN: Or what, how does one measure, in	22	MR. GROSSMAN: You said potential adverse impacts.
24	essence, most vulnerable.	24	I'm just saying I think they asked him about potential
25	MR. GROSSMAN: Is there a definition of the most	25	adverse health impacts, is that
			·····
	Page 83		Page 85
1		1	Page 85 MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report
1 2	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?	1 2	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most	2 3	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it.
2 3 4	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons	2 3 4	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can
2 3 4 5	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.	2 3 4 5	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question.
2 3 4 5 6	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said	2 3 4 5 6	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration? THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease. MR. ADELMAN: And you said THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include</li> <li>somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include</li> <li>somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include</li> <li>somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a health impact or might we expect it to have a health impact?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry? Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan at that point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a health impact or might we expect it to have a health impact?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry? Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan at that point? A If I go back in time 30 years or more, there was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a health impact or might we expect it to have a health impact?</li> <li>A Well, it's a compound question and one phrase I have it, that hasn't come up yet as warning is the exercise</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry? Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan at that point? A If I go back in time 30 years or more, there was a company in Northern Virginia called VERSAR and they did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a health impact or might we expect it to have a health impact?</li> <li>A Well, it's a compound question and one phrase I have it, that hasn't come up yet as warning is the exercise of professional judgment.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry? Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan at that point? A If I go back in time 30 years or more, there was a company in Northern Virginia called VERSAR and they did environmental engineering and related work. David Sullivan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>vulnerable portion of the population that they are required to take into consideration?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Well, the examples that I see most often cited are children, the elderly, asthmatics, persons with emphysema, a chronic lung disease.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: And you said</li> <li>THE WITNESS: If I recall, it does not include somebody with terminal cancer. I think they that's a carve out.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Which would make sense, yes. I believe this is a correct quote, but please tell me if I'm wrong. I believe you said the following. "You may have an exceedance, but that does not amount to a clinical health impact." Is that a direct quotation of what you said?</li> <li>A Yeah, it's close enough.</li> <li>Q The fact that an exceedance doesn't amount to a clinical health impact, does that in any way obviate the need to assess whether, in fact, an individual has had a health impact or might we expect it to have a health impact?</li> <li>A Well, it's a compound question and one phrase I have it, that hasn't come up yet as warning is the exercise</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually his report MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to have him read it. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I go ahead, you can ask that question. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you recall who actually contacted you, was it a specific representative of Costco? A Yes. It was David Sullivan. The initial call Q So Mr. Sullivan? A The initial call was placed to me by David Sullivan. Q Oh. Was he then, already had the contract or hired as a consultant by Costco? A I'm sure he was. Q Do you A He was already on, he had been on board Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan? A I'm sorry? Q Did you know Mr. Sullivan at that point? A If I go back in time 30 years or more, there was a company in Northern Virginia called VERSAR and they did

	Page 86		Page 88
1	related to occupational environmental health. And that's	1	BY MR. ADELMAN:
2	how he and I first met and got to know each other. And then	2	Q So that sort of answers my next question. Do you
3	I didn't hear from him for 25 years until a year ago, maybe	3	know if Costco contacted others with your sort of expertise
4	a little more than that now, and he told me about this	4	before they selected you or
5	project, asked me if I would be	5	A No, I don't.
6	MS. ADELMAN: We can't hear back here.	6	Q Do you know why Costco hired you?
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Can you try to keep your voice up a	7	A In part based, not for sure, but I'm speculating
8	little bit, Dr. Chase, because they can't hear you in the	8	in part based on David's recommendation because David had
9	back row.	9	seen me in action before; he knew what I had done with
10	MS. ADELMAN: Thank you.	10	VERSAR, he knew some of it; my CV and there was an initial
11	THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll try and speak	11	interview in which I told them I've got an awfully long
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Those in the back row could	12	history of getting involved in projects not necessarily
13	probably come to up a little closer if you wanted if	13	identical to this, but similar, projects that raise the same
14	you're having trouble hearing, but I maybe just	14	kinds of questions.
15	MR. ADELMAN: Do you have a microphone that was,	15	Q Okay.
16	is still available? We could give it to Dr. Chase.	16	A And I may have given him three references to boot.
17	(Discussion off the record.)	17	Q Okay.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but anybody in the back row	18	A But I don't remember. I said I may have given
19	can move closer in and, Ms. Adelman, you could move closer	19	them the names of references. I don't remember.
20	this way so perhaps you could hear better too and that might	20	Q Thank you. So you were hired as a consultant.
21	solve the problem in part. There are chairs open here.	21	Have you been hired as a consultant in other matters that
22	MS. ADELMAN: Mark will be thrilled.	22	are very closely like this one? I realize you've done a lot
23	MR. GROSSMAN: This is, in the legal business this	23	of consulting, but with respect to this situation which is
24	passes for togetherness.	24	acknowledged by almost everyone as almost unique, a very
25	MR. ADELMAN: It is not acceptable.	25	large gas station in the parking lot of a mall, et cetera,
	Page 87		
	i uge er		Page 89
1		1	
1	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder.	1	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable
2	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase.	2	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation?
2 3	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me	2 3	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object.
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing.	2 3 4	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been
2 3	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you.	2 3	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert.
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time	2 3 4 5 6	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done	2 3 4 5	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time	2 3 4 5 6 7	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I recognized the name and then he reminded me that he was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his testimony. I believe he did he was asked about what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I recognized the name and then he reminded me that he was a meteorologist who worked for a consultant to VERSAR and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his testimony. I believe he did he was asked about what other projects he's worked on that were of assistance to him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I recognized the name and then he reminded me that he was a meteorologist who worked for a consultant to VERSAR and I said, oh, that David Sullivan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his testimony. I believe he did he was asked about what other projects he's worked on that were of assistance to him in trying to reach his opinion, so it seems to me that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I recognized the name and then he reminded me that he was a meteorologist who worked for a consultant to VERSAR and I said, oh, that David Sullivan. MR. ADELMAN: So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his testimony. I believe he did he was asked about what other projects he's worked on that were of assistance to him in trying to reach his opinion, so it seems to me that's exactly the area that Mr. Adelman is inquiring, that is very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: I'll try and speak louder. MS. ADELMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Chase. THE WITNESS: And I guess that's an opening for me to let you know that I'm hard of hearing. MS. ADELMAN: So two of you. THE WITNESS: So there may come a point in time when I'm asking somebody else to speak up. So far I've done okay thanks to these new hearing aides that I'm wearing right now. I'm sorry, where were we? BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So you were, in fact, contacted by Mr. Sullivan? A Correct. Q And you have a long-standing acquaintance with him? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 25 years ago and then he hadn't heard from him. THE WITNESS: I hadn't heard from him in 25 years, so I didn't know who he was when he first called. I recognized the name and then he reminded me that he was a meteorologist who worked for a consultant to VERSAR and I said, oh, that David Sullivan. MR. ADELMAN: So THE WITNESS: And he introduced me to Patricia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	et cetera, have you been a consultant in any comparable situation? MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would like to object. We've already established his qualifications and he's been admitted as an expert. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, aren't these questions more addressed to the qualifications as an expert rather than to the testimony he's given? This is beyond the scope of any direct that he's given. MR. ADELMAN: You would think so. I've tried I've never gotten the line between voir dire and I'll drop that question. Sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: The voir dire goes to his qualifications as an expert. The cross-examination you're doing now is supposed to be directed to the testimony that he gave on the substance of the case. MR. ADELMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, I turn to his testimony. I believe he did he was asked about what other projects he's worked on that were of assistance to him in trying to reach his opinion, so it seems to me that's exactly the area that Mr. Adelman is inquiring, that is very much a part of his direct testimony granted he was cut off

Page 90		Page 92
1 understand, what was your last question, Dr. Adelman?	1	the list. I think your
2 MR. ADELMAN: That fundamentally was the question.	2	THE WITNESS: Okay.
3 He's essentially said that he has experience as a consultant	3	MR. GROSSMAN: your colleague is producing.
4 in matters like this and that helped him reach his	4	MR. BRANN: Dr. Chase, do you know which folder it
5 conclusions and I'm trying to basically ask him to what	5	was in? Is it in the suitcase or is in this black folder?
6 extent did you have previous consulting experience and	6	THE WITNESS: I think it's in the black folder.
<ul><li>7 testimony, as well as experience</li></ul>	7	Can you hand it to me?
8 THE WITNESS: May I offer	8	MR. BRANN: Sure.
9 MR. ADELMAN: relevance.	9	THE WITNESS: It's got secret pockets that
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I	10	though I could be wrong. You're right, it's pretty much not
11 THE WITNESS: a short answer?	11	in here. So
12 MR. GROSSMAN: I think hold on one second. I	12	MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we do this. During the
13 think you're right, Ms. Cordry, he did testify about that,	13	lunch hour you can take a look for it and see if you have it
14 so I would allow, I'll overrule the objection and you can	14	and in the meanwhile we'll go on to some other area.
15 ask that question. Go ahead, answer it.	15	BY MR. ADELMAN:
16 THE WITNESS: I went back over our list of	16	Q Well, I just, I'll just say could you give us an
<ul><li>inactive projects and active projects and I came up with a</li></ul>	17	example of the closest, similar situation and then we can
<ul><li>18 list of just looking at air quality, indoor air quality,</li></ul>	18	come back to this later on when you have your list?
<ul><li>19 as well as outdoor air quality and I came up with a list</li></ul>	19	A Well, power plants generate noise and emissions,
20 which I have with me. I can have Tim pull it out of that	20	and usually people are opposed to a big power plant being
<ul><li>21 black bag, 60, at least 60 projects related to air quality,</li></ul>	20 21	built in their backyard, the Nimby syndrome. And half of
<ul><li>22 the health effects of air quality.</li></ul>	22	them were not litigation cases, they were consulting, they
23 BY MR. ADELMAN:	23	were, about half of them consulting engagements. We've
24 Q That's not my question. My question is to what	24	consulted to a number of local schools and school districts.
<ul><li>25 extent had any of your testimony or experience in, about a</li></ul>	25	Arlington Public Schools was a fairly long project and it's
2.5 extent had any or your testimony or experience in, about a	25	Anington rubic beneois was a rainy long project and its
Page 91		Page 93
Page 91 1 large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation	1	Page 93 specific schools that in the District and I think one in
	1	-
1 large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation		specific schools that in the District and I think one in
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> </ol>	2	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> </ol>	2 3	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> </ol>	2 3 4	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase,
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay.
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else. BY MR. ADELMAN:
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station? MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> <li>were retained on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: We will proffer that this witness's</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> <li>were retained on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the</li> <li>others were in the United States. I think I mentioned a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: We will proffer that this witness's testimony by his answers, in fact, is not relevant to the case at hand as we attempted to state in the voir dire.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> <li>were retained on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the</li> <li>others were in the United States. I think I mentioned a</li> <li>carbon monoxide case.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: We will proffer that this witness's testimony by his answers, in fact, is not relevant to the case at hand as we attempted to state in the voir dire.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's fine. You can go</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> <li>were retained on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the</li> <li>others were in the United States. I think I mentioned a</li> <li>carbon monoxide case.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Why don't we just wait until you have the list so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: We will proffer that this witness's testimony by his answers, in fact, is not relevant to the case at hand as we attempted to state in the voir dire.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's fine. You can go ahead and prove that if you can, but I don't think that the</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>large gas station in a mall parking lot in the situation</li> <li>that everyone, I believe, has come to regard as a unique</li> <li>situation, what is the closest comparable consulting and</li> <li>testimonial experience?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if that was your</li> <li>question, but we can ask that question. Go ahead.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: None that are identical to this</li> <li>scenario. I think it's unique. I think it's unique from</li> <li>many perspectives. But may I look at the list if I want to</li> <li>try to tell him what's closest?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like</li> <li>to have you look at the list.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: That's fine.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So take a moment to have the</li> <li>gentleman review this.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I know from memory that it's seven</li> <li>or eight power plants, seven or eight power plants that we</li> <li>were retained on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the</li> <li>others were in the United States. I think I mentioned a</li> <li>carbon monoxide case.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>specific schools that in the District and I think one in Maryland, maybe two, near the front of Brysse or the front of Jison.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's Dr. Chase, let's just go on to the next area.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Move on to something else.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Not to beat this to death, Dr. Chase, in what way is a power plant comparable to this gas station?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Let's move along to a different line because I really explain to me how this is really going to help me in terms of resolving this case, whether this witness, how this witness compares a power plan to this gas station. I mean I really want to I want to have you hone in on the things that are going to affect analysis of the facts in this case.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: We will proffer that this witness's testimony by his answers, in fact, is not relevant to the case at hand as we attempted to state in the voir dire.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's fine. You can go</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>that everyone,</li> <li>situation, what</li> <li>testimonial exp</li> <li>MR. GR</li> <li>question, but with</li> <li>r THE WI</li> <li>scenario. I thi</li> <li>many perspect</li> <li>try to tell him with</li> <li>MR. GR</li> <li>to have you lo</li> <li>MR. AD</li> <li>MR. GR</li> <li>gentleman rew</li> <li>Greight power</li> <li>were retained</li> <li>others were in</li> <li>carbon monox</li> <li>BY MR.</li> <li>Q Why do</li> </ul>	on in a mall parking lot in the situation I believe, has come to regard as a unique is the closest comparable consulting and berience? OSSMAN: I don't know if that was your we can ask that question. Go ahead. TNESS: None that are identical to this nk it's unique. I think it's unique from tives. But may I look at the list if I want to what's closest? OSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like ok at the list. ELMAN: That's fine. OSSMAN: So take a moment to have the iew this. TNESS: I know from memory that it's seven plants, seven or eight power plants that we on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the the United States. I think I mentioned a ide case. ADELMAN: n't we just wait until you have the list so	on in a mall parking lot in the situation1I believe, has come to regard as a unique2is the closest comparable consulting and3berience?4COSSMAN: I don't know if that was your5we can ask that question. Go ahead.6TNESS: None that are identical to this7nk it's unique. I think it's unique from8tives. But may I look at the list if I want to9vhat's closest?10COSSMAN: He is indicating yes, he would like11ok at the list.12ELMAN: That's fine.13COSSMAN: So take a moment to have the14iew this.15TNESS: I know from memory that it's seven16r plants, seven or eight power plants that we17on. One of them was from Puerto Rico, the18the United States. I think I mentioned a19ide case.20ADELMAN:21n't we just wait until you have the list so22

	Page 94		Page 96
1	testified to in this case and the substance.	1	the original report, 15(b), dated November 19th or the new
2	MR. ADELMAN: It would seem to go to his	2	report of September 10th? Did you generate both of these
3	experience, his I'm sorry.	3	entirely by yourself?
4	BY MR. ADELMAN:	4	A Yes.
5	Q So you were hired by Costco. Was the fee for your	5	Q Thank you. Are you aware that at the last hearing
6	services in any way, any way contingent on the outcome	6	applicant for the, counsel for the applicant referred to
7	(indiscernible)?	7	your exhibit as conclusionary in nature?
8	A Of course not.	8	A Can I say in
9	Q Fine. So in response to, one response you sent,	9	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't, I don't have any I
10	this letter. I assume you have a copy of this letter, is	10	don't remember that exact quote in any event, but so
11	that your letter?	11	BY MR. ADELMAN:
12	MR. GROSSMAN: This is the letter of September 10,	12	Q I'm virtually certain, but would you agree that
13	2013?	13	your statement, your reports are conclusionary, they are a
14	MR. ADELMAN: November 19, 2012.	14	
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, that's the original.	15	A Did he say conclusionary?
16	MR. ADELMAN: The original. This is Exhibit	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, conclusionary is what he said.
17	15(b).	17	Do you mean
18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. ADELMAN: I just want to make sure that Mr.,	18 19	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: did they reach a conclusion? 1
20	Dr. Chase has a copy available. If not	20	don't know what that means exactly.
21	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of your	20	MR. ADELMAN: Actually, I'm trying to get the
22	original?	22	witness to explain if he agrees it's what Ms. Harris said,
23	THE WITNESS: I have it in the, it's in the room,	23	what does that mean? What is the substance of this?
24	but I just don't know which folder.	24	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it doesn't really matter how
25	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Would you, Dr. Adelman.	25	Ms. Harris characterized it if she did say that. I don't
	Page 95		Page 97
1	Page 95 MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one?	1	
1 2		1 2	
	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one?		recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify
2	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you.	2	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the
2 3	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.)	2 3	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse
2 3 4 5 6	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited	2 3 4 5 6	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that. A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter. MR. ADELMAN: I didn't photo shop this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any independent, scientific study of air pollutants existing at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter. MR. ADELMAN: I didn't photo shop this. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any independent, scientific study of air pollutants existing at the site of the proposed special exception?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter. MR. ADELMAN: I didn't photo shop this. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q And you provided a slightly different version of that report on September 10th which I have here. And there were a few minor revisions. In several instances you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any independent, scientific study of air pollutants existing at the site of the proposed Special exception?</li> <li>A The proposed Costco Q Yes.</li> <li>A site? No.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter. MR. ADELMAN: I didn't photo shop this. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q And you provided a slightly different version of that report on September 10th which I have here. And there were a few minor revisions. In several instances you've referred, have you not, to we found or we studied certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any independent, scientific study of air pollutants existing at the site of the proposed Special exception?</li> <li>A The proposed Costco</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A site? No.</li> <li>Q You conducted, in essence, an independent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ADELMAN: And I have do you need one? MR. GROSSMAN: I have a copy here. Thank you. Now you've got you've filmed yourself now. What are you going to do about that? (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to see if it's edited out or not. All right. Here, Dr. Chase, here's a copy. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please make sure that that is your letter because I'm going to ask you some questions based on your reading of your letter. So would you just take a look and make sure that it's what you sent. A It's on letterhead. It's dated November 19th and it's signed by me Q Okay. A in the original. MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take your word for it, Dr. Adelman, that you haven't modified the terms of the letter. MR. ADELMAN: I didn't photo shop this. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q And you provided a slightly different version of that report on September 10th which I have here. And there were a few minor revisions. In several instances you've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>recall her saying that, but let's have the witness testify as to what he thinks. I don't understand what BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So I'm quoting that letter. In reaching the conclusion that potential adverse impacts will not, excuse me, potential adverse impacts will not adversely affect the health or general welfare of the residents, you relied on the Exhibit 15(a), which is Dr. Sullivan's report, heavily, is that correct? I believe you said that.</li> <li>A Well, he did five reports, so I, I relied on the totality of them and I relied on my professional experience both personally and those 60 projects I mentioned before, I wasn't the lead on all of them. My vice president was the lead on some of them and he's, I don't know if it matters, but he's an M.D., Ph.D., board-certified toxicologist who still teaches part-time at Columbia School of Public Health and very well published.</li> <li>Q Did you yourself or your close associates do any independent, scientific study of air pollutants existing at the site of the proposed Special exception?</li> <li>A The proposed Costco Q Yes.</li> <li>A site? No.</li> </ul>

	Page 98		Page 100
1	you filed with District Court, all of which with respect to	1	MS. CORDRY: Breysse.
2	this report were about diesel fuel and cancer risk. Did you	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Breysse, but is it doctor?
3	do any independent literature review in connection with the	3	MS. CORDRY: Doctor, yes.
4	various vehicle, automobile emissions and the impact of	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Dr. Breysse, had not yet been
5	those emissions or potential impact of those emissions on	5	submitted in this case. So what literature, upon what
6	cancer or various product diseases?	6	literature regarding normal car emissions did you base your
7	A I heard what you said, but I didn't understand	7	review as summarized in the November 19, 2012 report?
8	what the question was.	8	THE WITNESS: Well, you're correct on the time
9	MR. GROSSMAN: He's asking he's saying that the	9	frames. I'm not disputing that. It would take me quite
10	literature that you sited in the attachment to your letters	10	awhile to go back and figure out which other articles I had
11	addresses, according to what Dr. Adelman says, addresses	11	reviewed before I ever saw Jison or Breysse's reports.
12	only diesel emissions.	12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13	THE WITNESS: He's right.	13	THE WITNESS: But it's a process that I started
14	MR. GROSSMAN: And his question is did you also	14	last year.
15	review literature regarding normal automobile emissions?	15	MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess, so I think that's the
16	THE WITNESS: Yes. I said yes.	16	essence of what Dr. Adelman is getting at, it appears from
17	BY MR. ADELMAN:	17	the fact that you only cited diesel literature here, there's
18	Q Could you site one or two of those articles, or	18	a question that he raises to whether or not you had a basis
19	more to the point, why did you not include those in your	19	in the literature when you wrote this report for conclusions
20	list of references?	20	regarding normal car emissions. I think that's what he's
21	A Over the span of about a year, I was trying to	21	getting to in his question. So are you answering, are you
22	keep the articles organized in some systematic way. For	22	telling me that you did or did not look at other literature,
23	example, I reviewed all of the citations by Dr. Jison. You	23	scientific literature regarding car emissions prior to
24	already have that list. You already know what those are and	24	writing your November 19, 2012 report?
25	so do I. The same is true for Dr. Breysse. And the other	25	MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, can I also clarify one
	Page 99		Page 101
1	ones and I have those with me and I have the other ones	1	thing?
1	with me too. I wasn't asked to expand my original reference	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. Let him answer my
3	list. And I also felt like I was running out of time	3	MS. HARRIS: Okay.
4	because this case has been very time-consuming and I've got	4	MR. GROSSMAN: question first.
5	enough, a lot of other responsibilities, so I didn't get to	5	MS. HARRIS: Okay.
	it. It could be done.	6	THE WITNESS: I did, but please keep in mind that
7	Q I understand. When you filed this report on	7	
8			last fall I was under a misconception, I guess you could
0	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on	8	last fall I was under a misconception, I guess you could call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there
9			last fall I was under a misconception, I guess you could call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me.
	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on	8	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there
9	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr.	8 9	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me.
9 10	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm	8 9 10	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you?
9 10 11	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have	8 9 10 11	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more
9 10 11 12	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references	8 9 10 11 12	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel
9 10 11 12 13	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry?	8 9 10 11 12 13	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman
9 10 11 12 13 14	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well. MR. GROSSMAN: I think what Dr. Adelman is trying	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had that in his possession at the time that he reviewed,
<ul> <li>9</li> <li>10</li> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ul>	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well. MR. GROSSMAN: I think what Dr. Adelman is trying to get at here is that on November 19, 2012, when you filed	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had that in his possession at the time that he reviewed, prepared his November 2012 report.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well. MR. GROSSMAN: I think what Dr. Adelman is trying to get at here is that on November 19, 2012, when you filed your initial report, you only, and you only referenced	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had that in his possession at the time that he reviewed, prepared his November 2012 report. MR. GROSSMAN: Well
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well. MR. GROSSMAN: I think what Dr. Adelman is trying to get at here is that on November 19, 2012, when you filed your initial report, you only, and you only referenced literature regarding diesel emissions, the other literature	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had that in his possession at the time that he reviewed, prepared his November 2012 report. MR. GROSSMAN: Well MS. CORDRY: Any other testimony you want to give?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	November 9th, Dr. Chase, when you filed this report on November 19, 2012, there were no filings, were there, by Dr. Jison or Dr. Breysse. All of those came subsequent. I'm asking you, this report, this 2-page letter and one I have pages of references, was filed at a time when the references you just mentioned had not been proffered. You read MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry? THE WITNESS: You're not wrong. That's correct. Maria Jison filed her first report in early January; her second one later in January; her third one in, or fourth one in March, March 29th, I believe; and Breysse's, both of Breysse's submissions were from 2013 as well. MR. GROSSMAN: I think what Dr. Adelman is trying to get at here is that on November 19, 2012, when you filed your initial report, you only, and you only referenced	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	call it, that there was more concern about diesel than there was about gasoline and that made sense to me. MR. GROSSMAN: Why did that make sense to you? THE WITNESS: Because diesel is potentially more hazardous to human health than gasoline emissions. Diesel emissions are. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Ms. Harris? MS. HARRIS: just to clarify. In connection with the zoning text amendment, 12-07, which preceded the filing, Mr., Dr. Breysse had, in fact, submitted a letter and so it may very well, he may, Mr., Dr. Chase may have had that in his possession at the time that he reviewed, prepared his November 2012 report. MR. GROSSMAN: Well

	Page 102		Page 104
1	You could answer that, but I guess we have to allow that	1	So I'd go to the substance of the question.
2	caveat just because the question assumed, hypothetically,	2	THE WITNESS: I don't have the September 10th
3	that those letters had not been produced at that time. So	3	version in front of me, but
4	do you know if you had seen any letter from Dr. Breysse	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have an extra copy of the
5	prior to the November 12, November 19, 2012 report you	5	(Discussion off the record.)
6	wrote?	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Your client.
7	THE WITNESS: There was a letter from him and it's	7	MS. HARRIS: September 10th, I already have a copy
8	probably in my folder. I didn't throw anything away. But	8	of that.
9	it wasn't a formal report.	9	THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question?
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Dr. Adelman.	10	BY MR. ADELMAN:
11	BY MR. ADELMAN:	11	Q Yes. I'm sorry. Given that your new submission,
12	Q Have you read Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report	12	the updated submission is only minimally different from the
13	that's labeled as Exhibit 15(a)? Have you read it in its	13	original submission, is it reasonable to state that you have
14	entirety? It's very long. Have you read it in its	14	not changed your conclusions despite the fact the EPA
15	entirety? A I don't think so.	15	revised its standard downward? A I think that's a mischaracterization of where I
16		16	
17 18	Q Could you give us a feeling how much of it or what parts you have read or you read?	17 18	was coming from. I was aware at the time of the November letter, I was aware of the impending change in the EPA
19	A I think I read 90 percent of it, but there were	19	standard. It was pretty widely known in some circles.
20	passages that were over my head that were very technical and	20	CASAC had been working on this for years. And, secondly, I
21	over my head. So I skipped them.	21	didn't you're correct, I didn't change my opinion, my
22	Q Okay. And you've already said you read in detail	22	professional opinion remained the same.
23	the various supplemental reports that Mr. Sullivan filed	23	Q So your professional opinion was and is that
24	since November 2012, again you read most of them, 90	24	it changed downward from 15 to 12 was not substantively
25	percent?	25	important?
	Dama 402		
	Page 103		Page 105
1	A I read 100 percent of that one.	1	Page 105 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that,
1 2	<ul><li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li><li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li></ul>	1 2	, and the second s
	A I read 100 percent of that one.		MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote
2	<ul><li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li><li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li><li>A I am.</li></ul>	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account
2 3	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> <li>2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> <li>2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> <li>2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your</li> <li>original filing. So your conclusions have not changed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December</li> <li>of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic</li> <li>meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've</li> <li>minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10,</li> <li>2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10,</li> <li>2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your</li> <li>original filing. So your conclusions have not changed</li> <li>despite the fact that EPA standards have been revised</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent? MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your original filing. So your conclusions have not changed despite the fact that EPA standards have been revised outward, is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent? MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. GROSSMAN: And so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your original filing. So your conclusions have not changed despite the fact that EPA standards have been revised outward, is that correct?</li> <li>A I was told I had only 24 hours in which to prepare</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent? MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. ADELMAN: conclusion from what Dr. Chase said and I would like a clarification on that, is that what he said?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your original filing. So your conclusions have not changed despite the fact that EPA standards have been revised outward, is that correct?</li> <li>A I was told I had only 24 hours in which to prepare that September 10th letter and I believe that came from Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It did, but the question to you is,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent? MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. GROSSMAN: And so MR. ADELMAN: conclusion from what Dr. Chase said and I would like a clarification on that, is that what he said? MR. GROSSMAN: Is that what you're saying?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I read 100 percent of that one.</li> <li>Q And you are aware, are you not, that in December of 2012 the EPA lowered its standard for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I am.</li> <li>Q What's the new standard, do you know?</li> <li>A I think I mentioned it, 12 micrograms per cubic meter on an annual basis.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A They left the 24-hour standard unchanged at 35.</li> <li>Q So would it be accurate to say that you've minimally revised your report, the one dated September 10, 2013, I'm sorry, below the what was that exhibit number? MR. GROSSMAN: The exhibit is, the September 10, 2013 letter is dated, is Exhibit 269(a).</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: 269(a).</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q So 269(a) is very, very similar to 15(b), your original filing. So your conclusions have not changed despite the fact that EPA standards have been revised outward, is that correct?</li> <li>A I was told I had only 24 hours in which to prepare that September 10th letter and I believe that came from Mr. Grossman.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he said that, but just so I understand your qualification to your testimony, Dr. Chase, are you saying that when you wrote your November 19, 2012 opinion that you took into account what you considered an impending change in the standard, in the air quality standard? THE WITNESS: I think I said imminent. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Imminent, impending, whatever you want to call it. THE WITNESS: And I think it was announced in the Federal Register on 12/14. MR. GROSSMAN: So I guess the reason I wanted to clarify that is because the sense of your question is, well, they changed the standard between November of 2012 and September of 2013, yet the conclusions didn't change and the sense of his answer is he took into account the change, if I'm understanding him correctly, even in his November 2012 letter because it was imminent? MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. ADELMAN: And that would be my MR. ADELMAN: conclusion from what Dr. Chase said and I would like a clarification on that, is that what he said?

	Page 106		Page 108
1	again. I had a good idea that EPA was going to make the	1	and found an air pollution source that would create a hazard
2	annual standard lower or stricter or more protective for all	2	to health? If you can't
3	of us, for all of society, but that even if they hadn't	3	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I can.
4	done that, I would have come up with the same opinion.	4	MR. GROSSMAN: You can? Okay.
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	5	THE WITNESS: I just can't do a thorough job.
6	BY MR. ADELMAN:	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7	Q In your numerous testimonies, have you ever	7	THE WITNESS: I mean I did it for Fannie Mae.
8	concluded that air quality effects would constitute a health	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9	risk in a specific situation? Have you ever testified that	9	THE WITNESS: I did it for the Department of
10	air quality impact of a specific situation would constitute	10	Transportation Headquarters building. That turned into a 2-
11	a health risk?	11	year project. That involved black mold, stachybotrys
12	A I'm quite sure I have, but I have to go back to	12	chartarum. Senate Childcare Center probably; the Florence
13	that list of 60 Tim has got over there or did you find it?	13	Bertel School, the gym; Fort Myer Construction probably; GSA
14	MR. ST. PIERRE: I did. Do you want it now?	14	probably; Kiplinger Washington Editors, I don't think that
15	MR. GROSSMAN: If you have it.	15	was litigation; MCI.
16	MR. ST. PIERRE: It's right on top.	16	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I mean I think that's
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.	17	the best that Dr. Chase can do from looking at all this.
18	THE WITNESS: And, again, these are not all	18	BY MR. ADELMAN:
19	litigation cases. Probably less than half are litigation	19	Q Which I made to the previous point, Dr. Chase, I
20	cases. I mean one of the things I did on here was I was in	20	seem to recall that Mr. Sullivan's number in his original
20	charge of diesel exhaust training for Amtrak locomotive	21	report for PM2.5 were above 12. And if you were aware, as
22	mechanics and how to protect them, how to minimize their	22	you stated, that it was highly like the EPA was going to
23	exposure. What's the name of the train station in Philly?	23	lower its standard to below 12, would that not have led you
	Penn	24	to come to a different conclusion in the original report?
25	MR. GROSSMAN: Penn Station.	25	A No.
25		25	
	Page 107		Page 109
1	THE WITNESS: Penn Station? Yes, most of that	1	Q You've stated, have you not, that the standards of
2	went on at Penn, at Penn Station in Philadelphia. Power	2	
3	plant projects Bucksport, Maine; Jacksonville.	3	A I think I remember the number you're referring to
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think he's asking you	4	and it was just a little bit above 12 and a wide margin of
5	to read them all. I think what he's asking the question	5	safety is built into these numbers.
6	is take a look at the list and can you recall from that,	6	Q I refer you now to the copy of your letter of
7	refreshing your recollection from that list, can you recall	7	November 19th. There's a couple of passages. I'd like you
8	if in any of the cases where you actually testified, did you	8	to read it. Sir, could you read, please, the first sentence
9	testify that a single source would create air pollution to	9	up to the comma just before, just after air quality?
10	the extent of creating a health hazard. Is that a fair	10	A Which page are you on?
11		11	
	characterization of your question?		Q This is the first page of your 2-page letter.
12	characterization of your question? MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right.	12	A Okay.
12	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right.	12	A Okay.
12 13	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	12 13	<ul><li>A Okay.</li><li>Q The first sentence.</li></ul>
12 13 14	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a	12 13 14	<ul><li>A Okay.</li><li>Q The first sentence.</li><li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li></ul>
12 13 14 15	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and	12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be	12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was	12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've also consulted to numerous Federal agencies on air quality, the Bureau of National Affairs, DOT, EPA itself.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> <li>A The first paragraph?</li> <li>Q Just the first sentence up to the comma.</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've also consulted to numerous Federal agencies on air quality, the Bureau of National Affairs, DOT, EPA itself. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but right now his	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which date?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> <li>A The first paragraph?</li> <li>Q Just the first sentence up to the comma.</li> <li>A "It is my understanding that some local residents</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've also consulted to numerous Federal agencies on air quality, the Bureau of National Affairs, DOT, EPA itself. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but right now his question is, if you can tell, if you can't tell from looking	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence. MR. GROSSMAN: Which date? MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> <li>A The first paragraph?</li> <li>Q Just the first sentence up to the comma.</li> <li>A "It is my understanding that some local residents have expressed concerns regarding potential,</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've also consulted to numerous Federal agencies on air quality, the Bureau of National Affairs, DOT, EPA itself. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but right now his question is, if you can tell, if you can't tell from looking at the list, Dr. Chase, that's okay, you just have to tell	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence. MR. GROSSMAN: Which date? MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> <li>A The first paragraph?</li> <li>Q Just the first sentence up to the comma.</li> <li>A "It is my understanding that some local residents have expressed concerns regarding potential, adverse impacts on air quality."</li> </ul>
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. ADELMAN: It sounds right. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'd have to go back to give you a complete answer, I would have to go back to my office and pull these files. But I think one example would be effective diesel exhaust in Atlantic City. Our client was Spencer Gifts, Inc., a power plant in Orlando. Oh, we've also consulted to numerous Federal agencies on air quality, the Bureau of National Affairs, DOT, EPA itself. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but right now his question is, if you can tell, if you can't tell from looking	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q The first sentence. MR. GROSSMAN: Which date? MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q "It is my understanding."</li> <li>A The first paragraph?</li> <li>Q Just the first sentence up to the comma.</li> <li>A "It is my understanding that some local residents have expressed concerns regarding potential, adverse impacts on air quality."</li> </ul>

	Page 110		Page 112
1	you by Mr. Sullivan or someone from Costco?	1	correct. I'm sorry, Mr. Flynn in his revised I'm
2	A No.	2	confusing the needs with the general, with the land use
3	Q No?	3	definition.
4	A I said, no, I didn't have discussion with	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well
5	residents.	5	MS. CORDRY: Mr
6	Q So how do you know what their concerns were or	6	MR. GROSSMAN: the Technical Staff defined the
7	are?	7	neighborhood in a way that included nearby residences,
8	A My client told me.	8	whereas your expert and your proffer was that your
9	Q Your client told you?	9	definition of neighborhood would not have included them.
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Why do you look surprised at that,	10	But Mr., Dr. Chase does include, does say some local
11	Dr. Adelman? Wouldn't you anticipate that?	11	residents, so I don't know how finely you can parse that,
12	MR. ADELMAN: No, actually I think I better not	12	Dr. Adelman, because he says some local residents, so he's
13	say anything, Mr. Grossman, that will be interpreted as	13	obviously including a concept of people who live in the
14	testimony.	14	area. Exactly what that means, I don't know, but
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, but you can answer my	15	MR. ADELMAN: That's precisely my point.
16	question, but	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17	MR. SILVERMAN: He just asked you.	17	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Grossman.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: but it's all right. If you	18	BY MR. ADELMAN:
19	prefer not to, you don't have to.	19	Q Dr. Chase, would it be unreasonable to assume that
20	MR. GROSSMAN: I just	20	Costco employees who work at the store and who may work at
21	MR. ADELMAN: I did	21	the gas station if it's built might also be concerned about
22	MR. GROSSMAN: I just	22	health risks?
23	MR. ADELMAN: I did expect it and I'm	23	A It's possible.
24	disappointed.	24	Q Possible? Thank you.
25	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	25	A Is that the question?
	Page 111		Page 113
1	Page 111 BY MR. ADELMAN:	1	
1 2	-	1 2	
	BY MR. ADELMAN:		Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps?
2	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you	2	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the
2 3	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents?	2 3	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is
2 3 4	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris.	2 3 4	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible?
2 3 4 5	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you.	2 3 4 5	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry.
2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client.	2 3 4 5 6	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there. I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there. I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there. I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there. I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that are abutting the parking lot? If the gas station is built</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. THE WITNESS: I messed up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that are abutting the parking lot? If the gas station is built in the parking lot, might those people also be concerned</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. THE WITNESS: I messed up. MR. GROSSMAN: It is true, isn't it? Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that are abutting the parking lot? If the gas station is built in the parking lot, might those people also be concerned about potential adverse air quality impacts?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. THE WITNESS: I messed up. MR. GROSSMAN: It is true, isn't it? Your definition of neighborhood was just including the mall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that are abutting the parking lot? If the gas station is built in the parking lot, might those people also be concerned about potential adverse air quality impacts?</li> <li>A Anything is possible, but you're leaving so much</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Do you happen to recall who specifically told you of the concerns of the residents? A Patricia Harris. Q Thank you. A And David Sullivan, but he wasn't my client. Q So when you speak of local residents, you name, do you not, the residents who live in a neighborhood, the vicinity of the proposed gas station? A I do. Q To your mind, what exactly is that neighborhood? A There's a hundred definitions that you could use. The Q How about the definition that your client uses? A I don't recall. I think they I think they used street boundaries and street names. MR. ADELMAN: For the record, Mr. Grossman, I'm reminding the witness that the client he's serving does not include any residences in its definition of neighborhood. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. THE WITNESS: I messed up. MR. GROSSMAN: It is true, isn't it? Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Thank you. What about people who use the pumps? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, he didn't answer the question. He said, "Is it possible?" He's asking you is that your question, is it possible? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, that's my question, sorry. THE WITNESS: Well, there's no gas station there.</li> <li>I guess not the, employees should be warehouse or MR. ADELMAN: I asked you specifically if the gas station is built. Let me re-read it. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. If the gas station were built, is it possible that employees of the gas station might also and do you have anything else? MR. ADELMAN: Have concerns. MR. GROSSMAN: Have concerns? THE WITNESS: Anything is possible. MR. GROSSMAN: Anything is possible. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Anything is possible. What about people who use the parking lot and who patronize the various stores that are abutting the parking lot? If the gas station is built in the parking lot, might those people also be concerned about potential adverse air quality impacts?</li> </ul>

	Page 114		Page 116
1	buy their stuff, pack their car up and leave. So I guess	1	opportunity to get some lunch before they close down the
2	I'd say possible, but not plausible.	2	cafeteria.
3	Q Dr. Chase, are you aware of the concept of	3	MR. ADELMAN: After he responds to my question on
4	secondhand smoke impact, smoking impact?	4	this.
5	A Of course.	5	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think you posed a question
6	Q All right. Do you personally know anything about	6	yet.
7	the air flow patterns and dispersal of air pollutants in the	7	MR. ADELMAN: No.
8	parking lot other than what you've read in Dr., Mr.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: That's why maybe it's, maybe it's
9	Sullivan's report?	9	not a bad time to
10	A No.	10	MR. ADELMAN: No.
11	Q Have you read pages 75 and 76 in Mr. Sullivan's	11	MR. GROSSMAN: to break.
12	report?	12	MR. ADELMAN: I didn't pose it first because it
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think that's an unfair	13	would be unfair to do that.
14	question unless he has it in front of him. Did you	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. So why don't we do you
15	MR. ADELMAN: I'm about to provide it.	15	want him to answer this question first, whatever you're
16	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, then let's	16	about to pose, is that what you'd like, you'd prefer?
17	provide it because I I don't think you can ask the	17	MR. ADELMAN: How about if it's okay with you, we
18	witness to memorize the page numbers.	18	can break now and he can have time to look at that.
19	MR. ADELMAN: Well, I think (Discussion off the record.)	19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: And then
20 21	BY MR. ADELMAN:	20	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's fair. Dr. Chase
22	Q What you have, Dr. Chase, is it's 2-sided. It was	21	THE WITNESS: Yes?
22	taken directly from Mr. Sullivan's report. It was 15(a). I	22	MR. GROSSMAN: what we're going to do is before
24	don't need you to read it out loud, but could you just scan	24	
25	it please? I have a question after you've had a chance to	25	to break for lunch and then when we come back after lunch,
	Page 115		Page 117
1	read it over.	1	he's going to ask you whatever questions he has regarding
2	A It looks like you've given me two copies of the	2	pages 75 and 76 of the November 19, 2012 Sullivan report,
3	same thing.	3	okay?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: You handed him two documents? Is		Shay!
		4	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me?
5	one supposed to be for me?	4 5	-
5 6	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this.		THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman?
	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir.	5	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am?
6 7 8	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you.	5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms.
6 7 8 9	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry.	5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because
6 7 8 9 10	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN:	5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying
6 7 8 9 10 11	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be
6 7 9 10 11 12 13	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today.
6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN:	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.)	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking, Dr. Adelman,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible, but generally speaking in double numbers the attorneys give,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.)	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking, Dr. Adelman, how much longer do you think your cross-examination will	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible, but generally speaking in double numbers the attorneys give, Dr. Adelman, I don't know, I don't want to make any
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking, Dr. Adelman, how much longer do you think your cross-examination will take?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible, but generally speaking in double numbers the attorneys give, Dr. Adelman, I don't know, I don't want to make any predictions. MS. HARRIS: Okay. Well, we'll make our own
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one supposed to be for me? THE WITNESS: I think it's a duplicate of this. MR. ABRAMS: One was supposed to be for you, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Thank you. MR. ADELMAN: Sorry. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q So it's two pages. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I certainly know I wouldn't remember the page numbers. All right. THE WITNESS: What do you want did you want me to read something? MR. GROSSMAN: He wanted you to skim it. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q I just want you to skim that document. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking, Dr. Adelman, how much longer do you think your cross-examination will take? MR. ADELMAN: I would expect about an hour.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Can I take this with me? MR. GROSSMAN: You may take it with you. MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman? MR. GROSSMAN: Ma'am? MS. HARRIS: Can we get a sense of how long Ms. Rosenfeld's questions and cross will be as well only because I'm wondering whether Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today because we have Mr. Flynn here if she is. I think the question is is it likely that Ms. Cordry is going to be testifying today. MS. ROSENFELD: I guess between one and two hours. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So if we come back here at 1:45, if Dr. Adelman takes an hour, that would be 2:45. I think we're probably one to two hours you said? I think it's unlikely that Ms. Cordry will testify because we have to leave by 4:45. So it's unlikely. It's possible, but generally speaking in double numbers the attorneys give, Dr. Adelman, I don't know, I don't want to make any predictions. MS. HARRIS: Okay. Well, we'll make our own

	Page 118		Page 120
1	1:45. We're in recess.	1	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think he was asking you to
2	(Recess.)	2	list them, I think he's asking you if there are other
3	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We're ready for your	3	pollutants other than benzene that are characterized or
4	question, Dr. Adelman, regarding pages 75 and 76.	4	could be potential health risks, is that
5	MR. ADELMAN: All right. Should we do that or	5	MR. ADELMAN: Precisely. Precisely.
6	should Dr. Chase, would Dr. Chase like to respond to those	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Are there other
7	couple of questions before of what he was going to look at	7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	his files?	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know, oh, you mean the	9	BY MR. ADELMAN:
10	previous	10	Q Yes? That wasn't intended to be a yes or no, I'm
11	MR. ADELMAN: Yes.	11	sorry. But since you started to name some of the compounds,
12	MR. GROSSMAN: let's get with the question that	12	what I'm interested in is can you name some of the health
13	you	13	risks, potential health risks, and with respect to any of
14	MR. ADELMAN: Okay. Fine.	14	the health risks you can mention, could you state the
15	MR. GROSSMAN: were about to ask	15	pollutant or pollutants that are presently sought to be
16	MR. ADELMAN: Fine.	16	causative of those health risks?
17	MR. GROSSMAN: and, when we broke.	17	MR. GOECKE: That's a compound question. Could we
18	MR. ADELMAN: Right.	18	break that down for him please?
19	BY MR. ADELMAN:	19	THE WITNESS: Yes.
20	Q Dr. Chase, you've had a chance to look at this	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, it might be easier. That's a
21	page 75 and 76 from Mr. Sullivan's report, is that correct?	21	fair question.
22	A Yes.	22	BY MR. ADELMAN:
23	Q And would you agree that in a general sense those	23	Q Could you list one specific health risk and the
24	pages refer to the risk of cancer potentially caused by	24	pollutant that is currently thought to be involved in
25	benzene?	25	imposing that health risk, other than benzene?
	Page 119		Page 121
1			, and the second s
1	A Yes.	1	A Other than benzene? There are other potential
2	A Yes. Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your	2	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about
2 3	A Yes. Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?	2 3	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds
2 3 4	<ul><li>A Yes.</li><li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li><li>A Part of my report.</li></ul>	2 3 4	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your</li> <li>report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can</li> <li>be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> <li>MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant. BY MR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q The question was not as to significance. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so we don't know, but there's a lot of polycentric, aromatic</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> <li>MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not significant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure to that pollutant?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so we don't know, but there's a lot of polycentric, aromatic hydrocarbons.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> <li>MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not significant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure to that pollutant?</li> <li>A Formaldehyde and irritation of the pulmonary tract</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so we don't know, but there's a lot of polycentric, aromatic hydrocarbons.</li> <li>Q And many of them are reasonably well-characterized</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene? A From diesel exhaust or just MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel. MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel. MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions. THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel? MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel. THE WITNESS: Not significant. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure to that pollutant? A Formaldehyde and irritation of the pulmonary tract at, again, at a high dose.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so we don't know, but there's a lot of polycentric, aromatic hydrocarbons.</li> <li>Q And many of them are reasonably well-characterized as to potential health risk, is that correct?</li> <li>A Benzene has been</li> <li>Q Other than Benzene?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> <li>MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not significant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure to that pollutant?</li> <li>A Formaldehyde and irritation of the pulmonary tract at, again, at a high dose.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Which is, in essence, a major focus of your report, is that correct?</li> <li>A Part of my report.</li> <li>Q Fine. Thank you. Are you aware that cancer can be caused by many other airborne pollutants?</li> <li>A Say again?</li> <li>Q Are you aware that cancer can be caused or may be caused by many other airborne pollutants, not just benzene?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that in addition to the four VOC's that you enumerated in your letter, there are various other airborne pollutants which are found in automotive exhaust and automotive emissions?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Are you aware that, are you aware that these other pollutants constitute a range of potential health risks?</li> <li>A Well, many of them are not well-characterized, so we don't know, but there's a lot of polycentric, aromatic hydrocarbons.</li> <li>Q And many of them are reasonably well-characterized as to potential health risk, is that correct?</li> <li>A Benzene has been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A Other than benzene? There are other potential emissions from you didn't say we were talking about diesel and so, but it sounds, sounds</li> <li>Q I'm definitively not talking about diesel, other than diesel, what are emissions, not benzene?</li> <li>A From diesel exhaust or just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, not, not diesel.</li> <li>MR. ABRAMS: Not diesel.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Auto emissions, but not diesel emissions.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Air emissions? Air emissions, but not diesel?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Not diesel.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not significant.</li> <li>BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q The question was not as to significance. The question was can you name one specific pollutant and a health risk which is thought to be associated with exposure to that pollutant?</li> <li>A Formaldehyde and irritation of the pulmonary tract at, again, at a high dose.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A At a high enough dose, formaldehyde can produce</li> </ul>

		Page 122		Page 124
1	control	I measures.	1	A You asked me about nitrogen dioxide, didn't you?
2		Since you	2	Q Yes.
3		and design.	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, he asked if nitrogen dioxide
4		Since you raised that point, the vapor control	4	was present in automotive exhaust.
5		ons are on gas pumping stations, are they not?	5	THE WITNESS: At low levels, yes.
6		MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what do you mean they	6	BY MR. ADELMAN:
7		the gas pump stations?	7	Q Does its presence in automotive exhaust, and
8		MR. ADELMAN: I'm asking the question is about	8	therefore in the air around the automobiles, constitute a
9		oming out of the tailpipe of the cars.	9	potential health risk, yes or no?
10		MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	10	A No.
11		MR. ADELMAN: Those are auto emissions. The vapor	11	Q No health risk? If we could return, if you would
12		I devices are, to my knowledge, not on the tailpipes	12	return to your letter of November 19th, Exhibit 15(b)?
13		cars, is that correct?	13	had you previously read the first half of the first
14		THE WITNESS: Correct.	14	sentence. Could you please read the second half of that
15	I	BY MR. ADELMAN:	15	sentence now, beginning with, despite state-of-the-art?
16	Q	Thank you. Those auto emissions, those auto	16	A "Despite state-of-the art emission controls on
17	emissi	ons contain a number of components, do they not?	17	Costco's existing property in Wheaton, Maryland."
18	А	Yes.	18	Q You're now testifying on special exception case S-
19	Q	For example, PM2.5, correct?	19	2863, are you not?
20	Α	From cars?	20	A I think I am. I don't know the number.
21	Q	From cars.	21	Q All right.
22	Α	Yes.	22	MR. GROSSMAN: He doesn't know the number.
23		And what health risks or risk are associated with	23	BY MR. ADELMAN:
24	PM2.5		24	Q Are you aware that the gas station in question is
25	A	Well, they're dose dependent.	25	proposed, that is to say the process we're going through is
		Page 123		Page 125
1	Q	I understand that.	1	to determine if it can be built, it has not been built, are
2	Α	Concentration dependent.	2	you aware of that?
3	Q	What risks are potentially associated?	3	A I know that.
4	Α	Irritation of the pulmonary system, the lungs, and	4	Q Thus, there are no state-of-the-art control,
5	we thir	nk lung cancer.	5	emission controls at the existing site, is that correct?
6	Q	Others, are there other risks?	6	A Not in place, but they're part of the design.
7	Α	At high enough levels, cardiovascular.	7	Q Are you aware that Costco doesn't, in fact, own
8		MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry, cardiovascular?	8	the property in question that is zoned by Westfield and
9		MR. GROSSMAN: At high enough levels,	9	leased, or will be leased by Costco?
10		vascular. Are there other risks?	10	MR. GROSSMAN: What difference does that make?
11		MS. ROSENFELD: Cardiovascular what?	11	THE WITNESS: No.
12		MR. GROSSMAN: He asked if there were other risks	12	MR. ADELMAN: It goes to the expert witness's
13		has answered at high enough levels, cardiovascular.	13	expertise as to the basic facts of the case.
14		THE WITNESS: Or heart.	14	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't see how that in any way
15		BY MR. ADELMAN:	15	affects his health opinions and I think if you're segueing
16		Carbon monoxide? What about it?	16	off the sentence, which I admit this first sentence might be ambiguous as to state-of-the-art emission controls on an
17 18		Is it in automotive exhaust?	17	existing property, he doesn't say the existing gas stations,
18 19		At very low levels.	18 19	it is an existing property and whether or not he says it's
20		Does the level present in automotive exhaust	20	owned by Costco or not, it's their property in the lease in
20		tute a potential health risk?	20	a leasing sense, so I just don't see where that would help
22		The way you phrased it, I guess my answer would be	22	us at all. Let's try I mean let's try to stick to an
			23	area
23	ves			
23 24	yes. Q	Thank you. What about nitrogen dioxide present in	24	MR. ADELMAN: I'll move on. I'll move on.
23 24 25	Q	Thank you. What about nitrogen dioxide present in otive exhaust, yes or no?	24 25	MR. ADELMAN: I'll move on. I'll move on. MR. GROSSMAN: that is relevant to what I have

	Page 126		Page 128
1	to decide.	1	THE WITNESS: I don't have the Sullivan report in
2	BY MR. ADELMAN:	2	front of me. I'm not exactly sure. I don't want to mis-
3	Q Are you aware that Costco was forced, excuse me,	3	speak.
4	are you aware that the County Council passed EPA 12-07? Are	4	BY MR. ADELMAN:
5	you aware of the EPA 12-07 passed by the County Council?	5	Q All right. That sentence is not set off by
6	MR. GOECKE: Objection. Relevance.	6	quotes, this is your report. I'm asking you a question
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, what is the relevance of that,	7	about your report.
8	whether he's aware of the ZTA?	8	A I know, but I still took it from Sullivan's
9	MR. ADELMAN: Withdrawn. BY MR. GROSSMAN:	9	report.
10 11	Q Could you please read the entire sentence that	10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: He's actually referring to Sullivan in this sentence. He says he, the sentence before it refers
12	begins, it's the third paragraph that begins with, this	12	to the report by David Sullivan, November 2012, and it says
13	report, and ends with, exposure to it, could you read that	13	this report provides. He's referring to the Sullivan report
14	sentence? First page of your letter, third paragraph.	14	there.
15	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, you can all read	15	MR. ADELMAN: I understand that. I'm asking the
16	it. It speaks for itself. He doesn't have to read it.	16	witness to explain the sentence.
17	What about it?	17	MR. GROSSMAN: I know, but you I know, but you
18	MR. ADELMAN: Well, then can Dr. Chase explain to	18	said just before that, you said you're not asking about the
19	me, to us in, to you, sir, in layman's terms what that	19	Sullivan report, you're asking about his report and he is
20	sentence means?	20	referencing the Sullivan report in this statement. I don't
21	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And we're talking about	21	think that's he's not saying, if I understand you, Dr.
22	this report? Which one? There are two of them.	22	Chase, you're not saying that this 95 percent upper limit
23	MR. ADELMAN: This report provides a	23	point is part of your independent conclusion, you're saying
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And it's okay. I see it.	24	that's something you took from the Sullivan report, is that
25	(Discussion off the record.)	25	correct?
		-	
	Page 127		Page 129
1	Page 127 MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.	1	Page 129 THE WITNESS: Yes.
1 2		1	
	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th.		THE WITNESS: Yes.
2	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in	2 3	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports.	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes.
2 3 4 5	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms? A Well, it assumes that an individual is potentially	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today. Q I want you to return to the point that of the 15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms? A Well, it assumes that an individual is potentially exposed for 70 years, 24 hours a day, which is implausible,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today. Q I want you to return to the point that of the 15 references you cite in your file, 14 based on your titles, reflect studies related to cancer risk and/or benzene usually, only pick between the two, and you agreed that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms? A Well, it assumes that an individual is potentially exposed for 70 years, 24 hours a day, which is implausible, but it does assume it and that the cancer risk protections for each of the substances that he looked at included a 95 percent upper limit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today. Q I want you to return to the point that of the 15 references you cite in your file, 14 based on your titles, reflect studies related to cancer risk and/or benzene usually, only pick between the two, and you agreed that that is the case. I have a copy of one of the references, while
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms? A Well, it assumes that an individual is potentially exposed for 70 years, 24 hours a day, which is implausible, but it does assume it and that the cancer risk protections for each of the substances that he looked at included a 95 percent upper limit. MR. GROSSMAN: What does that mean? What do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today. Q I want you to return to the point that of the 15 references you cite in your file, 14 based on your titles, reflect studies related to cancer risk and/or benzene usually, only pick between the two, and you agreed that that is the case. I have a copy of one of the references, while I trip over all the cords.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. ADELMAN: November 19th. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same in both MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. ADELMAN: reports. MR. GROSSMAN: So what did you mean he's asking what did you mean by this sentence, the one that begins, this report provides, MR. ADELMAN: In layman's terms MR. GROSSMAN: a 95 percent upper limit, et cetera? THE WITNESS: That's based on the Sullivan report and it's one of several ways that, providing conservatives in cancer risk estimations or projections. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Could you please explain what the sentence means in layman's terms? A Well, it assumes that an individual is potentially exposed for 70 years, 24 hours a day, which is implausible, but it does assume it and that the cancer risk protections for each of the substances that he looked at included a 95 percent upper limit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q In the last sentence of that paragraph you refer to a wide margin of safety, is that correct? A Yes. Q What do you mean by a wide margin of safety? A That is defined by CASAC, the CASAC Committee. Q And what is the definition? A I don't offhand know, but it would go something along if they thought that the risk of developing cancer after 70 years of exposure, that substance X was 10, for their purposes they changed the 10 to 20. I'm not saying that's what they did because I don't know without having CASAC report in front of me. And so that it's not taken out of context, I also pointed out that the CASAC calculations were taking into account sensitive populations as we defined earlier today. Q I want you to return to the point that of the 15 references you cite in your file, 14 based on your titles, reflect studies related to cancer risk and/or benzene usually, only pick between the two, and you agreed that that is the case. I have a copy of one of the references, while

	Page 130		Page 132
1	BY MR. ADELMAN:	1	THE WITNESS: You didn't mention the fact that
2	Q First of all, am I correct in assuming that	2	this is based on studies done with fuels and engines
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Adelman said that you had	3	produced before the year 2000. That makes a huge
4	indicated that all of these references attached to your	4	difference.
5	report related to the effects of benzene. I know that you	5	BY MR. ADELMAN:
6	had testified they were all related to diesel engines. I	6	Q Are you objecting to the article that you cited?
7	don't recall you saying, but I may be mistaken	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's not objecting to the
8	MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry, I may have mis-spoke.	8	article.
9	Excuse me. Yes, I'm, thank you for catching that. What I	9	THE WITNESS: No.
10	meant to say was that they're all studies on diesel and oral	10	MR. GROSSMAN: He's saying you cited only one
11	cancer risk.	11	paragraph of an article that has multiple things in it and
12	BY MR. ADELMAN:	12	he's saying that the study was done regarding at least
13	Q Am I correct in assuming you've actually read all	13	automobile engines before 2000. So he's clearing up, I
14	15 of the articles?	14	guess you would say, the point you're raising.
15	A Oh, I did.	15	BY MR. ADELMAN:
16	Q Good. The article that I gave you is No. 15 on	16	Q What is the date of publication of the article?
17	your list of references. I wonder if you could look through	17	A 2012.
18	the title for me?	18	Q Is it a fairly recent article?
19	A Carcinogenicity of diesel, engine and gasoline	19	A The article is fairly recent.
20	engine exhaust and some nitro-airings.	20	Q Fine. And it summarizes
21	Q The reason I call this out is that it does refer	21	A The data that they're citing is not.
22	to gasoline engine exhaust. Could you please turn to the	22	MS. CORDRY: If I'm looking at this, the only
23	second page, that's page No. 664, and look at the next to	23	reference I see before 2000 seems to be talking about the
24	the last paragraph. It begins, in conclusion. Could you	24	diesel engines. Maybe I'm missing it. But the bottom of
25	please read that paragraph?	25	the front page of the very bottom of the first column
		-	
	Page 131		Page 133
1	Page 131 A I don't have a page 664.	1	
1 2		1 2	Ĵ
	A I don't have a page 664.		they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page
2	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: double-sided.</li> </ul>	2	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline
2 3	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this.</li> </ul>	2 3	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: double-sided.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: double-sided.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans,	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading? MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000." MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I don't have a page 664. Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN: Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his opinion. He's here as a health expert. Yes, that's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell MS. CORDRY: Oh.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his opinion. He's here as a health expert. Yes, that's overruled. You can answer.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Oh.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: can we tell whether, from the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his opinion. He's here as a health expert. Yes, that's overruled. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Well, you're picking parts of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Oh.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: can we tell whether, from the article whether or not the data they're referencing for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his opinion. He's here as a health expert. Yes, that's overruled. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Well, you're picking parts of the article and taking things out of context.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines some more and finishes talking about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Oh.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: can we tell whether, from the article whether or not the data they're referencing for ordinary car emissions is from older or more recent engines?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I don't have a page 664.</li> <li>Q It's the MR. GROSSMAN: It's the second page in this. MR. ADELMAN: double-sided. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. And it's the next to the last paragraph. THE WITNESS: In conclusion, do you want me to read it? MR. ADELMAN: Yes, please. THE WITNESS: "The working group classified diesel engine exhaust as carcinogenic to humans, Group 1, and gasoline engine exhaust as possibly carcinogenic to humans, Group 2B. BY MR. ADELMAN:</li> <li>Q Thank you. Would you agree that that paragraph seems to state that one or more elements in gasoline exhaust from automotive tailpipes are possibly carcinogenic? MR. GOECKE: Objection. The statement speaks for itself.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, but he can ask him his opinion. He's here as a health expert. Yes, that's overruled. You can answer. THE WITNESS: Well, you're picking parts of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>they're talking about the diesel engine exhaust in their extracts, but I don't see the 2000 referring to the gasoline engine exhaust which are, that was on the second page starting at the second paragraph in the second column there. MR. GROSSMAN: Can you tell, Ms. Cordry, from the audible whether they're considering vehicles before 2000 or not in your reading?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, I'm reading, the only reference I see to the year 2000 is the statement, the diesel, bottom of the first page</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: "The diesel engine exhaust and their extracts used in carcinogenicity studies with experimental animals would generate from fuels in diesel engines produced before 2000."</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Then it goes on and talks about diesel engines and that's the second page.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just saying can we tell</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Oh.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: can we tell whether, from the article whether or not the data they're referencing for</li> </ul>

	Page 134		Page 136
1	certainly nothing to suggest that it is. And by contrast to	1	there too many of the, and we still haven't talked about
2	the part about saying what they're talking about with diesel	2	Jison and Breysse, but too much of the literature out there
3	engines, I would suggest maybe they are.	3	is so dated that you can't translate it to, you can't apply
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me ask you this. Is it	4	it to the present and you can't apply it to the proposed
5	really disputed in this case by anybody that car exhaust	5	Costco gas station. And I'm trying to make a compelling
6	fumes can have, depending on dosage, health effects? I'm	6	argument for I can tell you why.
7	not sure where I don't know that that's a dispute at	7	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
8	issue, is it?	8	THE WITNESS: And earlier I mentioned the
9	MS. CORDRY: Well	9	watershed or benchmark year of 2007. That's the year that
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Applicant, is it disputed that a	10	most folks agree that the design of diesel engines and their
11	car exhaust in certain dosages can have health effects?	11	exhaust systems radically changed. We haven't mentioned at
12	THE WITNESS: May I response?	12	all about the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel in diesels. That
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir.	13	matters. That's protective of health.
14	THE WITNESS: On page 2, middle column, it	14	I did mention the high-efficiency, catalyzed
15	says, "Gasoline exhaust and cancer risk was	15	diesel particulate filters and there's a couple of other devices in I'm not an expert on diesel engines, but a
16	investigated in only a few epi-studies and because	16	-
17 18	of the difficulty to separate effective diesel and	17 18	couple MS. ROSENFELD: Excuse me, Mr. Grossman
19	gasoline exhaust, evidence for carcinogenicity was	19	THE WITNESS: of other devices.
20	evaluated as inadequate,"	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes?
21	end quotes.	21	MS. ROSENFELD: I would renew the objection that I
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. That's as to one type of	22	made earlier. All of this goes to mechanical and design
23	health effect, but I guess my question was broader. Is it	23	impacts of engines and fuels and filters, all of which goes
24	disputed in this case, applicant's counsel, that car	24	well beyond the scope of his report.
25	exhausts, depending on the dosage, can have some adverse	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Well
	Page 135		Page 137
1	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case?	1	Page 137 THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health.
1 2	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue.	1 2	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking
2 3	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak	2 3	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever
2 3 4	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in
2 3 4 5	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts
2 3 4 5 6	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to
2 3 4 5 6 7	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.	2 3 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask. MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I can speak</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I can speak</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at</li> <li>hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought</li> <li>that the question was raised when to, whether or not car</li> <li>exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a</li> <li>question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe</li> <li>the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr.</li> <li>Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely</li> <li>what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So</li> <li>is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase,</li> <li>that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I can speak</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at</li> <li>hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought</li> <li>that the question was raised when to, whether or not car</li> <li>exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a</li> <li>question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe</li> <li>the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr.</li> <li>Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely</li> <li>what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So</li> <li>is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase,</li> <li>that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage,</li> <li>emissions, these types of emissions could have health</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects. Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman? MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask. MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase, that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage, emissions, these types of emissions could have health effects, but it all was dosage dependent. Did I misunderstand that? THE WITNESS: No, you didn't misunderstand that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I assume that that's part of your case, is it not? MS. ROSENFELD: And none of those projections are in his report. I'm sitting here with an expert who is going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase, that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage, emissions, these types of emissions could have health effects, but it all was dosage dependent. Did I misunderstand that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, you didn't misunderstand that.</li> <li>That's exactly correct. And maybe it would help if I told</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I assume that that's part of your case, is it not? MS. ROSENFELD: And none of those projections are in his report. I'm sitting here with an expert who is going to testify, or in the process of testifying on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase, that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage, emissions, these types of emissions could have health effects, but it all was dosage dependent. Did I misunderstand that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, you didn't misunderstand that.</li> <li>That's exactly correct. And maybe it would help if I told you I'm not in disagreement with all these experts and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I assume that that's part of your case, is it not? MS. ROSENFELD: And none of those projections are in his report. I'm sitting here with an expert who is going to testify, or in the process of testifying on this information. I have absolutely no way to cross-examine him
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase, that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage, emissions, these types of emissions could have health effects, but it all was dosage dependent. Did I misunderstand that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, you didn't misunderstand that.</li> <li>That's exactly correct. And maybe it would help if I told you I'm not in disagreement with all these experts and scientists all over the world who have reported on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I assume that that's part of your case, is it not? MS. ROSENFELD: And none of those projections are in his report. I'm sitting here with an expert who is going to testify, or in the process of testifying on this information. I have absolutely no way to cross-examine him on what he's testifying about right now. He's providing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>health effects? Is that a true issue in this case? MS. HARRIS: I don't believe it is a true issue. THE WITNESS: I can speak MS. HARRIS: But I don't think it's the issue at hand either.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Well, no, but I thought that the question was raised when to, whether or not car exhaust can have adverse health effects. There is also a question about, more specifically, carcinogenic effects.</li> <li>Maybe I overly-broadened my concept of the question. Maybe the question was directed just to carcinogenic effects. Dr. Adelman?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: You're precisely that's precisely what I intended to ask.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If there's any health effect? So is it I took it from your earlier testimony, Dr. Chase, that, but you were saying that depending on the dosage, emissions, these types of emissions could have health effects, but it all was dosage dependent. Did I misunderstand that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, you didn't misunderstand that.</li> <li>That's exactly correct. And maybe it would help if I told you I'm not in disagreement with all these experts and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: If I recall, that's human health. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I am taking his, whatever he offers about this, I'm considering whatever the health evidence is. I'm not taking him as an expert in diesel mechanics, but he's talking about the health impacts of the modern diesel engine versus earlier versions. So to that extent MS. CORDRY: He's talking about gasoline engines. MS. ROSENFELD: Which again is not MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but you've also raised the point about the diesel trucks that are delivering the fuel. I agree with you that the vast majority of your case is not about the effects of diesel fuel because the only diesel fuel that will be impactful here, if at all, will be the delivery trucks. But you did raise that point as an issue and that you were careful to show how long each diesel truck would be there and would they be running or not and so on and so forth in your, in the evidence. So I assume that that's part of your case, is it not? MS. ROSENFELD: And none of those projections are in his report. I'm sitting here with an expert who is going to testify, or in the process of testifying on this information. I have absolutely no way to cross-examine him

	Page 138		Page 140
	-		-
1	no, no basis on which to cross-examine the accuracy of his	1	Wheaton community, the neighborhood, however you define it.
2	statements.	2	It's just not possible.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on which	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, people could measure at
4	statements you're talking about, about the health impacts or what happened with diesel trucks. And he has we've	4	least the level of pollutants, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, that's been done in Sterling,
5	already had the testimony in the record about the changes to	6	Virginia, and it's been modeled for Wheaton and you're
7	diesel technology. So I don't, I just don't it's not an	7	talking, you're talking tiny fractions of what's already out
8	area that I'm taking him as an expert on in changes in	8	there.
9	diesel technology. What I'm taking him as an expert on is	9	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but what I'm just,
10	the health impact. So the question is does he have	10	I'm just asking you, I presume, though, that one could right
11	testimony he has offered, he is in the middle of a sentence,	11	now, I presume, take measurements of the various pollutants
12	an objective regarding, I thought, about the health impacts	12	and then if the station were operation, take measurements
13	and I thought it was going to get into car emissions rather	13	after, over some period of time thereafter to see if you're
14	than diesel, but he has talked mostly about diesel, but I'm	14	correct about there being only a tiny increase.
15	sure he'll get into cars, so let's hear the whole statement	15	THE WITNESS: You could, but it would be a waste
16	that he has to say about that.	16	of time and money because you won't be able to demonstrate
17	THE WITNESS: There's a lot that, I don't know, I	17	it. The fact that the background
18	haven't read all the transcripts, but does everybody know	18	MR. GROSSMAN: You won't be able to demonstrate
19	that when the diesel truck, delivery truck shows up to	19	what? You won't be able to demonstrate health impact or you
20	offload the fuel, they're required to turn off their engine?	20	won't be able to demonstrate whether or not this
21	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I understand, but we're not we just want to hear, because of your expertise is	21	THE WITNESS: Incremental health impact or
22 23	not as to how they operate the engines, it's as to the	22 23	background. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand from what you've said
23 24	health impacts of anything. That's what I, your testimony	23 24	that that's your opinions, but you could take the
25	and, in fact, your summary report is restricted to because	25	measurement, you could take measurements of whether or not
	Page 139		Page 141
1	-	1	Ũ
1 2	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance	1	Page 141 there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?
	-		there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or
2	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not	2	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?
2 3	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are	2 3	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my
2 3 4	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of	2 3 4	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that.
2 3 4 5	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station.	2 3 4 5	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly.	2 3 4 5 6	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding. I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding. MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt were the health impacts here, if I understood you. THE WITNESS: That I could trust in my written report, but I'll say it again. I don't think there's going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see if there, what, if any, increases there are and various pollutant levels over some period of time. But, anyway, that's something for the future. It is something that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt were the health impacts here, if I understood you. THE WITNESS: That I could trust in my written report, but I'll say it again. I don't think there's going to be any health impacts from this gas station and if it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see if there, what, if any, increases there are and various pollutant levels over some period of time. But, anyway, that's something for the future. It is something that the parties should consider as a potential condition. But we're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt were the health impacts here, if I understood you. THE WITNESS: That I could trust in my written report, but I'll say it again. I don't think there's going to be any health impacts from this gas station and if it goes forward, there's no one in the world who would be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see if there, what, if any, increases there are and various pollutant levels over some period of time. But, anyway, that's something for the future. It is something that the parties should consider as a potential condition. But we're off the track here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt were the health impacts here, if I understood you. THE WITNESS: That I could trust in my written report, but I'll say it again. I don't think there's going to be any health impacts from this gas station and if it goes forward, there's no one in the world who would be able to design a study that would be able to show that there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see if there, what, if any, increases there are and various pollutant levels over some period of time. But, anyway, that's something for the future. It is something that the parties should consider as a potential condition. But we're off the track here.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Stop me if I'm out of line, but</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in fairness to the other side, they have to know in advance the area in which you're going to testify to and it's not technically the operation of a diesel truck, it is what are the health impacts, if any, from the proposed operation of this Costco gasoline station. THE WITNESS: If I could respectfully disagree a little bit? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Certainly. THE WITNESS: As an expert board-certified in occupational and environmental medicine, we, the concept of dose response was drilled into me 40 years ago and I can't talk about health without talking about dose or MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about THE WITNESS: potential exposure. MR. GROSSMAN: I expect you to talk about dose. I understand that. But my question, my question to you went to the dose aspect, but you indicated you were going to tell me about kind of, or more broadly describe what you felt were the health impacts here, if I understood you. THE WITNESS: That I could trust in my written report, but I'll say it again. I don't think there's going to be any health impacts from this gas station and if it goes forward, there's no one in the world who would be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>there's been an increase in the level of one pollutant or another, is that correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Not only could you do so, my understanding is Costco plans to do so, monitoring, if the gas station is built, they're going to be doing monitoring every three months or something like that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Is that his testimony that they're going to do that?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>I don't know if that's the case, but that was his understanding.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I don't see Mr. Brann shaking his head yes on that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case if that's something that the parties ought to consider as a potential condition if, in fact, the Board of Appeals were to approve a special exception here, the question of monitoring to see if there, what, if any, increases there are and various pollutant levels over some period of time. But, anyway, that's something for the future. It is something that the parties should consider as a potential condition. But we're off the track here.</li> </ul>

1       MR. SILVERMAN: Im just going by		Page 142		Page 144
2         MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just going by 3         MR. GROSSMAN: Are you next up in terms of cross- 3           3         MR. SLVERMAN: The would be doing in now. 5         3         assanciation?           4         basically have to start from someplace. I mean if they were 5         Going to monitor, they would be doing in now. 5         BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you very much. 5         BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you very much. 5           7         gas station - if the Board of Appeals tomorrow were to 5         BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you very much. 5         GO To Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you 7           10         basicality base to base allow bofore anything was operational. 10         basicality base operational conditions should have to be 5         O To Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you 7           12         station if goes over the level?         1         An R ROSSMAN: Yes that would have to be 3         O Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you 7           13         MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it dopends on - I mean thero 4         1         Concileation Anything was operational. 10         Concileation the comprehensive 1           14         To convertable set this would lift, you would let me, 1         1         The WITNESS: The your would let me, 1           14         To convertable set this something that should be 1         Concileation the comprehensive 1           14         I probably have it is meantif the y were 1         Co	1	MR. SILVERMAN: you can't	1	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
3       MR. SILVERMAN: Thark you, But you have to have, going to monitor, they would be doing in now.       3       asamination?         4       basically have to start from someplace. I mean if they were going to monitor, they would have to, well, but the gas station if the Board of Appeals somotow were to a public and so on. So you still have to the to establish a built and so on. So you still have to the to establish a built and so on. So you still have to the to establish a built and so on. So you still have to the to establish a baseline before anything was operational.       0       D. Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you say in your wild on the comprehensive sampling data for a similar Cosco gas station in Sterling, Virginia. Can you a similar Cosco gas station in Sterling, Virginia.         10       baseline before anything was operational.       10       describe what that sampling data was and where it is contained in the current record?         11       MR. GROSSMAN: Unil, it don't know.       1       1       1       1       1         12       station if it goes over the level?       1       1       1       1       1       1         13       GROSSMAN: Well, it depends onI mean there or concivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects 10       1 <td< td=""><td></td><td>-</td><td>2</td><td>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you next up in terms of cross-</td></td<>		-	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Are you next up in terms of cross-
5 going to monitor, they would be doing in ow.         5         BY MS, ROSEMFELD:           6         MR, GROSSMAN: They would have to, well, but the         6         Q. Dr. Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you           7 gas station if the Board of Appeals comorrow were to         8 approva the gasoline station, it would still have to be         9 minitor Costco gas station in Sterling, Virginia.         C. Dr. Chase, in your Sterling that in reaching these           10 baseline before anything was operational.         9 similar Costco gas station in Sterling, Virginia.         C. Dr. Chase, in your Sterling that in reaching these           12 station if it goes over the level?         9 similar Costco gas station in Sterling, Virginia.         C. Dr. Chase, in your Sterling that some the gasoline approvance approva	3		3	
e         NR. GROSSMAN: They would have to, well, buthe         G         D. C.Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you           7         gas station - if the Board of Appeals tomorrow were to         say in your third, full paragraph that in reaching these           8         approve the gasoline station, it would still have to be         spinions you relied on the comprehensive sampling data for a similar Costco gas station in Stering, Virginia. Can you           10         baseline before anything was operational.         10         describe what that sampling data was and where it is           11         MS. CORDRY: Unbuild if?         14         A I gave you back a copy. If you would let me,           13         MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean these         15         THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?           14         MS. CORDRY: Unbuild if?         14         (Discussion of the record.)           15         MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean these         16         DY MS. You you would let me,           16         oconsidered as a potential condition solution be board of Appeals could         15         THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?           16         oconsidered as a potential condition solution the Board of Appeals could be         10         10         paragraph that in reaching the dust.           19         out of, way out of order. It is something that should be         0         Ano a you telied on the c	4	basically have to start from someplace. I mean if they were	4	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you very much.
7         gas station – if the Board of Appeals out of appeals out of appears out of a approve the gasoline station, it would still have to be obtains a similar Costco gas station in Sterling. Virginal. Can you of describe what that sampling data was and where it is           10         baseline before anything was operational.           11         MR. CROSMAN: I don't know.           12         station if it goes over the level?           13         MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know.           14         MR. CROSSMAN: Well, it depends on I mean there it a conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects           16         are operational conditions should the Soard of a papels docide to approve a special exception here. But           10         obsack to the track here and in order to do           11         BY MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.           12         Page 143           12         Q Long before you took the cast that you took here           13         GROSSMAN: Wing is that           14         MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last question.           15         Frequent of the record from medical scolo you were           14         A lare probably have it in my suitcase, but I           12         Q Long before you took the cast that you took here           14         MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last question.           14         MR. ADELMAN: I'm one.	5	going to monitor, they would be doing it now.	5	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
a approve the gasoline station, it would still have to be built and so on. So you still have time to establish a baseline before anything was operational.         B options you relied on the comprehensive sampling data tor a similar Costo gas station in Sterling, Virginia. Can you describe what that sampling data was and where it is contained in the current record?           1         MS. CORDRY: And then what, shut down the gas station if it goes over the level?         1         contained in the current record?           1         MR. GROSSMAN: Idon't know.         1         gave you back a copy. If you would let me, 13           1         MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on ~1 mean the recorrectively set that would limit, you know, adverse effect.         1           1         conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effect.         1         THE WITNESS: Im sorry, Michele?           1         conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effect.         1         Q. Vers. You say you relied on the comprehensive asampling data for a similar Costoo gas station in Sterling.           1         conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effect.         1         Q. Day urelied on the comprehensive asampling data for a similar Costoo gas station in Sterling.           1         conservable set adverte herak here and in order to do 20         adverte it scited?           2         Jet sty to get back to the track here and in order to do 3         2         A hou car you tell me what report that's in and 3           2	6	MR. GROSSMAN: They would have to, well, but the	6	Q Dr. Chase, in your September 10, 2013 report, you
9         built and so on. So you still have time to establish a         9         similar Costoo gas station in Sterling, Virginia Can you           10         baseline before anything was operational.         10         describe what that sampling data was and where it is           11         MR. CORDRY: And then what, shut down the gas         contained in the current record?           12         station if it goes over the level?         12         A I gave you back a copy. If you would let me,           13         MR. CROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean there         15         THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?           16         are operational conditions shat the Board of Appeals could         16         BY MS. ROSSNEFLD:           17         ocnceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects         17         Q Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive           18         if necessary, But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way         18         Data that was reported by David Sullivan.           12         Lappeals decide to approve a special exception here.         20         And any you relied on the comprehensive           19         out of, way out of order.         its something that should be         20         Andara sreported by David Sullivan.           21         A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         21         A No.           22         Q Long before you t	7	gas station if the Board of Appeals tomorrow were to	7	say in your third, full paragraph that in reaching these
10       baseline before anything was operational.       10       describe what that sampling data was and where it is         11       MS. CORDSY: And then what, shut down the gas       is contained in the current record?         13       MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know.       13       contained in the current record?         14       MS. CORDSY: Unbuild if?       14       contained in the current record.)         15       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean there       14       (Discussion off the record.)         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         17       Conceived as a potential condition should the Board of Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       17       Q Ves. You say you relied on the comprehensive         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       20       conscience what that sampling data data did you review (Tom Sterling?)         21       Papeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       10       Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       Q that, Hhink, lefs - instead of my pusing the question.       24       A No.         23       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       24       A No.         24       Page 143       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I       2       Q Doy ou reapment what what	8	approve the gasoline station, it would still have to be	8	opinions you relied on the comprehensive sampling data for a
11       MS. CORDRY: And then what, shut down the gas         12       station if it goes over the level?         13       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it dom't know.         14       MS. CORDRY: Unbuild it?         15       MR. GROSSMAN: Yell, it dom't know.         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could         17       conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be         20       considered as a potential condition should he Board of         21       A pala that was reported by David Sulfivan.         22       left stry to get back to the track here and in order to do         23       that, Ithink, lefts - instead of my pushing the question.         24       If go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.         24       I go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.         24       Page 143         25       A Uh-hu-hy.         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you weres         4       required to take the Hippocratic cath, of course, right?         5       A Uh-hu-hy.         6       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the         7       Q Air Scon?         8       MR. CROSSMAN: Why is that -	9	built and so on. So you still have time to establish a	9	similar Costco gas station in Sterling, Virginia. Can you
12       station if it goes over the level?       12       A I gave you back a copy. If you would let me,         13       MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know.       13       could I         14       MS. CORDRY: Unbuild if?       13       could I         15       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean there       14       (Closcussion off the record.)         15       mean there       14       (Closcussion off the record.)         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       17       Q Yes. You asyno urbited on the comprehensive         18       in hare scale and the track here and in order to do       20       paragraph? What data idd you review from Sterling?         21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       21       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       let's try to u took the track here and in order to do       22       A And as you tell me what report that's in and         23       that, I think, let's       24       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         24       I boy that data was it?       23       where it's cited?         24       A No.       23       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, or took?       1	10	baseline before anything was operational.	10	describe what that sampling data was and where it is
13       MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know.       13       could I -         14       MS. CORDRY: Unbuild it?       14       (Discussion off the record.)         15       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on - I mean three       15       THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         17       conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects       17       Q Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive         18       incessary. But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way       17       Q Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       18       assimpling data tor a similar Costco gas station in Sterling.         14       Urigoia.       22       Q And can you tell me what report that's in and         14       Hild back and let Dr. Adeiman continue his questions.       22       Q And can you tell me what report that's in and         18       saday, when you graduated from medical school you were       required to take the Hippocratic oath, or course, right?       2       A No.         14       Dy you happen to recall which version of the       4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, or course, right?       4       A	11	MS. CORDRY: And then what, shut down the gas	11	contained in the current record?
14       MS. CORDRY: Unbuild it?       14       (Discussion off the record.)         15       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on I mean there       15       THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         17       conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects       17       Q       Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive         18       if necessary. But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way       10       Yignia. What's the first sentence of your third, full         20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of       29       Ara that was reported by David Sullivan.         21       lefs try tog tback to the track here and in order to 0       22       And can you tell me what report that's in and         23       that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the question,       24       A       No.         25       MR. ADELMAN: I'n we just a few last questioning.       24       A       No.         24       Q       Long when you graduated from medical school you were       26       Q       What data was it?         2       Q       Long when you graduated from medical school you were       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, o	12	-	12	
15       MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on I mean there 16       15       THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Michele?         16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         17       conceived with the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be 10       Creation of concerts the first strate of the comprehensive 12       26         19       considered as a potential condition should the Board of 21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But 21       19       Wirginia.         22       considered as a potential condition shing the question, 24       11       By MR. ADELMAN: larve just a few last questions.         24       I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.       25       Q       What data was it?         23       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       25       Q       What data was it?         24       BY MR. ADELMAN: Newny ou graduated from medical school you were 4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       2       A       No.         2       Q boy up happen to recall which version of the 7       Hippocratic oath you took?       4       A       1       A       1       A       1       A         2       Quot gober to rec	13		13	
16       are operational conditions that the Board of Appeals could       16       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         17       conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects       17       Q       Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive         18       if necessary. But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way       18       sampling data for a similar Costoc gas station in Sterling?         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of         14       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       1       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       left stry to get back to the track here and in order to do       23       where it's cited?         24       Ill go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his question.       24       A No.         25       Q       What data was it?       29         2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       2       Q       Do you recall what data it was, what it says         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       4       A Nair scent?       2       Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       4       A nair scent?       1         4       Requife to take the Hippocrati	14		14	
17       conceivably set that would limit, you know, adverse effects       17       Q       Yes. You say you relied on the comprehensive         18       if necessary. But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way       13       sampling data for a similal Costoo gas station in Sterling,         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       19       Virginia. What's the first sentence of your third, full         20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of       20       paragraph? What data id or a similar Costoo gas station in Sterling,         21       lef's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       21       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       lef's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       23       where it's cited?         24       I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his question.       23       What data was it?         Page 143         Page 145		-		-
18       if necessary. But, anyway, that's, once again, we're way       18       sampling data for a similar Costco gas station in Sterling,         19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       Virginia. What's the first sentence of your third, full         20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of       Daragraph? What data did you review from Sterling?         21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       20       And can you tell me what report that's in and         23       that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the question,       20       And can you tell me what report that's in and         25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       24       A No.         25       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       2       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the         7       Hippocratic oath, you took?       8       A an air scents       7         8       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?         9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?       10       A Gabon monoxide, lead, sulfur         13       MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,       12       Q Usation monox				
19       out of, way out of order. It is something that should be       19       Virginia. What's the first sentence of your third, full         20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of       20       paragraph? What data did you review from Sterling?         21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       20       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       let's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       23       what at that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       let's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       24       A No.         25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       24       A No.         2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, or tocall which version of the       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I         2       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, you took?       8       A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.         9       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?         10       towata physician does or dees not in				
20       considered as a potential condition should the Board of       20       paragraph? What data did you review from Sterling?         21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       20       aragraph? What data did you review from Sterling?         22       let's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       20       A Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         23       that, I think, let's - instead of my pushing the question,       21       A No.         24       I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.       24       A No.         25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       26       Q What data was it?         24       I       BY MR. ADELMAN:       Page 143       Page 143         2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I         2       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       4 cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       5       A         5       A Uh-huh. Yes.       6       A An air scents         7       Q Air scent?       9 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>				
21       Appeals decide to approve a special exception here. But       21       A       Data that was reported by David Sullivan.         22       let's try to get back to the track here and in order to do       Q       And can you tell me what report that's in and         23       that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the questioning.       Q       And can you tell me what report that's in and         23       that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the questioning.       Q       And can you tell me what report that's in and         23       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       Page 143       Page 143         Page 143       Page 143       Page 145         Q       Long before you took the cath that you took here       A       I a       I probably have it in my suitcase, but I         2       Q       Long before you took the cath that you took here       2       Q       Do you recall what data it was, what it says         3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of       4       cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data         4       may out took?       8       A       - for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.         9       MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as       10       A do you remember which pollutants?         10       tow what a physician does or does not intend				
22       let's try to get back to the track here and in order to do         23       that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the question, is questioning.         24       I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.         25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.         25       MR. ADELMAN:         2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here trequired to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?         5       A Uh-huh. Yes.         6       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the 7 Hippocratic oath you took?         8       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that         9       MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as         10       tow hat a physician does or does not intend to do.         11       MR. GROSSMAN: 'I'm not going to allow that         12       Q Lozone, like that perhaps been one?         13       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.         14       MR. GROSSMAN: - off the beam of what we're about         15       here.         16       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.         17       MR. GROSSMAN: - off the beam of what we're about         18       he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the it.         19       nutre this Hippocratic cath, we're not going into here.         16       MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not goin		-		
<ul> <li>that, I think, let's instead of my pushing the question,</li> <li>I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.</li> <li>I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.</li> <li>Page 143</li> <li>Page 143</li> <li>Page 143</li> <li>Page 145</li> <li>I A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I</li> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here</li> <li>today, when you graduated from medical school you were</li> <li>required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh, Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the</li> <li>Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as</li> <li>to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> <li>MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,</li> <li>here.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,</li> <li>here.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,</li> <li>here.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,</li> <li>he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the</li> <li>nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,</li> <li>he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the</li> <li>nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his</li> <li>M. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his</li> <li>A I wasn't there, but that's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the, what information was</li> </ul>				
24       I'll go back and let Dr. Adelman continue his questioning.       24       A No.         25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       24       A No.         25       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here i required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I       2       Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were i required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I       2       Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says         5       A Uh-huh. Yes.       6       A an air scents       7       Q air scent?         8       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?       9         9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?       10       A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur       11         12       question. I just think it's       11       a GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that       12       Q U have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur         13       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.       14       A Well, I left one out.       15       Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?         16       MS. GROSSMAN: Mal I'm not going to go into his, it she sheen approved as an expert after a voir dire and the net she prapose as an				
25       MR. ADELMAN: I have just a few last questions.       25       Q       What data was it?         Page 143         1       BY MR. ADELMAN:       2       Q       Long before you took the oath that you took here       3       dodg, when you graduated from medical school you were       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       d cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data       5       was?         6       Q       Do you happen to recall which version of the       7       Q       Air scent?         7       Q       Air scent?       8       A - for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.         9       MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as       9       Q       And do you remember which pollutants?         10       to what a physician does or does not intend to do.       11       oxides, PM2.5, is that six?         12       question. I just think it's       12       Q       I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur         13       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.       14       A       Well, I left one out.         15       here.       16       A Sorry?       17       Q				
Page 143       Page 145         1       BY MR. ADELMAN:       2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I       2       Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says         3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       5       A       Uh-huh. Yes.       2       Q Do you happen to recall which version of the       4       cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data         7       Q Air scent?       8       A - n air scents       7       Q Air scent?         8       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       9       Q And do you remember which pollutants?       10         10       to what a physician does or does not intend to do.       10       A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen         11       MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that       11       oxides, NOX, PM2.5.       11         12       Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur       13       dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.       14         13       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.       15       Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?       16       A Sorry?         17       MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,       18       A That might be it.       19       Q Or VOC'S?				-
1       BY MR. ADELMAN:       1       A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I         2       Q Long before you took the oath that you took here       Image: Comparison of the transmission of transmissin transmit transmission of transmission of transmission				
2QLong before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were trequired to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?2QDo you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of 45AUh-huh. Yes.3comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of 46QDo you happen to recall which version of the 7Hippocratic oath you took?5A7QDa you papen to recall which version of the 77QA na air scents 778MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that 9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as 106AA na ir scents 779MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as 1010ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that 1211oxides, PM2.5, is that six?12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about 1511AWell, I left one out.1514MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about 1515QMaybe hold on. Ozone?1616MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, 1717QOzone, like that perhaps been one?1815he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the 1919QOr VOC's?2020All right.12QNo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is		Page 143		Page 145
3       today, when you graduated from medical school you were       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       5       A       Uh-huh. Yes.       3       comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of         5       A       Uh-huh. Yes.       6       A       An air scents       7       Q       Air scents         7       Hippocratic oath you took?       6       A       An air scents       7       Q       Air scents         9       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       8       A       for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.         9       Q       And do you remember which pollutants?       10       A       Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen         11       MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that       11       oxides, PM2.5, is that six?       12         12       Q       I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur       13       3       dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.         14       MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about       14       A       Well, I left one out.         15       Q       Max GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about hais,       17       Q       Ozone, like that perhaps been one?         16       MR. GRO				
4       required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?       4       cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data         5       A       Uh-huh. Yes.       5       was?         6       Q       Do you happen to recall which version of the       5       was?         7       Hippocratic oath you took?       7       Q       Air scent?         8       MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that       8       A       - for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.         9       MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as       9       Q       And do you remember which pollutants?         10       to what a physician does or does not intend to do.       10       A       Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen         11       MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that       11       oxides, PM2.5, is that six?       12       Q       I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur         13       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.       14       A       Well, I left one out.       15       Q       Maybe hold on. Ozone?         16       MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.       16       A       Sorry?       17       Q       Ozone, like that perhaps been one?         18       he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the       18       A       That might be it.	1	BY MR. ADELMAN:	1	A I probably have it in my suitcase, but I
5AUh-huh. Yes.5was?6QDo you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?6AAn air scents7Hippocratic oath you took?7QAir scent?8MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that 98A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as 109QAnd do you remember which pollutants?10to what a physician does or does not intend to do.10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?12question. I just think it's 1212QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the 1918AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic coath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a 2421QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22follow on to his comment.23A </td <td></td> <td>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here</td> <td></td> <td>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says</td>		Q Long before you took the oath that you took here		Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says
6QDo you happen to recall which version of the 76AAn air scents 7QAir scent?8MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that 9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as 108A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as 119QAnd do you remember which pollutants?10to what a physician does or does not intend to do.10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?1212QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, 1817QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the 1918AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a 2321QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairne	2	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were	2	Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of
7Hippocratic oath you took?7QAir scent?8MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that8A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as9QAnd do you remember which pollutants?10to what a physician does or does not intend to do.10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?1212question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22ifollow on to his comment.23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24Q <td< td=""><td>2 3 4</td><td>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</td><td>2 3 4</td><td>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data</td></td<>	2 3 4	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?	2 3 4	Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data
8MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as9QAnd do you remember which pollutants?90Nd do you remember which pollutants?10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?1212question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14A15here.15Q16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16A17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17Q18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18A19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19Q20All right.20A21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21Q23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23A24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes.	2 3 4 5	Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?
9MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to to what a physician does or does not intend to do.9QAnd do you remember which pollutants?10to what a physician does or does not intend to do.10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?12question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a 2221QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22austion, so in fairness, no further comment about that.23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was? A An air scents
10to what a physician does or does not intend to do.10ACarbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?1212question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22follow on to his comment.23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents Q Air scent?</li> </ul>
11MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that11oxides, PM2.5, is that six?12question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> </ul>
12question. I just think it's12QI have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> </ul>
13MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.13dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24QDo you know if the, what information was24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen</li> </ul>
14MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about14AWell, I left one out.15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24QDo you know if the, what information was24Q	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> </ul>
15here.15QMaybe hold on. Ozone?16MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.16ASorry?17MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,17QOzone, like that perhaps been one?18he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the18AThat might be it.19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24QDo you know if the, what information was24Q	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.</li> <li>All right.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a follow on to his comment.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his</li> <li>Q Do you know if the, what information was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>18 he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the</li> <li>19 nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.</li> <li>20 All right.</li> <li>21 THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a</li> <li>22 follow on to his comment.</li> <li>23 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his</li> <li>24 question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.</li> <li>18 A That might be it.</li> <li>19 Q Or VOC's?</li> <li>20 A No.</li> <li>21 Q So were those actual air samples that were taken</li> <li>22 at Sterling?</li> <li>23 A I wasn't there, but that's my understanding.</li> <li>24 Q Do you know if the, what information was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right?</li> <li>A Uh-huh. Yes.</li> <li>Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> </ul>
19nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.19QOr VOC's?20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22follow on to his comment.21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24QDo you know if the, what information was24Q	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> </ul>
20All right.20ANo.21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken22follow on to his comment.21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> </ul>
21THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a follow on to his comment.21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken 22 at Sterling?23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.21QSo were those actual air samples that were taken 22 at Sterling?23QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> </ul>
22follow on to his comment.22at Sterling?23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> </ul>
23MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his23AI wasn't there, but that's my understanding.24question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.24QDo you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> <li>Q Or VOC's?</li> </ul>
24 question, so in fairness, no further comment about that. 24 Q Do you know if the, what information was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here. All right. THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> <li>Q Or VOC's?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So were those actual air samples that were taken</li> </ul>
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here. All right. THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a follow on to his comment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> <li>Q Or VOC's?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So were those actual air samples that were taken at Sterling?</li> </ul>
25 Let S turn to IVIS. Rosenteid. 25 extrapolated from that data?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here. All right. THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a follow on to his comment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> <li>Q Or VOC's?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So were those actual air samples that were taken at Sterling?</li> <li>A I wasn't there, but that's my understanding.</li> </ul>
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Long before you took the oath that you took here today, when you graduated from medical school you were required to take the Hippocratic oath, of course, right? A Uh-huh. Yes. Q Do you happen to recall which version of the Hippocratic oath you took? MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that MR. ADELMAN: Because it has different clauses as to what a physician does or does not intend to do. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not going to allow that question. I just think it's MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: off the beam of what we're about here. MR. ADELMAN: I'm done. MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not going to go into his, he's been approved as an expert after a voir dire and the nature of this Hippocratic oath, we're not going into here. All right. THE WITNESS: Could I make one comment? It is a follow on to his comment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, because I stopped his question, so in fairness, no further comment about that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q Do you recall what data it was, what it says comprehensive sampling data. About what, the number of cars, the hours of operation, can you describe what the data was?</li> <li>A An air scents</li> <li>Q Air scent?</li> <li>A for criteria air pollutants as defined by EPA.</li> <li>Q And do you remember which pollutants?</li> <li>A Carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, PM2.5, is that six?</li> <li>Q I have five, carbon monoxide, lead, sulfur dioxide, NOX, PM2.5.</li> <li>A Well, I left one out.</li> <li>Q Maybe hold on. Ozone?</li> <li>A Sorry?</li> <li>Q Ozone, like that perhaps been one?</li> <li>A That might be it.</li> <li>Q Or VOC's?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q So were those actual air samples that were taken at Sterling?</li> <li>A I wasn't there, but that's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the, what information was</li> </ul>

	Page 146		Page 148
1	A Yes, average, average concentrations of the six	1	Q And NOX?
2	airborne agents we just identified, but it gets a little	2	A Apparently not.
3	complicated because EPA under the National Ambient Air	3	Q And what about PM2.5?
4	Quality Standards, EPA requires that the levels be average	4	A Give me a moment.
5	for three, three years, with the exception of carbon	5	MR. SILVERMAN: What?
6	monoxide and lead, but the other four, they have to do a 3-	6	MS. ROSENFELD: He asked for a moment.
7	year average.	7	MR. SILVERMAN: Oh.
8	Q So are you saying that these are air samples that	8	MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking at that, can
9	come from EPA monitoring sites or do you know if there were	9	somebody clarify something for me in terms of the terms NOX
10	sites, specific samples taken at Sterling?	10	and NO2? Does NOX include nitrogen dioxide?
11	A No, I believe these were taken at the Sterling gas	11	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
12	station.	12	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
13	Q Can you, if I were to give you the November 2012	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, as well as other nitrous
14	report, would you take a look through and show me where that	14	
15	date is either included or summarized?	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
16	A If you show me what	16	MR. GROSSMAN: So it's just a broader category of
17	Q The, you know	17	all nitrous oxides?
18	MR. GROSSMAN: The Sullivan, the Sullivan report?	18	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
19	MS. ROSENFELD: This, yes, Mr. Sullivan's report	19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20	from November 2012.	20	Isn't it the other way around, NOX includes NO2 and other
21	THE WITNESS: Okay.	21	nitrogen oxides?
22	MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking at that, I'll	22	THE WITNESS: Isn't it the other way around, NOX
23	mention that I marked the article form, the IARC of June	23	includes NO2 and other nitrogen oxides?
24	2012 on carcinogenicity of diesel engine and gasoline engine	24	MR. GROSSMAN: That's, yes, that's what I thought
25	exhaust and some nitro airings as an exhibit, Exhibit 275,	25	I was saying.
	Page 147		Page 149
1		1	-
1	Page 147 since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for	1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
	since we referenced it in the testimony.		THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)	2	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 3 4	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113.	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking
2 3 4 5 6	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section?	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And while you're looking</li> <li>A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section? A I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking.
2 3 4 5 6	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And while you're looking</li> <li>A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section? A I'm sorry? Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section? A I'm sorry? Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section? A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section? A I'm sorry? Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section? A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking? Q And the title, is there a caption?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And the title of that section? A I'm sorry? Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section? A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking? Q And the title, is there a caption? A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling, Virginia site?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which pollutants were contained as air samples in Mr. Sullivan's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling, Virginia site?</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which pollutants were contained as air samples in Mr. Sullivan's report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling, Virginia site?</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q And lead?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which pollutants were contained as air samples in Mr. Sullivan's report. THE WITNESS: Meaning he didn't do all of them?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling, Virginia site?</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q And lead?</li> <li>A And what?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which pollutants were contained as air samples in Mr. Sullivan's report. THE WITNESS: Meaning he didn't do all of them? MS. ROSENFELD: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>since we referenced it in the testimony. (Exhibit No. 275 was marked for identification.)</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It begins on page 113. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. And the title of that section?</li> <li>A I'm sorry?</li> <li>Q And just to refresh my memory, would you read the title of that section?</li> <li>A It's Section 2.1. Is that what you're asking?</li> <li>Q And the title, is there a caption?</li> <li>A Sterling, Virginia, Costco study, 2010.</li> <li>Q Okay. And what pollutants were included in that?</li> <li>A Benzene, carbon monoxide, VOC's, noise and odor impacts. And this continues for a number of pages.</li> <li>Q And can you tell if any of these were drawn from actual samples at Sterling?</li> <li>A Can I what?</li> <li>Q Were there actual samples taken at the Sterling, Virginia site?</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q And what?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I'm not finding it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And while you're looking A But I'm not, I'm not sure this is the only place I should be looking. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: I can't find it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And can, is sulfur dioxide in here? A Say it again? Q Sulfur dioxide? A Nope. Q So it appears you were mistaken about that, is that correct? A Say again? MR. GROSSMAN: Mistaken about what? MS. ROSENFELD: About which air sample, which pollutants were contained as air samples in Mr. Sullivan's report. THE WITNESS: Meaning he didn't do all of them?

	Page 150		Page 152
1	measured that we didn't talk about like valuing ethyl	1	THE WITNESS: That I'm not an expert, I don't
2	benzene, zylene, as well as benzene.	2	pretend, claim to be an expert of reading isoplats.
3	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	3	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
4	Q And do those all fall into the category of VOC's?	4	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5	A Are those VOC's, is that yeah.	5	Q Did you express an opinion earlier about urban
6	Q Do they fall within that category?	6	versus rural or are you not offering an opinion on that?
7	A Yes.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I stopped him from offering an
8	Q And can you tell if there were actual, physical	8	opinion about
9	samples taken at the Sterling site	9	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
10	A Yes.	10	MR. GROSSMAN: that.
11	Q for those VOC's? Earlier you testified that	11	THE WITNESS: Can I?
12	you read the whole November 12th Sullivan report with the	12	MR. GROSSMAN: No. I don't think it's within your
13	exception of some passages that I think you described as,	13	claimed area of expertise, unless you tell me is it
14	quote, over your head. Could you just generally point to	14	within your expertise to offer an opinion about urban versus
15	the sections that you did not review?	15	rural meteorological dispersion rates?
16	A This is, we're talking about almost a year ago.	16	THE WITNESS: As one of my staff pointed out when
17	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but if you can find	17	we went out there, there was cement everywhere. It was
18	the sections and answer her question	18	urban.
19	THE WITNESS: That I did not review or	19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's an observation, but
20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that you found that were, as	20	I'm just saying is it your, part of your expertise to
21	you characterized them, over your head I guess because of	21	evaluate dispersion rates based on these criteria or is it,
22	arcane, meteorological analysis that might have been in some of the sections. She's entitled to ask that question.	22 23	is that considered beyond your expertise? THE WITNESS: I think that's beyond.
23 24	THE WITNESS: Well, there's a lot of these.	23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So then I'm correct in not
25	MR. GROSSMAN: What are you holding up, what page	25	allowing you to offer an opinion on whether or not you
	Page 151		Page 153
1		1	Ű
1 2	Page 151 are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27.	1	Page 153 should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.
	are you holding up? Can you read the page?		should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You
2	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27.	2	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.
2 3	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it	2 3	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And
2 3 4	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion?	2 3 4 5 6	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we
2 3 4 5	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so.	2 3 6 7 8 9	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure?	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that, that particular figure? I mean you said there are a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>DY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want this back, don't you?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that, that particular figure? I mean you said there are a lot of these and then you held it up. What did you mean by that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>DY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want this back, don't you?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that, that particular figure? I mean you said there are a lot of these and then you held it up. What did you mean by that, sir?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that.</li> <li>That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want this back, don't you?</li> <li>Q Yes, thank you. There were some tables in there,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that, that particular figure? I mean you said there are a lot of these and then you held it up. What did you mean by that, sir? THE WITNESS: That I'm not good at reading	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want this back, don't you?</li> <li>Q Yes, thank you. There were some tables in there, though, that gave summaries of certain concentrations, is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	are you holding up? Can you read the page? THE WITNESS: The page number is 27. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that one with an isopath on it of THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: the meteorological dispersion? THE WITNESS: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually could you read the THE WITNESS: I think so. MS. ROSENFELD: title of that figure please? THE WITNESS: The title of the figure? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. THE WITNESS: "Topographic map showing the three kilometer radius circle used to define land use characteristics of the area surrounding the proposed Costco gas station." MR. GROSSMAN: What are you saying about that, that particular figure? I mean you said there are a lot of these and then you held it up. What did you mean by that, sir? THE WITNESS: That I'm not good at reading isoplats.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>should apply the urban or rural dispersion rates? You certainly had an opinion from Mr. Sullivan on that one. MS. ROSENFELD: And THE WITNESS: And I have an opinion too, but if I can't say it, then MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. But in fairness, we have to try to it's not that I want to cut you off on anything you want to say, it's that in fairness to the other side you're listed as an expert in health effects, not in meteorology and dispersion, so if it's not your area of expertise, in fairness we want to try to limit you to that. That's the reason why I'm limiting you to that. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And so, Dr. Sullivan, as a general rule, you're saying you didn't review the isoplats on those graphs in the 2012 report?</li> <li>A Not the isoplats per se. The bottom line is yes.</li> <li>Q So you there are some charts, tables?</li> <li>A If you want to read, give this back you want this back, don't you?</li> <li>Q Yes, thank you. There were some tables in there, though, that gave summaries of certain concentrations, is that what you relied on then</li> </ul>

	Page 154		Page 156
1	you. In your testimony you identified a number of what you,	1	A is the date of the Federal Register where, the
2	what I understood you to say were certain governing air	2	preliminary announcement of the EPA is lowering the PM2.5
3	quality standards promulgated by the Army Corps of Engineers	3	annual standard from 15 to 12 micrograms per meter to, but
4	by the FBI, by Fannie Mae, by the U.S. Capitol architect,	4	then that showed up again in January or February, and I
5	GSA and others. Are any of those standards either cited in	5	don't think it became effective, I don't think it became law
6	your report or	6	until April of this year.
7	A I think you misheard me. I	7	Q Okay. And did you read the entirety of those
8	Q Okay.	8	Federal Register publications as it relates to PM2.5?
9	A When I listed those agencies and I have the list	9	A I doubt it.
10	in front of me this time, it's they all involved air	10	Q And there are other pollutants involved in this
11	quality investigations and recommendations, but they were,	11	case, the CO, the NOX and others. Are those also regulated
12	the nature of them was all over the map.	12	in this same rule that was first promulgated on December 14,
13	Q Okay. So these are agencies that you did air	13	2012?
14	quality-related work for, you were citing them as having	14	A Yes and no. I mean the change was made to PM2.5,
15	promulgated standards that are applicable in this case, is	15	but the other five criteria air pollutants, as they're
16	that correct?	16	referred to, are part of the six. The PM2.5 is one of the
17	A I'm not sure. Would you say it again?	17	six and the other five are the other part of the six.
18	Q You were listing a series of agencies that you had	18	Q And so where would I look in the Federal Register
19	worked with or for in your capacity as monitoring air	19	to find the standards that, the EPA standards for those
20	quality, advising on air quality issues?	20	other five?
21	A Responding to employee complaints.	21	A I don't know. Since they didn't change them, it's
22	Q Okay.	22	probably, you have to go back five years in time to find the
23	A Not always taking air sampling and not all of them	23	
24	involved applying standards, although most of them did.	24	MR. GROSSMAN: What?
25	Q Okay.	25	THE WITNESS: The advance notice of proposed
	Page 155		Page 157
	r ugo roo		
1	A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different	1	-
1 2		1 2	
	A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different		rulemaking.
2	A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.	2	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3	<ul><li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different</li><li>projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li><li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand</li></ul>	2 3	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5.</li> <li>What are the other five?</li> <li>A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short.</li> <li>Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct?</li> <li>A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12.</li> <li>Q And the standard for CO?</li> <li>A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal Register. Can you list for me the relevant sections in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check. (Discussion off the record.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal Register. Can you list for me the relevant sections in the Federal Register that you think are applicable to this case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: CO is 9 PPM, but there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal Register. Can you list for me the relevant sections in the Federal Register that you think are applicable to this case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check. (Discussion off the record.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal Register that you think are applicable to this case?</li> <li>A December 14, 2012, would be one.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: CO is 9 PPM, but there's a qualifier. There's a qualifier on all of these. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A And I can leave a copy of the 60 different projects with the Hearing Officer is you want me to.</li> <li>Q No, no, that's okay. I think I did misunderstand you. I though you were listing regulatory standards issued by these different agencies.</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q When you were conducting your work for these various agencies, were you looking at indoor air quality or outdoor air quality or both?</li> <li>A A combination.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with indoor air quality issues?</li> <li>A Oh, yeah.</li> <li>Q And is indoor air quality sometimes an issue? Are pollutants found in indoor, inside buildings from time to time?</li> <li>A Absolutely, yes. That's true worldwide.</li> <li>Q In terms of the standards that govern in this particular case, you said in your testimony, I believe, that you had reviewed recent, relevant sections of the Federal Register that you think are applicable to this case?</li> <li>A December 14, 2012, would be one.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, can you speak up just a little?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rulemaking. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And you talk about six, one of them being PM2.5. What are the other five? A Lead; carbon monoxide; nitrogen oxides, or NOX for short; sulfur oxides, or SOX for short; and I believe the sixth one is ozone, or O3 for short. Q Okay. And the PM2.5 standard, I, is now at a 12, a limit of 12, is that correct? A It became 12 in April of this year. It dropped from 15 to 12. Q And the standard for CO? A CO? Oh, I need that table, Tim. I don't have those, all those numbers memorized. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think you have it with you. THE WITNESS: I thought I had it here earlier. MR. ST. PIERRE: I think it's in here. THE WITNESS: Go ahead and open it. I think it's nine, but let me kind of double check. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: CO is 9 PPM, but there's a qualifier. There's a qualifier on all of these. The qualifier on carbon monoxide is that's 9 PPM is an 8-hour

	Page 158		Page 160
1	THE WITNESS: Lead is a rolling 3-month average,	1	MR. SILVERMAN: Could we get a copy?
2	0.15 micrograms per meter cube, not to be exceeded, period.	2	MS. ROSENFELD: We, yes, if
3	Nitrogen dioxide is well, that's another Federal Register	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
4	piece I read was on NO2. That became, the current standard	4	MS. ROSENFELD: we could get a copy and take a
5	for nitrogen oxide, well, there's two, an annual standard of	5	look over the break?
6	53 parts per billion, but the new one is based on a 1-hour,	6	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's fair. I'm going to
7	time-weighted average. It's 100 parts per billion and	7	hand it to you. Sarah is going to put an exhibit number on
8	according to EPA you have to do a 3-year average.	8	it just so we
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	MS. ROSENFELD: I
10	Q And for the NOX, where is that 100 parts per	10	MR. GROSSMAN: know because he's pulled it out.
11	billion to be measured from?	11	It's a flashy exhibit. We ought to have something flashy in
12	A Where is it being measured from or	12	the record. Exhibit 276 is an EPA 2011, February 2011 air
13	Q Yes.	13	quality guide for nitrogen dioxide.
14	A when was it reported?	14	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I somehow missed
15	Q No, where is that 1-hour standard applied	15	275.
16	geographically?	16	MR. GROSSMAN: 275 was something that was the
17	A Everywhere.	17	2012 article by the IARC regarding carcinogenicity of diesel
18	Q That's the maximum level everywhere?	18	and gas engine exhausts and some nitro air links.
19	A Actually it's, technically it's the 98th	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, thank you.
20	percentile, but that's close enough, averaged over a 3-year	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Do you want to take a look
21	period. And that was published in early 2010, I think	21	at the air quality guide by the EPA?
22	January 2010, but it didn't become effective until April,	22	THE WITNESS: There's a lot more on NO2 that
23	March or April of 2010.	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't forget to hand it back to me,
24	Q And do you remember if you read that entire	24	sir, when you put it back, all right?
25	Federal Register publication?	25	THE WITNESS: I got on the EPA website, but didn't
	Page 159		Page 161
1	A Say it again?	1	print out. I understand that it was discovered that
2	Q Do you recall if you read everything associated	2	relatively short-term exposure to nitrogen dioxide can
3	with the EPA's issuance of its updated rule on NOX?	3	precipitate an asthma attack in children and that apparently
4	A I probably didn't, no, I didn't read everything,	4	was, prior to 2010. It didn't happen when I was standard or
5	but I went to some extra lengths, went to the Internet and I	5	short-term standard for NOX.
6	printed out, you know, the color graph, is that in here?	6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7	MR. ST. PIERRE: The Federal Register?	7	Q And is it your understanding that's the case only
8	(Discussion off the record.)	8	with respect to children or anybody with asthma?
9	THE WITNESS: This is all NOX. It's kind of	9	A If you read the flipside of that colored thing, I
10	flashy in color on the front, but on the flipside it	10	think you'll see, it won't take long, I think it could
11	describes the health effects associated within O2 and why EPA after all these decades suddenly, out of the blue,	11	affect others with respiratory disorders as well. So I
	FEA alter all these decades suddenly out of the blue	12	think it was a good thing that they did, but I don't know
12	•	1 0	
13	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average.	13	why they insisted on a 3-year average.
13 14	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be	14	Q What do you
13 14 15	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days?	14 15	<ul><li>Q What do you</li><li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li></ul>
13 14 15 16	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question	14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on	14 15 16 17	Q What do you A Do you have to wait three years to find out whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to me.
13 14 15 16 17 18	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do?	14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> <li>me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here	14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> <li>me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> <li>"The one hour standard will protect public health by</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here ready for us?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> <li>me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> <li>"The one hour standard will protect public health by</li> <li>limiting people's exposure to short-term, peak</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here ready for us? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I mean	14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads, "The one hour standard will protect public health by limiting people's exposure to short-term, peak concentrations of NO2 which primarily occur near major</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here ready for us?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> <li>me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> <li>"The one hour standard will protect public health by</li> <li>limiting people's exposure to short-term, peak</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here ready for us? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I mean MS. CORDRY: Okay. All right. But I	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to</li> <li>me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> <li>"The one hour standard will protect public health by</li> <li>limiting people's exposure to short-term, peak</li> <li>concentrations of NO2 which primarily occur near major</li> <li>roads. Community-wide NO2 concentrations will be</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	adopted the 1-hour time-weighted average. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this will be MS. CORDRY: Ten days? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's responding to a question and is supplying information in response to a question on the stand. What would you have him do? MS. CORDRY: Provided if he's had it sitting here ready for us? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I mean MS. CORDRY: Okay. All right. But I MR. GROSSMAN: I mean	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q What do you</li> <li>A Do you have to wait three years to find out</li> <li>whether there's an exceedance? That doesn't make sense to me.</li> <li>Q The second paragraph of this reads,</li> <li>"The one hour standard will protect public health by limiting people's exposure to short-term, peak concentrations of NO2 which primarily occur near major roads. Community-wide NO2 concentrations will be limited to levels below those that have been linked to</li> </ul>

	Page 162		Page 164
1	In your opinion does, would this suggest that if the maximum	1	MS. ROSENFELD: In terms of these standards, yes,
2	exposures were at roadways, that areas more distant from	2	please.
3	roads would generally have lower exposures	3	THE WITNESS: The next one is ozone and that's
4	A Yes.	4	.075 parts per million based on an 8-hour average. And then
5	Q to NO2? It says,	5	in their comment field they say annual fourth highest daily
6	"Those individuals who spend time on or near major	6	maximum 8-hour concentration averaged over three years.
7	roads can experience NO2 exposures considerably	7	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8	higher than occur away from roads. These	8	Q Could you read that last one again?
9	exposures are of particular concern for sensitive	9	A Or give you a copy.
10	groups such as people with lung disease, including	10	Q Oh, sure.
11	asthma, children and older adults."	11	A Annual fourth highest daily max, maximum 8-hour
12	Does that suggest to you any older adults or just those with	12	concentration averaged over three years. Out of these six,
13	asthma? I'm happy to let you	13	the only two that they don't have a 3-year average qualifier
14	A That's an interesting question. I doubt any of us	14	on are the first two, carbon monoxide and lead. All the
15	are immune from, even without a history of asthma, if I'm	15	other ones have, you're supposed to do a 3-year average, the
16	exposed to a high enough NO2 level, I could develop asthma,	16	next one being PM2.5 and that was recently lowered to 12
17	anybody could. So, no, it's not limited to in my opinion	17	micrograms per meter cube, but they want to see annual means
18	it's not limited. People with existing lung disease,	18	for a 3-year period of time before deciding whether
19	regardless of age, are going to be more vulnerable, more	19	exceedance has taken place or not.
20	susceptible. But before they did this, the, since 1996, the	20	The next one, there's more comments on particulate
21	only limit they had on NO2 was 53 parts per billion averaged	21	matter, but if you're going to get a copy of this, you'll be
22	over a full year.	22	able to see it. The last one is sulfur dioxide and that is
23	Q So is it your understanding that the short-term	23	a 1-hour average, the limit being 75 parts per billion. But
24	limit was established because EPA recognized that people can	24	this time they want to look at the 99th percentile, not the
25	suffer health effects over a much shorter period of time,	25	98th like the earlier one, but the 99th percentile of 1-hour
	Page 163		Page 165
1	Page 163 and in your reading	1	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years.
1 2		1 2	
	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you		daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years.
2	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those	2	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people
2 3	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel	2 3	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile?
2 3 4	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects?	2 3 4	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our</li> <li>next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our</li> <li>next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any</li> <li>other questions that I may have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.</li> <li>Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>and in your reading</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q do you sorry in your reading do you</li> <li>recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those</li> <li>exposures could be before someone would start to feel</li> <li>adverse health effects?</li> <li>A My recollection was that it could be as short as</li> <li>15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our</li> <li>next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any</li> <li>other questions that I may have.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.</li> <li>Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.</li> <li>Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA'S MAAQS</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA'S MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: I don't want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for identification.)</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: I don't want to THE WITNESS: Do you want me to finish answering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: What's December?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: I don't want to THE WITNESS: Do you want me to finish answering the question that was on the table?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.</li> <li>Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: What's December? MR. GROSSMAN: It's December 14, 2012.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: I don't want to THE WITNESS: Do you want me to finish answering the question that was on the table? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, certainly. I apologize.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well. Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: What's December? MR. GROSSMAN: It's December 14, 2012. THE WITNESS: For the whole table?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and in your reading A Yes. Q do you sorry in your reading do you recall if EPA had any estimates as to how short those exposures could be before someone would start to feel adverse health effects? A My recollection was that it could be as short as 15 minutes, but they didn't set the standard that way. Q Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, when we take our next break, I would like to get a copy and return to any other questions that I may have. MR. GROSSMAN: I can are you asking to take the break now? MS. ROSENFELD: Not necessarily. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll leave that up to you. MS. ROSENFELD: No, I'm happy to go on, but if I move on MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: I don't want to THE WITNESS: Do you want me to finish answering the question that was on the table?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>daily maximum concentrations averaged over three years. MR. GROSSMAN: What would make them change from the 98th percentile to the 99th percentile? THE WITNESS: It's a committee. Twenty-two people on the committee and they're fighting, I guess. MR. GROSSMAN: Could I have that document you were reading from and we'll mark that as an exhibit as well.</li> <li>Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: They're moving in the right direction. I don't always understand the rationale underlying the way they define the limits. MR. GROSSMAN: This will be Exhibit 277. Although it indicates it's page 1 of 2, there's nothing on the flipside of this page. Is there anything significant on page 2? THE WITNESS: I don't think so. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And this is EPA's MAAQS Standards. And it's last updated December 14, 2012. (Exhibit No. 277 was marked for identification.) THE WITNESS: What's December? MR. GROSSMAN: It's December 14, 2012.</li> </ul>

	Page 166		Page 168
-	or pot	-	then the payt paragraph talks about the fact that pack
1	or not	1	
2	THE WITNESS: That's interesting because it has	2	exposures generally occur near major roads and then the
3	the new	3	second sentence says, community-wide NO2 concentrations will
4	MR. GROSSMAN: It has dates, it has other dates	4	be limited to levels below those that have been linked to
5	next to each pollutant on the, in the left-hand column, but	5	respiratory-related emergency room visits at hospital
6	I'm just the actual sheet has an update of December 14,	6	admissions. Is it your understanding that the expectation
7	2012.	7	is that as you get more distant from roadways, the NO2 level
8	THE WITNESS: Well, I don't think the PM2.5 rule	8	will decrease?
9	went into effect until April, but EPA was jumping the gun I	9	A Yes.
10	guess. That's from their website.	10	Q And is it your understanding that's why EPA set
11	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. It does, and it does	11	that 100 parts per billion maximum 1-hour standard?
12	indicate for the both PM2.5 and PM10, December 14, 2012, as	12	A I'm sorry, I can't hear you.
13	the final rule cite. Whether or not that's accurate, I have	13	Q Is it your understand that that's why the EPA set
14	no idea.	14	the roadway maximum at a 1-hour standard of 100 parts per
15	MR. SILVERMAN: I think it is.	15	billion?
16	MS. CORDRY: I think it is too.	16	A Yes, unless I missed something.
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. We have two thinks it is.	17	Q No, I don't think so.
18	All right. And the other document you were, that we marked as an exhibit, I think it's this other colorful one here.	18 19	A I'm sure. Q Though it wasn't a trick question.
19	THE WITNESS: This one?		<b>.</b> .
20	MR. GROSSMAN: I think so, perhaps.	20 21	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, it was. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
21 22	THE WITNESS: That's the other one.	22	Q And looking at the reverse page, reverse side of
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.		that, of Exhibit 276, where it says the air quality index is
23 24	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, that's the colored one.	23 24	good, it says zero to 50, what measure, unit of measurement
24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, why don't we take our	24 25	are they using, from zero to 50?
20	WIX. GROSSMAN. Okay. Well, why don't we take our	25	are they using, nom zero to so:
	Page 167		Page 169
1		1	Ŭ
	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How	1	A I have no idea where those numbers come from.
2	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do	2	<ul><li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li><li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li></ul>
2 3	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made.	2 3	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> </ul>
2 3 4	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00.	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.)	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> <li>standards?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> <li>standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination,	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> <li>standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that</li> <li>objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one</li> <li>pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, Ms. Rosenfeld?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A I have no idea where those numbers come from. Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter? A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is. Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection. THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you. MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is. MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A I have no idea where those numbers come from. Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter? A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is. Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection. THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you. MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is. MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it</li> <li>micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait</li> <li>a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA</li> <li>standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that</li> <li>objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one</li> <li>pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the</li> <li>way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, Ms. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A I have no idea where those numbers come from. Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter? A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is. Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection. THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you. MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is. MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way. THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go ahead. MS. ROSENFELD: The sheet?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. ST. PIERRE: Yes, here it is.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And if you were to convert parts per billion to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go ahead. MS. ROSENFELD: The sheet? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, he's gotten it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And if you were to convert parts per billion to the micrograms per cubic meter, how would you calculate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go ahead. MS. ROSENFELD: The sheet? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, he's gotten it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And if you were to convert parts per billion to the micrograms per cubic meter, how would you calculate that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	afternoon break now and we'll make copies of these. How many copies do we need? One, two, three, four, five. Do you want to go for six? All right. I'll have copies made. I don't guarantee you color, so you're going to lose some of the quality of the document here. We'll come back at 25 after 3:00. (Recess.) MR. GROSSMAN: Did you all get your copies? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, we did, thank you. MS. CORDRY: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to resume? All right. If you'll resume with your cross-examination, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Dr. Chase, going back to Exhibit 276, which is the air quality guide for nitrogen dioxide, on the back page A It's the one in bright color. I'm sorry, go ahead. MS. ROSENFELD: The sheet? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, he's gotten it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And on the back page, on the flipside of that, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I have no idea where those numbers come from.</li> <li>Q Do you know if it's parts per billion or is it micrograms per cubic meter?</li> <li>A I don't think it's either one because oh, wait a minute. It's not labeled, so I don't know what it is.</li> <li>Q So you don't know if it's a link to any EPA standards?</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I'll overrule that objection.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Do you know what happened to my one pager? I think I gave it to you.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: It's now an official exhibit by the way.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Let me back up and say they could well be parts per billion because that would be consistent with this other document. But they didn't, didn't label it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And if you were to convert parts per billion to the micrograms per cubic meter, how would you calculate that?</li> <li>A Using 188.</li> </ul>

	Page 170		Page 172
-	F0 and multiply it by 1 000	-	the isservest and all of his shorts are done in misrograms
1	50 and multiply it by 1.88?	1	
2	MR. GROSSMAN: You have that methodology	2	per meter and this is parts per billion.
3	elsewhere.	3	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
4	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm trying to establish MR. GROSSMAN: Whether he knows the conversion	4	MS. CORDRY: So if we're going to ask him how these relate to the levels that Mr. Sullivan found, we have
5	MS. ROSENFELD: whether he knows	5	to get these numbers into micrograms per meter cubed, which
6	MR. GROSSMAN: methodology?	6	means I don't want to be dividing these numbers again, I
7	MS. ROSENFELD: conversion.	7	
8 9	THE WITNESS: I believe you multiply micrograms	8	want to be multiplying these numbers, actually for our
	per cubic meter by 188 to get to parts per billion. So it	9 10	purposes. MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
10 11	would be the reverse procedure to go the other direction.	11	MR. BROSSNAN, Right. MS. ROSENFELD: He'll need to know the formula in
12	That's the shorthand way of doing it and it's the more	12	order to answer some of my questions relating to the tables.
13	scientific way of doing it.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: So you have a methodology there of
14	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	14	determining the, from the documents you have what the
15	Q Let me just ask to clarify. So if we're looking	15	appropriate formula is? There's some controversy here at
16	at the 50 parts per billion on the front sheet of Exhibit	16	counsel table. They say you're doing it backwards.
17	276, we would take 50 and multiply it by 188 to get to	17	THE WITNESS: The, to get from parts per billion
18	micrograms per cubic liter, is that correct?	18	to micrograms per cubic meter, you multiply by 1.88.
19	A The other way.	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Correct. Thank you.
20	MR. GROSSMAN: No, 1.88.	20	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21	MS. ROSENFELD: 1.88.	21	THE WITNESS: And the adverse applies.
22	THE WITNESS: Did I say 188?	22	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.
23	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	23	THE WITNESS: And so that brings August 16th
24	THE WITNESS: Sorry, 1.88. Now you would divide	24	
25	by 1.88.	25	MR. GROSSMAN: He has the form.
	Page 171		Page 173
1	MS. CORDRY: That's where we got in trouble	1	THE WITNESS: page 33 makes it crystal clear.
2	before.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: There seems to be a suggestion here	3	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
4	that it's not multiply, but divide, or not divide, but	4	Q Thank you. When Mr. Sullivan prepared his updated
5	multiply. That's what Ms. Cordry	5	2013 report, did you discuss any of his modeling assumptions
6	MS. CORDRY: Well, that's what	6	as he prepared that report? Did you discuss that with Mr.
7	MR. GROSSMAN: is saying.	7	Sullivan?
8	MS. CORDRY: And that's what Mr. Sullivan said	8	A Did I no, but
9	eventually.	9	Q Did you, did you
10	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I understand. I don't	10	A did I discuss
11	remember what the exact methodology was, but higher	11	Q collaborate
12	mathematical minds than mine will have to figure that out.	12	A what with him?
13	Let's not waste any more time on this conversion factor.	13	Q Right. Did you collaborate with him as he was
14	That's just a conversion methodology. I mean I think	14	developing his modeling assumptions?
15	MS. ROSENFELD: Well	15	A On this 2013 report?
16	MR. GROSSMAN: that somebody who works with	16	Q Correct.
17	these things	17	A No.
18	MS. ROSENFELD: But	18	Q Okay. And are you aware that he made substantive
19	MR. GROSSMAN: should be, should, if they	19	changes to his modeling assumptions, changes from his 2012,
20	actually are doing it would go to a formula somewhere and	20	November 2012 report to his August 2013 report?
21	just apply the formula. Who remembers all the conversions?	21	A I'm aware that he made, that he changed some of
22	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, because I may be asking him	22	the assumptions. I don't know that I would characterize
23	questions about some of the numbers and some of the	23	them as substantive. I think that they were, he made more
24	conversions in these reports, so	24	realistic assumptions.
25	MS. CORDRY: Mr. Sullivan did his calculations and	25	Q Do you know

	Page 174		Page 176
1	A The first time around, the first time out, he made	1	MS. CORDRY: Had a falling out.
2	some almost absurd, absurdly conservative assumptions.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't understand. You're
3	Q And	3	saying
4	A So he toned them down a bit.	4	THE WITNESS: I don't either. Like I said, it's
5	Q what background do you have in modeling? Do	5	third or fourth-hand information.
6	you have any expertise in modeling, air quality modeling?	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh. Let's just strike that from
7	A Yeah, I have 49 units of math. I graduated with	7	the record since I don't think it, I don't think that it is
8	honors for mathematics and statistics.	8	germane here.
9	Q Have you been qualified as an expert in air	9	(Discussion off the record.)
10	modeling?	10	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11	A No.	11	Q On September 5th, Kensington Heights Civic
12	Q In meteorology?	12	Association filed a motion with the Hearing Examiner and
13	A No.	13	attached to that was an affidavit from Dr. Cole making
14	Q Can you describe what modifications Mr. Sullivan	14	certain calculations based on NOX numbers that were provided
15	made between his November 2012 report and his August 2013	15	in the November 2012 report by Mr. Sullivan. Have you
16	report?	16	reviewed that affidavit?
17	A No.	17	A I don't think I've seen it. It's not ringing a
18 19	Q You have no idea what modeling assumptions were modified?	18 19	<ul><li>bell. September 5th is pretty recent.</li><li>Q And in that report, Mr. Sullivan, Dr. Cole</li></ul>
20	A Well, I hope so. You asked me if I were aware		concludes that using the urban numbers drawn from Mr.
20 21	that he had made some changes and he	20 21	Sullivan's November 2012 report, the total 1-hour NO2
22	Q And what is your understanding of those changes?	22	concentrations would reach levels of 277 micrograms per
23	A The only ones that he made were more realistic.	23	cubic meter within the mall parcel. Do you have any reason
24	That's my understanding, but I can't be specific.		to dispute that number?
25	Q You can't more realistic, but you can't	25	MR. GOECKE: I object. He hasn't seen the
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
			_
	Page 175		Page 177
1	Page 175 describe what they are, is that your answer?	1	
1 2	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which	1 2	· ·
	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand		document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope
2	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to	2	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying.
2 3	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they	2 3	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to
2 3 4 5 6	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur	2 3 4 5 6	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the
2 3 4 5 6 7	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013	2 3 4 5 6 7	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy. THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy. THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy. THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277. THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting his own private firm about 20 years ago.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy. THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277. THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number. MS. ROSENFELD: It's actually the conclusion is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting his own private firm about 20 years ago. MR. GROSSMAN: So what does that have to do I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying. MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection? MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy. THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277. THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number. MS. ROSENFELD: It's actually the conclusion is here and the supporting analysis is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting his own private firm about 20 years ago. MR. GROSSMAN: So what does that have to do I don't understand, what does that have to do with the changed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's actually the conclusion is here and the supporting analysis is</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So that I can take a look, tell me</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting his own private firm about 20 years ago. MR. GROSSMAN: So what does that have to do I don't understand, what does that have to do with the changed assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan? THE WITNESS: They had a falling out. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's actually the conclusion is here and the supporting analysis is</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So that I can take a look, tell me what I have a copy of it here just tell me what paragraph you're talking about.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His contention</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	describe what they are, is that your answer? A I don't know what, I don't know specifically which ones they were. I am vaguely aware of third-hand information, but at one point he and Dr. Cole were trying to collaborate and they Q But those conversations, I proffer, didn't occur as part of the 2013 report, the November, the August 2013 report? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know what he's about to say, so I, so let's hear the rest of the sentence and then you can tell me if it's not germane. Do you want to finish your sentence, Dr. Chase? THE WITNESS: Yes, but it's not, I don't think it's helpful. I'm just aware that early on David was collaborating with a Dr. Cole who I don't think I've ever met. I don't know him, but apparently he is, I think I've got this right, Dr. Cole used to be with EPA and was director or head of their modeling division before starting his own private firm about 20 years ago. MR. GROSSMAN: So what does that have to do I don't understand, what does that have to do with the changed assumptions made by Mr. Sullivan? THE WITNESS: They had a falling out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>document before. She hasn't shown him a copy of this document. She's already established that he's not an expert in air modeling or methodology, so this is beyond the scope of what he's been testifying.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think in fairness we ought to show him the affidavit, but I think that you can ask him the question as to whether or not he has any reason to dispute the number and if he doesn't or he has, he wants to qualify it in some way, he can. Then if she wants to ask him, in effect, a hypothetical, which she can ask him, based on that, that figure she can do that which is, I think, I assume where she's going. What paragraph, in which paragraph did you make this protection?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Clearly, and I just handed up my other copy.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Didn't you say 277?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, 277.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm trying to find that number.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's actually the conclusion is here and the supporting analysis is</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: So that I can take a look, tell me what I have a copy of it here just tell me what paragraph you're talking about.</li> </ul>

	Page 178		Page 180
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	1	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2	MS. ROSENFELD: I believe they're all page 6, a	2	Q If you look at Table 2, summary results, for
3	typo. But it's paragraph 13 is his summary paragraph.	3	example, he has background listed as 98 across the NOX 1-
4	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I see it.	4	hour. Do you see, do you see background listed as 98?
5	THE WITNESS: Well, I haven't read the whole	5	A Yeah, and
6	document but, yes, I have reason to question	6	Q And then he has a total modeled plus background
7	MS. ROSENFELD: You do?	7	which includes these other sources that are listed above
8	THE WITNESS: 277.	8	background.
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	A I see that.
10	Q Okay. Based on what?	10	Q Okay.
11	A Based on the EPA standard where the limit for, the	11	A It gets to 141.
12	1-hour limit is 100 parts per billion and based on appendix	12	Q That's correct. And I
13	A to Sullivan's August 16th report in which he reported that	13	A And these are micrograms per meter cubed. That's
14	the 1-hour average for the year 2012 was 83, not 277.	14	what it says here.
15	Q And in Mr. Sullivan's you're referencing his	15	Q And appendix A, which you just referenced, Mr.
16	August 2013 report, correct?	16	Sullivan reduced the background number from 98 to 90. My
17	A Yep.	17	question for you
18	Q And in there you say his 1-hour average for 2012	18	A Just one second. No, the 90 is a 3-year average
19	was 83?	19	and this is only for 2012.
20	A Yes, on page 33, also appendix A.	20	Q I believe that 2012 references is 2012 report and
21	(Discussion off the record.)	21	not a 1-year average, but we will clarify that with Mr.
22	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	22	Sullivan when we speak with him again. My question relating
23	Q Dr. Chase, appendix A here says revised NO2	23	to Dr. Cole's affidavit, Dr. Cole went back to the original
24 25	background concentrations and Dr. Cole's affidavit goes to total concentrations. So we're really comparing apples and	24 25	
25	total concentrations. So we re really comparing apples and	25	and granted the 1-hour maximum concentrations for urban and
	Page 179		Page 181
1	orongoo Annondiy A is background only		
	oranges. Appendix A is background only.	1	concluded that they would exceed the 1-hour NOX standard set
2	oranges. Appendix A is background only. A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour	1 2	concluded that they would exceed the 1-hour NOX standard set by the EPA.
	• • • •		-
2	A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour	2	by the EPA.
2 3	A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.	2 3	by the EPA. A That's what it says.
2 3 4	<ul><li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li><li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards,</li></ul>	2 3 4	by the EPA. A That's what it says. Q Okay.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	by the EPA. A That's what it says. Q Okay. A Now where did he get his numbers from?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards. Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	by the EPA. A That's what it says. Q Okay. A Now where did he get his numbers from? Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report. A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November. Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his November 2012 report, do you recall? A I'm aware of that. Q Okay. A But that doesn't explain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	by the EPA. A That's what it says. Q Okay. A Now where did he get his numbers from? Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report. A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November. Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his November 2012 report, do you recall? A I'm aware of that. Q Okay. A But that doesn't explain Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	by the EPA. A That's what it says. Q Okay. A Now where did he get his numbers from? Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report. A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November. Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his November 2012 report, do you recall? A I'm aware of that. Q Okay. A But that doesn't explain Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you page 8 of Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report. And this is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan changed his assumptions. Mr.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you page 8 of Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report. And this is how he characterizes summary results updated, November 2012</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan changed his assumptions. Mr.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you page 8 of Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report. And this is how he characterizes summary results updated, November 2012 results for corrected NO2 background.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan changed his assumptions. Mr.</li> <li>Sullivan changed his assumptions in August of 2013. And I believe you just testified that you had a general third-</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you page 8 of Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report. And this is how he characterizes summary results updated, November 2012 results for corrected NO2 background.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan changed his assumptions. Mr.</li> <li>Sullivan changed his assumptions in August of 2013. And I believe you just testified that you had a general third-hand, you were vaguely aware of that from third-hand</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A No, they're both characterized as 1-hour standards.</li> <li>Q Yes, I understand that they're 1-hour standards, but they're a different pollutant, a different strata in those pollution levels. But the appendix A that you're referencing in the 2013 report is only the background concentration. It does not include the ring road, the warehouse, the queues, the other elements of emissions that are included in the total of Mr. Sullivan's reports.</li> <li>A Background is background, and background includes everything.</li> <li>Q I understand. No.</li> <li>A No?</li> <li>Q Is it your testimony that background includes the results of all sources under Mr. Sullivan's reports?</li> <li>A It's my assumption that background is based on background. I don't know where the monitor is located.</li> <li>Q All right. Mr., Dr. Chase, I'm going to show you page 8 of Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report. And this is how he characterizes summary results updated, November 2012 results for corrected NO2 background.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>by the EPA.</li> <li>A That's what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Now where did he get his numbers from?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan's November 2012 report.</li> <li>A Well, 2012 wasn't over in November.</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan divided instead of multiplied in his</li> <li>November 2012 report, do you recall?</li> <li>A I'm aware of that.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But that doesn't explain</li> <li>Q Mr., Dr. Cole did the calculation using the</li> <li>November 2012 numbers. Mr. Sullivan in his 2013 report, as you've said, you've had a general understanding, reduced certain modeling assumptions, the amount of time spent in queues, the background level of NO2 and that's why</li> <li>A Oh, so the two were using different sets of assumptions?</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan changed his assumptions. Mr.</li> <li>Sullivan changed his assumptions in August of 2013. And I believe you just testified that you had a general third-</li> </ul>

	Page 182		Page 184
1	underlying modeling assumptions. They are not the same	1	MR. GROSSMAN: 277. So you're saying that without
2	assumptions that he used in November of 2012. Dr. Cole in	2	the other information that is shown in Exhibit 277, you
3	his affidavit used the November 2012 numbers.	3	can't make a determination as to whether the conclusion in
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Perhaps we could get at this in a	4	paragraph 13 of Dr. Cole's exhibit, which is itself Exhibit
5	slightly different way. I think where you're going, and let	5	262(b) I think it is, is, represents a health hazard?
6	me see if we can just get there, is to ask this witness if	6	THE WITNESS: That's what I'm saying.
7	you assume that Dr. Cole is correct in his summary, in his	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
8	affidavit and that's paragraph No. 13, page 6, well, I think	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	all your pages and summaries in this affidavit, all of the	9	Q Assuming that Mr. Sullivan used a 3-hour average,
10	pages are labeled 6 of 7	10	a 3-year average and concluded that the 1-hour level of NOX
11	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. It is an error.	11	was 277 micrograms per cubic meter, would that level
12	MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't know what page it was,	12	constitute a health hazard?
13	but it is paragraph No. 13 and he concludes that applying	13	A Assuming that Sullivan did that
14	the original assumptions and correcting the mathematical	14	Q That's correct.
15	error that the NO2 concentration will be 277 micrograms per	15	A or Cole?
16	cubic meter within the mall parcel which would exceed the	16	Q Assume that he applied the 3-year average of the
17	EPA's maximum 1-hour, NO2 standard of 190 micrograms per	17	98th percentile
18	cubic meter. And my question to you is if he's correct in	18	A He Sullivan did. I'm looking at it.
19	that assumption, if he's correct in that calculation, and	19	Q And assuming his result was 277 micrograms per
20	that it would be 277 micrograms per cubic meter for the 1-	20	meter, assuming, I'm asking a hypothetical.
21	hour NO2 standard, would that represent a health hazard to	21	A I would take that to represent an exceedance of
22	the people in the mall or in that immediate environment? Is	22	the new EPA standard of 100 parts per billion that's only
23	that essentially where you're going?	23	been in place for three years.
24	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, it is.	24	Q And you using EPA's current standard of 100 parts
25	MS. CORDRY: Yes.	25	per billion, what health effects would you expect to see?
	Page 183		Page 185
1		1	-
1 2	Page 183 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think	1	
	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much.		A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but
2	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think	2	A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and	2 3	A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average	2 3 4	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to	2 3 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from. MR. GROSSMAN: That this, you're holding up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> <li>Q The CASAC standards are on 277?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from. MR. GROSSMAN: That this, you're holding up exhibit, what's the exhibit number on that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> <li>Q The CASAC standards are on 277?</li> <li>A Yeah.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from. MR. GROSSMAN: That this, you're holding up exhibit, what's the exhibit number on that? THE WITNESS: I forget.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> <li>Q The CASAC standards are on 277?</li> <li>A Yeah.</li> <li>Q Aren't these EPA standards, National Ambient Air</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from. MR. GROSSMAN: That this, you're holding up exhibit, what's the exhibit number on that? THE WITNESS: I forget. MR. GROSSMAN: It's written on the corner there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> <li>Q The CASAC standards are on 277?</li> <li>A Yeah.</li> <li>Q Aren't these EPA standards, National Ambient Air Quality Standards?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much. MR. GROSSMAN: Because I don't think THE WITNESS: Several comments. I don't know and I can't tell from this one page that he did a 3-year average as EPA calls for and Sullivan did do a 3-year average as MR. GOECKE: But, Dr. Chase, they're asking you to assume. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Mr. Goecke. So you don't know whether he did a 3-year average, but can you answer my question without knowing that or do you need to know that? Do you need to know whether he did a 3-year average to answer my question as to whether or not a 1-hour NO2 concentration of 277 micrograms per cubic meter within the mall parcel would represent a health hazard to those in the mall or in its nearby environments? Can you tell that from that bold fact? THE WITNESS: No, I don't know and I don't have, I don't have an appropriate count standard to compare it to, or vice versa. It is not expressed on this paragraph 13, it's not giving us all the information that this comes from. MR. GROSSMAN: That this, you're holding up exhibit, what's the exhibit number on that? THE WITNESS: I forget.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A I don't know how wide the margin of safety is, but if it's not wide enough, then like we discussed earlier, I would expect respiratory symptoms.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.</li> <li>A Respiratory symptoms. MR. GROSSMAN: If it wasn't, if the margin of safety wasn't wide enough, you would expect respiratory symptoms? THE WITNESS: Might expect respiratory symptoms. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Where would you look to find what the margin of safety is?</li> <li>A CASAC documents.</li> <li>Q CASAC establishes the margin of safety?</li> <li>A I believe so.</li> <li>Q Does CASAC promulgate regulations?</li> <li>A Yep.</li> <li>Q And where would I find the CASAC regulations for NO2?</li> <li>A Well, the standard is found at Exhibit 277.</li> <li>Q The CASAC standards are on 277?</li> <li>A Yeah.</li> <li>Q Aren't these EPA standards, National Ambient Air</li> </ul>

	Page 186		Page 188
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	EPA, but CASAC makes its recommendations to EPA typically every five years to EPA administrator. And if they're in agreement, they get published in the Federal Register and eventually become law. Q But they become law once they're adopted by the EPA, correct? A I think so. I think that's correct. Q In addition to looking at the National Ambient Air Quality Standards promulgated by EPA, where, what regulation would I look at for the CASAC standards? Are they published in the Federal Register? A Was the CASAC regulation published? Yes, it was. Q No, I think you said that CASAC has its own regulations. A No, CASAC formulates recommendations that they, for our National Ambient Air Quality Standards, passes them on to the EPA director and if she or he agrees, then they become law, they get published in the Federal Register and become law.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>expertise with standards that are, and I don't, I don't participate in CASAC. For perspective, my recollection is that the OSHA permissible exposure limit for NO2 is 50 times higher than this EPA 100 parts per billion.</li> <li>Q Does OSHA regulate ambient air standards for A No.</li> <li>Q non-workers A They're Q so that A No, but, no, but it issues standards to protect workers from the workplace.</li> <li>Q And when is the last time that OSHA updated that standard?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q Has it ever been updated?</li> <li>A I can't tell. MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Chase, do you have OSHA standards with you? THE WITNESS: With me?</li> </ul>
20	MR. GROSSMAN: I think it the sense I get is	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
21 22	was just an imprecise use of the term regulations. They make recommendations for regulations. They're reflected in	21 22	THE WITNESS: Well, here's the one for Tim, a volunteer sent me. Do you got the booklet with you?
23	the EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards.	23	MR. ST. PIERRE: I don't. We normally don't have
24	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	24	a printout of the OSHA.
25	Q And EPA adopts them or doesn't. And, however, you	25	MR. GROSSMAN: I guess for the record we should
	Page 187		D 400
			Page 189
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an adequate margin of safety?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million which is the same as 5,000 parts per billion. So she
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an adequate margin of safety?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an adequate margin of safety?</li> <li>A I don't know. Would it be a number that could not exceed three micrograms per minute meter cubed, again, based over a 3-year average.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million which is the same as 5,000 parts per billion. So she compared the 5,000 parts per billion to EPA's 100 parts per billion, you get a difference of 50, 50. MR. GROSSMAN: The reason I ask this question is I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an adequate margin of safety?</li> <li>A I don't know. Would it be a number that could not exceed three micrograms per minute meter cubed, again, based over a 3-year average.</li> <li>Q And for CO, the adequate margin of safety would be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million which is the same as 5,000 parts per billion. So she compared the 5,000 parts per billion to EPA's 100 parts per billion, you get a difference of 50, 50. MR. GROSSMAN: The reason I ask this question is I just wondered since you've raised the question about workers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>said that you looked to CASAC for the margin of safety, or did I misunderstand?</li> <li>A That's where I would look.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But I don't know how many reams from transcripts I might have to go through. Hopefully we can find them quickly.</li> <li>Q You used the expression margin of safety several times today. I'm going to go through several pollutants one at a time. For NOX, what, in your opinion would be an adequate margin of safety for the NOX 1-hour standard?</li> <li>A For SOX?</li> <li>Q NOX. NOX.</li> <li>A NOX? I don't know. I would have to do my own independent review of the available literature on</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A dose response.</li> <li>Q And for PM2.5, what would, in your opinion, be an adequate margin of safety?</li> <li>A I don't know. Would it be a number that could not exceed three micrograms per minute meter cubed, again, based over a 3-year average.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	identify who Tim is. Tim, what's your name please? MR. ST. PIERRE: I'm Tim St. Pierre and I'm project manager and research associate for Dr. Chase. MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. All right. And you're the gentleman that Dr. Chase has occasionally referred to to supply some documentation, is that correct? MR. ST. PIERRE: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Can I comment that Tim has also a master's degree MR. GROSSMAN: No, I'm not asking him to testify as a witness here. I just want to make sure the record reflects who you've been talking to in the audience. THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: You see where it says CI? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: The five is in parts per million which is the same as 5,000 parts per billion. So she compared the 5,000 parts per billion to EPA's 100 parts per billion, you get a difference of 50, 50. MR. GROSSMAN: The reason I ask this question is I

	Page 190		Page 192
1	for them be the OSHA standard or the EPA standard?	1	actually workers are supposed to be controlled by the OSHA
2	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, that's an interesting	2	standards, then I guess we should look to that too. I don't
3	question and it's not clear to me yet whether it would be	3	have an opinion about it, I just thought, I think it's a
4	the OSHA standards because they are workers or if it would	4	question that should be addressed.
5	be EPA because it's outdoors and EPA regulates the National	5	MS. CORDRY: I would say the question gets much
6	Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are the outdoor	6	more complicated than our other standards as well.
7	standards. I've been looking at that and when I have an	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Of course.
8	answer, I will be happy to share it.	8	MS. CORDRY: And OSHA standards have not been
9	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We ought to get an	9	updated since essentially the reports promulgated in the
10	answer from both sides on that as well as	10	1970's and there's a whole set of bureaucratic reasons for
11	THE WITNESS: Good luck. Can I comment? Can I	11	that and there are other standards that applied and there
12	comment on that?	12	are other people out on the mall that are not just workers
13	MR. GROSSMAN: I'll ask you in one second. But I	13	and so forth, so
14	just, it's more of a lawyer question, I guess, than an	14	MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. The only reason I raise
15	expert question, but so I'd like to hear from both sides on	15	the issue is because I believe that workers is one of the criteria in the zoning ordinance itself and you have raised
16 17	that issue and I'd also like to get a more complete picture on what the OSHA standards are that are reflected in that	16 17	that issue with regard to the measurements taken on the mall
18	little document that I saw that Dr. Chase had. Now, Dr.	18	itself and in your papers so that and then as soon as I
19	Chase, did you want to say something?	19	heard OSHA standards and they are somewhat different, I
20	THE WITNESS: By Federal statute, OSHA standards	20	said, well, there may be an issue here that we should
21	would apply to employees.	21	address.
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that may be true. That's why	22	MS. CORDRY: But I think we are
23	I said it's a lawyer opinion question and I wanted to get	23	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't have an opinion.
24	their, their feedback. That may be true and it may be that	24	MS. CORDRY: At this point I think we're trying to
25	that's what we would apply for the workers, that part of it.	25	stay focused on the original question of, with Mr.
	Page 191		Page 193
	Tage 101		i age 155
			• ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	THE WITNESS: Isn't it jurisdictional?	1	Sullivan's original numbers or with the corrected
2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.	2	calculations and with the numbers that are there without
2 3	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to	2 3	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are
2 3 4	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say?	2 3 4	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high
2 3 4 5	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a	2 3 4 5	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate	2 3 4 5 6	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that	2 3 4 5	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate	2 3 4 5 6 7	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be interested in hearing that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and by their own parameters, they ought to be judged in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be interested in hearing that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess it didn't come up as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and by their own parameters, they ought to be judged in terms of health risk. I thought that's what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be interested in hearing that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess it didn't come up as an issue until the question arose because the mathematical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and by their own parameters, they ought to be judged in terms of health risk. I thought that's what MR. GROSSMAN: I know that's your assertion and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be interested in hearing that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess it didn't come up as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and by their own parameters, they ought to be judged in terms of health risk. I thought that's what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan, what did you want to say? MR. SILVERMAN: I just wanted to say it's really a jurisdictional question that OSHA can't come in to regulate the workplace unless its standards are exceeded, but that doesn't stop EPA from, particularly the outdoor workplace from coming in and saying its standards have been exceeded. It's a question of jurisdiction. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're not talking I'm not talking so much about who is regulating as to which set of standards should be applied in trying to assess the question of health risk that I have to apply. And since we seem to have a dearth of actual standards beyond the EPA numbers that we've been given THE WITNESS: Well, I took it that the applicant's whole case was the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or health standards. Now if they want to change that, I'd be interested in hearing that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess it didn't come up as an issue until the question arose because the mathematical error in the question arose as to whether or not the actual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	calculations and with the numbers that are there without going off onto workers, just with the numbers that are there, do those represent a level that is sufficiently high above the original standard that they would constitute a health issue. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you may be staying focused on that. I have to focus on all the issues. MS. CORDRY: Well, I mean that is the public health question, so I thought we were trying to address that. MR. GROSSMAN: That is one of the public health questions. It's one of the issues here. MR. SILVERMAN: I thought I heard dispute with the applicants and I've heard it said many times, is that they are standing by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and then we're trying to show those standards are inadequate. And now we have a situation where they appear to be violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and by their own parameters, they ought to be judged in terms of health risk. I thought that's what MR. GROSSMAN: I know that's your assertion and they claim that they're not above those standards, so

	Page 194		Page 196
1	MR. GROSSMAN: So that's	1	safety, was it your testimony then that you would look to
2	MR. SILVERMAN: That's right.	2	the CASAC standards or their recommendations as the
3	MR. GROSSMAN: You're saying that that's, that's	3	appropriate margin of safety?
4	the air contention and that's always been Mr. Sullivan's	4	A Is it my recommendation to do so?
5	contention and that he filed his revised report to further	5	Q Was it your testimony, yes, that that's what you
6	buttress that contention. Whether or not he's correct, I	6	would look to?
7	haven't reached any conclusions about. I'm just waiting,	7	A Yes, but I don't know what else is in that docket.
8	looking for the evidence. But this other issue came up, so	8	There may be transcripts of heated discussions, citations of
9	I thought it's good to hear from the parties.	9	literature that, beyond what I've already looked at that
10	MS. ROSENFELD: And on that note I would like to	10	might be of relevance. But that won't, that won't resolve
11	point out that Mr. Sullivan in his report did not reference	11	the discrepancy between Sullivan and Cole on which is the
12	OSHA. It came up for the first time as part of Dr. Chase's	12	right number.
13	latest submission. That's the first time we've had any	13	Q Well, and that wasn't my question. You have, as
14	reference to OSHA in this case. Again, unless I'm	14	I said, used this phrase, a wide margin of safety and you
15	interrupting you, I do have more questions.	15	testified earlier that just because a pollutant level might
16	MR. GROSSMAN: You have a right to interrupt.	16	be, quote, a little bit over, end quote, the EPA standard,
17	MS. CORDRY: May I suggest that if we are going to	17	it wouldn't matter provided there was a wide margin of
18	be talking about OSHA standards as well and worker health	18	safety and I'm trying to establish what margin is adequate.
19	standards, that's another piece of material evidence that	19	Is one percent over? I mean it's your testimony, as I
20	ought to go back to the Planning Staff because there's a lot	20	understand it, that it's okay if it's under and it's okay if
21	that could be looked into in that regard.	21	it's over. So how much over in your expert opinion is
22	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, maybe. I just	22	A I can't give you a
23 24	right now want to know whether or not, what the parties say about whether OSHA standards play a part in this. So I pose	23 24	Q okay? A single answer to that question. It depends on
24	the question to you and you can all tell me the answer as to	24 25	the agent involved.
23		20	and agoin involved.
	Page 195		Page 197
1		1	Page 197 Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that
	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1 2	Ŭ
	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may		Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that
2	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I	2	Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?
2 3	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback	2 3	Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be
2 3 4	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> <li>(Discussion off the record.)</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> <li>(Discussion off the record.)</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> <li>(Discussion off the record.)</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that</li> <li>because that was going to be my next question. What</li> <li>percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be</li> <li>appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> <li>(Discussion off the record.)</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one.</li> <li>(Discussion off the record.)</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the, that may be the,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the, that may be the, you can segue into your argument on that or not depending on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is 15, which would be the one that was recently reduced to 12? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think you asked him</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I hope you do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is 15, which would be the one that was recently reduced to 12?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the, that may be the, you can segue into your argument on that or not depending on your response to it. All right. So I interrupted your interruption of my interruption, so it's up to you, Ms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is 15, which would be the one that was recently reduced to 12? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think you asked him the appropriate standard, EPA standard was to apply. He,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the, that may be the, you can segue into your argument on that or not depending on your response to it. All right. So I interrupted your interruption of my interruption, so it's up to you, Ms. Rosenfeld.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is 15, which would be the one that was recently reduced to 12? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think you asked him the appropriate standard, EPA standard was to apply. He, you're asking him about the margin of safety portion above</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	whether or not OSHA standards play a part. They may or may not. It was just raised by the witness on the stand, so I feel having raised it, that at least, or to get feedback from the parties as to whether they think that is a relevant consideration here. MR. SILVERMAN: I think that so far there's not been any testimony as to what the attendant of work eight hours a day is taking into his body in the course of his work day being right next to the cars and we haven't heard any testimony about that at all I don't think. So I think that question would, that that would be the factual predicate for discussion of OSHA. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think as a factual predicate for my asking the question as to whether or not we should be looking at OSHA standards and any one of you can reply saying yes or no and why. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope you do. MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the, that may be the, you can segue into your argument on that or not depending on your response to it. All right. So I interrupted your interruption of my interruption, so it's up to you, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Well, actually that's, I'm glad you said that because that was going to be my next question. What percentage over the EPA standard would you consider to be appropriate for ozone?</li> <li>A I don't know.</li> <li>Q And what percentage over would you consider to be appropriate for PM2.5?</li> <li>A I think I answered that one. (Discussion off the record.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If you could refresh my memory then please?</li> <li>A I think on that one I said it should likely not be more than three mics, three micrograms per meter cube. In other words, if you took the current 12 and added three, then we would be back at 15, which is what it was up until very recently.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony then that the adequate margin of safety, the appropriate EPA standard to apply is 15, which would be the one that was recently reduced to 12? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think you asked him the appropriate standard, EPA standard was to apply. He, you're asking him about the margin of safety portion above the EPA standard, right?</li> </ul>

	Page 198	Page 200
1	MS. ROSENFELD: That is what I asked.	1 THE WITNESS: Ten times the number that's there,
2	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 .075.
3	THE WITNESS: Well, I answered it, didn't I?	3 MR. GROSSMAN: Pardon?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, you did.	4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5	THE WITNESS: Obviously, I gave you my own	5 Q Ten times for ozone?
6	personal opinion. Others would have different answers.	6 A Yeah. So that would be .75 EPM. I'm sure I was
7	Other experts would have different answers to the question.	7 exposed to more than that for far more than three years.
8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We're getting close to
9	Q And the appropriate margin of safety for CO?	9 the bewitching hour for me. What's how much longer do
10	A CO? That we have a better understanding of. I	10 you think your cross-examination will be, Ms. Rosenfeld?
11	would say on the order of, in the neighborhood of 10 or 15	11 MS. ROSENFELD: I think at least an hour.
12	parts per million.	12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I think it's fair to assume
13	Q Above the EPA standard?	13 that Ms. Cordry will have to fit her testimony into the next
14	A Yes.	14 five minutes or we won't hear her today.
15	Q Okay.	15 MS. CORDRY: No need, Your Honor. Clearly proven.
16	A See, we know so much more about the patho-	16 Okay. I'm done. Thank you.
17	physiology of carbon monoxide in humans than we do from some	17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It says QED is the
18 19	of these other things. It's kind of like you're saying what's the threshold for exposure to sunlight. Sunlight	<ul><li>18 all right. So since you're going to take another hour, I</li><li>19 mean we can go on for another few minutes, but really about</li></ul>
20	causes skin cancer. What's the threshold for noise?	20 22 we have to stop.
20	Q And if I could ask you the same question, the	21 MS. ROSENFELD: I just had a couple more questions
22	appropriate margin of safety for sulfur oxides?	22 on this one line
23	A For which?	23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
24	Q Six.	24 MS. ROSENFELD: if you wanted to
25	MR. SILVERMAN: Sulfur oxide.	25 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
	D (444	
	Page 199	Page 201
1	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I	1 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
1 2	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> </ol>
	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> </ol>
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead?	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate,	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide?	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone.	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone. A Ozone?	<ul> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> <li>their scientific analysis?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone. A Ozone? Q Ozone.	<ul> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> <li>their scientific analysis?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone. A Ozone? Q Ozone. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: Having spent the first 25 years of my life in L.A. and surviving to this point, I'd use more	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> <li>their scientific analysis?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Designed to protect public health?</li> <li>A Of course, yes.</li> <li>Q So the NOX standard is a health-based standard, is</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone. A Ozone? Q Ozone. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: Having spent the first 25 years of my life in L.A. and surviving to this point, I'd use more latitude there.	<ul> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> <li>their scientific analysis?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Designed to protect public health?</li> <li>A Of course, yes.</li> <li>Q So the NOX standard is a health-based standard, is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Sulfur oxide. Sulfur dioxide. I don't know. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the appropriate margin of safety for lead? A That's something we have better literature on, but I'm still speculating. I would say MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want you to speculate. You can estimate. But if you have to speculate, then don't give an answer. THE WITNESS: I would estimate .5 micrograms per meter cube. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, refresh my recollection. Did we get a similar margin of safety figure for the nitrogen dioxide? MS. ROSENFELD: He said he didn't know. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And the last one would be ozone. A Ozone? Q Ozone. (Discussion off the record.) THE WITNESS: Having spent the first 25 years of my life in L.A. and surviving to this point, I'd use more	<ol> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Just generally speaking, when EPA reduces its</li> <li>pollutant limit from one level to a lower level, what</li> <li>process does the EPA go through in making that</li> <li>determination?</li> <li>A Typically turn it over to CASAC.</li> <li>Q And</li> <li>A You're talking air pollution I assume?</li> <li>Q And they make their recommendation to the EPA,</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And is that based on clinical studies or peer</li> <li>review journals? How do they come how does CASAC come up</li> <li>with the number that they recommend?</li> <li>A All of the above. They review the available and</li> <li>more recent literature, medical and scientific literature on</li> <li>the agent in question.</li> <li>Q So it's a health-based recommendation based on</li> <li>their scientific analysis?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q Designed to protect public health?</li> <li>A Of course, yes.</li> <li>Q So the NOX standard is a health-based standard, is</li> </ol>

	Page 202		Page 204
1	Q Yes.	1	(Whereupon, at 4:35 p.m., the hearing was
2	A Yes.	2	adjourned.)
3	Q And CO is a health-based standard?	3	
4	A Yes.	4	
5	Q And PM2.5 is a health-based standard?	5	
6	A All of them.	6	
7	Q All of them? VOC's, are they health-based?	7	
8	A VOC? VOC's are not regulated.	8	
9	Q Okay.	9	
10	(Discussion off the record.)	10	
11	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	11	
12	Q So just as a general principle then, the EPA would	12	
13	have reduced the NOX, the 1-hour PM2.5 from 15 to 12 based	13	
14	on health-based analysis, is that correct?	14	
15	A Yes. MS ROSENEELD: Mr. Crossman, this is a good	15	
16	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, this is a good	16	
17 18	stopping point. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right, so when we	17 18	
19	come back on the 20th, we'll take, resume with the cross-	19	
20	examination of Dr. Chase and any redirect and then go	20	
21	directly to Mr. Sullivan.	21	
22	MR. GOECKE: That's correct.	22	
23	THE WITNESS: You said the 20th?	23	
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. That's this Friday.	24	
25	THE WITNESS: That's this Friday?	25	
	Page 203		Page 205
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.		. Digitally signed by Tracy M. Hahn
2	THE WITNESS: Okay.		ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE
3	MR. GROSSMAN: And may I have back Exhibits 276		DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that
4	and 277 please that you have in front of you, Dr. Chase?		the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the
5	Those two, yes, that one.		electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the
6	THE WITNESS: There's one other there. This one?		Office of Zoning and Administrative Hearings in the matter
7	MR. GROSSMAN: The one with the colorful		of:
8	THE WITNESS: Where did you go?		
9	MR. GROSSMAN: That's it. They're actually		Petition of Costco Wholesale Corporation
10	exhibits now in the record here. Thank you.		Local Map Amendment No. S-2863
11	THE WITNESS: I think you have a black and white		Office of Zoning and Administration Hearings No. 13-12
12	COPY.		
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that's well, we have black		By:
14	and white copies. Do you want a copy, a black and white of these? These are the exhibits that were marked into the		
15 16	record. All right. Is there anything else we have to		
16	resolve before we adjourn for today and resume on the 20th?		
18	Don't forget to give me the electronic copies ASAP and we'll		
19	go on from there. Thank you all and we are adjourned for		Tracy M. Hahn, Transcriber
20	today.		
21	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.		
22	MS. HARRIS: Thank you.		
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, Dr. Chase.		
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you.		
25	MR. GROSSMAN: See you on Friday.		

st:1;7:1;2.1:453:10; -7(1)         st:1;7:2.1:453:10; -7(1)         st:1;7:2.1:453:10; -7(1)         acting (2) -7(1)         st:1;7:2.2:7:1:45; -7(2)         acting (2) -7(2)         st:1;7:1:2.2:7:1:45; -7(2)         acting (2) -7(2)	PETITION OF COSTCO	) WHOLESALE CORPO	KATION	1	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		8.13.17.12 14.53.19.	96.11 21.97.3.98.11	adopted (3)	42.9
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c} -(1)\\ 21:3 \\ \hline \\ 21:3 \\ 21:3 \\ \hline \\ 21:3 \\ 21:3 \\ 21:3 \\ \hline \\ 21:3$	—				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
A         sets:889         107:12:108:18,109:15, 90:17         36.3         <					
	21:3				
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			, , , , ,		,
abbreviation (1)         activities (1)         18;113:5.8,13,17; actual (7)         avance (3)         76:17,22,77:14;73; 11:33:19:1150:25           As:18         actual (7)         17,20,23;116:33,71,0; 12:20;21;12;12;20;10;         actual (7)         11:33:19:1150:25         13:10:13:61:61:01:33; 13:10:13:61:163,71,0; 45:18;21;24:21;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;12;1	Α				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
Abigai         actual (7)         17.20.23:116:37.10, 15.91:16         adverse (19)         13:115:13:61:01:3           51:16         150:81:66:61:191:15.23         150:81:66:61:191:15.23         151:11:12:20:12:14:24:62:15: 11:12:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:58;         13:22:134:25:11:54;         14:22:142:11:56;         13:22:13:11:51:23:12:13:14:24:25;         15:22:11:51:23:11					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
abic (13)         1508:1666:(1911523         1184:45.11,14.16.18, 812:17:12;20:19, 241:658:15.18; 199.20164:22         672:580:10.8418.23, 191205.922:115; 129:205.6109:23; 113:22:134:257:61:09:23; 113:22:134:257:61:09:23; 113:22:134:257:163:75         agreed (3)           above (8)         962:1107:81:1012; 962:1107:81:1012; 193:52:3197:22; 198:13:201:15         159:18:107:80:13:15; 193:52:3197:22; 198:13:201:15         113:49.14.25;132:5, 193:13:201:15         171:485:49:20; 97:6         96:22:186:17           above (8)         962:1107:81:1012; 198:13:201:15         61:01.61:284:15; 198:13:201:15         41:21:485:49:20; 97:6         96:22:186:17           above (8)         96:21:107:81:1012; 198:13:201:15         151:49.11:42:24; 131:49.11:42:24; 131:29:115         41:21:485:49:20; 97:199:159:115         90:159:16:59:22; 157:18:167:19           abroad (1)         34:22:35:19,21:22         46:9         154:20         87:8           34:7         add (3)         adequate (5)         Advising (1)         87:8           317:23:155:10         30:144:11:40:2         107:20         25:48:23:49:35:0           317:24:157:11         107:12         116:19:12:11         107:20         25:48:23:49:35:0           32:17/12         197:14         ADUD (1)         107:20         25:48:23:49:35:0           317:27         174:2         109:11:18:07         ADID (1)         107:20         25:48:23:49:35:0					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					-
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
ABRAMS (2)203-925:143:1.9.13.1652-9157:18:167:19115.7;121:8acute (4)Adelman's (1)advising (1)aides (1)34:7add (3)ad-22;35:19.21.22adequate (5)Advisory (2)air (90)Absolutely (5) $39:14;44:1;46:2$ adequate (5)Advisory (2)air (90)9:12,20:13:28:19; $39:14;44:1;46:2$ 187:11,19.23; $49:2.3$ 12:22;13:19:24:2;137:23:155:16197:14ADHD (1)107:2025:48:23:49:3:50;absurd (1)addition (6)35:9affect (7)51:16.19:52:17:52;174:26:13:23:21,23:73:18;adjourn (1)29:10;41:21:48:5;57:16.18:20:28:21;aburting (1)20:4;52:1020:31749:20:93:16;97:6;59:4,12.20:22:67;aburting (1)additional (2)adjourned (2)161:1180:16:82:11:84:18113:20additional (1)adjuictacted (1)49:890:18:18;19:2,12:22:19:12:25:15accept (4)80:277:17affect (3)97:19:10:5:6:10:66:43:8,17:76:18,23address (3)adjuidciating (2)15:2:29:11;12:5:15107:9.19:10:5:6:10:66:accept (4)addresses (3)adjuidciating (2)17:6:1:1:11:11:11:12:48;29:14:44:14:0:23:18:2:3;145:6:67:82:11:45:16:10:16:3:18:3:14:5:6:67:82:11:45:16:10:16:3:16:17:6;121:22addresses (3)adjuidciating (2)176:7:1:6:23:16:6:1234:5:6:67:77:66:5:66:77:76:6;16:10:16:6:17:77:76:6;133:1035:1.9:13:11:15:8:14:2:2:13:23:23:3:13:9;155:10:10:16:1339:6:77:77:6:6:25:67:77:66:5					
Albertanis (c)acute (4)Ademan's (1)advisor (1)advess (1)abroad (1) $34:22:35:19.21.22$ $46:9$ $154:20$ $87:8$ $34:7$ $3d(3)$ $34:22:35:19.21.22$ $46:9$ $154:20$ $ar (90)$ $Absolutely (5)$ $39:14:44:1:46:2$ $187:11.19.23:$ $49:2.3$ $12:22:13:19.24:2:$ $9:12:20:13:28:19;$ $197:14$ $4DED$ (1) $41:20.20:42:15:4$ $41:20.20:42:15:4$ $absurd$ (1) $addition (6)$ $35:9$ $affect (7)$ $51:16.19:52:17:5:$ $absurd$ (1) $119:11:186:8$ $203:17$ $49:203:16:97:6:$ $59:4,12.20:23:7:19:2:17:5:16:18:20:38:19$ $abutting$ (1) $additions (1)$ $adjourned (2)$ $161:11$ $15:69:19:70:2.3:7$ $abutting (1)$ $additions (1)$ $adjucicating (2)$ $15:2:22:11:12:5:15$ $107:9:19:02:3:10:23:14:7,7$ $accept (4)$ $80:2$ $addreses (3)$ $addreses (3)$ $31:12:20:11:12:5:15$ $107:9:19:02:1:14:7,7$ $accept (2)$ $addresse (3)$ $addresse (3)$ $addresse (3)$ $adlicating (2)$ $15:2:22:11:12:5:15$ $107:9:19:08:1:16:17:6:18:3:40:22:18:2:3,14:45:16:16:7,7:6:18:23:40:22:18:2:3,14:45:12:10account (3)51:15:03:10:16:1342:24:24:24:27:3:45:1,23:14:45:16:16:3,23:11:42:12:42:13:43:23,14:45:16:16:12,33:14:45:16:12,33:14:45:12:12:12:12:13:13:23:14:45:16:16:3,23:13:23:13:32:14:45:13,82:13,44:15:16:16:12,13:14:15:16:12:14:12:12:13:13:13:15:16:16:12:13:14:15:16:12:14:12:12:13:13:14:15:16:14:12:13:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
and row (1)         add (3)         adequate (5)         Adviory (2)         air (90)           34:7         39:14;44:1;46:2         187:11.19.23;         49:2,3         12:22;13:19:24:2;           137:23;155:16         197:14         ADBUHD (1)         107:20         25;48:23:49:35:00;           absurd (1)         6:13;23:21,23;73:18;         adjourn (1)         29:10;41:21;48:5;         57:16,18:20;52:17:5;           absurd (1)         119:11:186:8         203:17         49:20;20;31:697:6;         59:4,12,20;22;67:16;           abutting (1)         119:11:186:8         203:17         49:20;20;31:697:6;         59:4,12,20;22;67:16;           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         97:19;10:5;61:66:3           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         afficating (2)         15:2:29:11:125:15         107:9;10:5;61:66:3           accept (4)         addresset (3)         adjust (2)         176:13,16;177:6;         121:11,11:124:8;           accomplished (1)         45:24:98:11,11         29:4         administered (1)         167:1         13:15:6:15;160:12           accourdig (4)         51:3,14,15,16,16;         34:5         again (3)         121:61:7;168:23         145:6;7,82:1;46:1           acceurate (3)         51:6,14;6:12,21;7         34:16:6					
Absolutely (5)         39:14:44:1;46:2         187:11,19.23;         49:2,3         12:22:13:19:24:2;           9:12:20:13;28:19;         added (1)         196:18:197:17         Affairs (1)         41:20,20;42:15;42           137:23:155:16         addition (6)         35:9         affect (7)         51:16,19:52:17;52           174:2         additional (2)         adjourn (1)         29:10;41:21;48:5;         57:16:18,20;58:21           absurdly (1)         additions (1)         adjournel (2)         161:11         15:69:19:70:2.3;           abutting (1)         20:3:17         20:3:19:204:2         affects (3)         90:18,18.19:2.11           accept (4)         address (3)         adjuctating (2)         affects (3)         97:19:10:56:1063           acceptable (1)         22:17:19:2:1:19:10         affacts (1)         15:2:29:11;12:5:15         107:9;19:10:11;12:48:           accomplished (1)         25:13:41:43         addresses (3)         abLEMAN (1)         89         14:9:19:20;154:2.1           accomplished (1)         25:13:49:14:11         29:4         administered (1)         affects (3)         14:9:19:20;154:2.1           accomplished (1)         25:13:49:14:20:29:3:13:13:19:24:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:49:11:12:13:59:15:160:12:11:11:12:13:59:15:160:12:14:11:12:49:12:1					
Absorber (1)       added (1)       196:18:197:17       Affairs (1)       41:20.20:42:15:42         137:23:155:16       addition (6)       35:9       affect (7)       25:48:23:49:35:00         absurd (1)       addition (6)       35:9       affect (7)       29:10:41:21:48:5;       57:16.18.20:28:21;         absurd (1)       additional (2)       adjournet (2)       161:11       15:69:19:70:23;       79:41:20:20:42:11:84:11         absurd (1)       20:45:21:10       20:31:9:204:2       affects (3)       90:18.18.19:71:7       49:20:93:16:97:65;       59:4.1:20:22:37:11:8:51:18,19:21:22         abditional (2)       additens (1)       adjuicated (1)       49:8       90:18.18.19:21:22         accept (4)       80:2       77:17       affects (3)       97:19:10:56:106:2         acceptabe (1)       22:17:192:21:193:10       78:7.11       affects (3)       97:19:105:61:06:2         86:25       addresses (3)       ADLEMAN (1)       8.9       14:5:24:98:11,11       29:4       aftermoon (1)       19:20:23:15:8:7,12:24         21:22       addresses (3)       ADLEMAN (1)       8.9       47:20:49:11.18:50:4:12       13:15:61:60:12         according (4)       45:24:98:11,11       29:4       aftermoon (1)       19:20:23:15:160:12       13:15:61:60:12       13:15:61:60:					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
lb.10.1100/10         addition (6)         35:9         affect (7)         51:16,19:52:17:52           174:2         61:323:21,23:73:18;         adjourn (1)         29:10,41:21;48:5;         57:16,18:20:58:21           absurd (1)         19:11:1186:8         20:31:7         49:20:93:16:97:6;         59:41,22,02.26;           abutting (1)         20:45:21:0         20:31:9:204:2         adjourned (2)         161:11         15:69:19:70:2,3:7           abutting (1)         additions (1)         adjudicated (1)         49:8         90:18,18:19:2,1:2,20:2,16;           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         97:19:108:5:6106:3           accept (2)         addressed (3)         adjust (2)         15:2:29:11:125:15         107:9,19:108:1:11           86:25         addresses (3)         adjust (2)         176:13,16;177:6;         121:11,11;124:8;           accomplished (1)         45:24:98:11,11         29:4         administered (1)         19:20;23:18:2;           accound (3)         21:22:42:62:42:73:3,45;         administered (3)         34:5         again (30)         21:167:17:168:23           accound (3)         25:24:92:13:34:14,81:02;         24:9         47:20:49:11,18:50:4;         186:2;         18:119:60:4;           105:4;16:129:17         2.25:33:34:14:					
abstruct (f)         6:13;23:21,23;73:18;         adjourn (1)         29:10;41:21;48:5;         57:16,18,20;58:21           absurdly (1)         119:11;186:8         203:17         49:20;93:16;97:6;         59:4,12,20;22;67:           174:2         additional (2)         203:19;204:2:         affected (1)         80:16;82:11;84:18           abutting (1)         additions (1)         adjudicated (1)         49:8         90:18,18,19,21,22           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         97:19;105:61;06:3           86:25         addressed (3)         adjudicating (2)         15:2;29:11;125:15         107:9,19:108:1:10           86:25         addressed (3)         adjust (2)         176:13,16;177:6;         121:11,11;124:8;           accepted (2)         addresses (3)         ADLEMAN (1)         8.9         149:19,20;154:2,1           accomplished (1)         51:3,14,15,16,16;         21;47:17:3;18;         administer (1)         afternoon (1)         19,20;23;155:8;           account (3)         12:22         ADELMAN (225)         administers (1)         41:61:01:6;35:6;         174:69;177:7;16:16:23           account (3)         12:52;31:9:32:3,3,13:9;         administers (1)         41:61:01:6;35:6;         174:69;177:7;16:8             account (3)         12:52;31:9:					
absurdly (1)         119:11:186:8         203:17         49:20;93:16;97:6;         59:4,12,20,22:67:           174:2         additional (2)         adjourned (2)         161:11         15:(91:97:02.3;7)           abutting (1)         20:4;52:10         20:319:204:2:         affects (3)         90:18,18,19,21,22           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         90:18,18,19,21,22           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         97:19:105:6:100:5           accept (4)         80:2         22:17:192:21:193:10         78:7,11         affects (3)         97:19:105:6:100:5           acceptable (1)         22:17:192:21:192:4         91:91:2:10         178:24:180:23:182:3,         145:6:78,21:14:7,           accomplished (1)         45:24:98:11,11         29:4         affernoon (1)         19,20,23:15:8,9,           according (4)         51:1,14.51,6:16;         34:5         again (30)         21:16:17:16:6:12           accuract (1)         20:3:11:83:1,4         20:2:3:11:83:1,4         29:4         affernoon (1)         19,20,23:15:8,9,           accurate (3)         57:1,4:13:6:15:160:12         34:5         again (30)         21:16'17:168:23           accurate (3)         57:4:1,4:3:2:6,7         57:16:25:67:77:0:6;         190:6					
answing (1)         additional (2)         adjourned (2)         161:11         15:69:19:70:2.3;7           abutting (1)         20:4;52:10         203:19:204:2         affected (1)         80:16:82:11:84:11           113:20         additions (1)         adjudicated (1)         49:8         90:18;18,19;21,22           accept (4)         80:2         77:17         affects (3)         97:19;105:6;106:3           acceptable (1)         22:17;192:21;193:10         78:7,11         affdidwit (8)         23:113:22;114:7,7           accepted (2)         10:12:89:7;192:4         9:19;12:10         178:24;180:23;182:3,         145:67,8,21;146:7           accomplished (1)         45:24;98:11,11         29:4         afternoon (1)         19;20:23;155:8.9,           21:22         ADELMAN (225)         administers (1)         4:16;10:16;35:6;         174:69;177:3;18:           accorndig (4)         5:13;41:45,16;16;         34:5         again (30)         21:167:17;168:23           accurate (3)         57:16;03:10;166:13         39:67,9,13;40:1,221;         administers (1)         4:16;10:16;35:6;         174:69;177:3;18:           accurate (3)         57:16;03:10;166:13         39:67,9,13;40:1,221;         administon (1)         19:79:12:12;137:9;         airborne (5)           accurate (3)         57:7;66					
10-2.         20:4;52:10         20:3:19:204:2         affected (1)         80:16:82:11:84:18           113:20         additions (1)         adjudicated (1)         49:8         90:18.18,19,21,22           accept (4)         a0:2         77:17         affected (1)         97:19:10:56:106:           acceptable (1)         22:17:19:21:193:10         78:7,11         affects (3)         97:19:10:56:106:           acceptable (1)         22:17:192:21:193:10         78:7,11         affectos (3)         23:11:32:21:14:7.           acceptable (1)         22:17:192:24         9:19:12:10         176:13.16:177:6;         121:11.11:124:8;           accepta (2)         10:12;89:7;192:4         9:19:12:10         178:24:180:23:182:3,         149:19.20:154:2,1           according (4)         5:13.14.15.16.16;         34:5         again (30)         21:167:17:168:23           according (4)         5:13.14.15.16.16;         34:5         again (30)         21:167:17:168:23           accuracy (1)         20:32:33:41:4.8.12;         52:10.79:3:186:2         78:8:10:22:4:16:1.18;         19:0:4:21:8:193           accurate (3)         37:4.11.15.21:38:2,6;         76:8         139:21:14:21:8:149:12,         48:18:119:6.9,13;           st:1.5:103:10:166:13         39:6.7,9.13:40:1,2,21;         admixisons (2) <td< th=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
additiong (1)       additions (1)       adjudicated (1)       49:8       90:18,18,19,21,22         accept (4)       80:2       77:17       affects (3)       97:19;105:6;106:5;         acceptable (1)       addressed (3)       adjudicating (2)       78:7,11       affidavit (8)       23;113:22;114:7,         acceptable (1)       addressed (3)       addresses (3)       adjust (2)       176:13,16;177:6;       121:11,111;124:8;         acceptible (1)       addresses (3)       addresses (3)       91:9;12:10       178:24;180:23;182:3,       145:67,8,21;146;         accomplished (1)       45:24;98:11,11       29:4       afternoon (1)       19,20,23;155:8,9,         21:22       ADELMAN (225)       administered (1)       167:1       13;156:15;160:12         account (3)       14,20;29:3;11,18;30:1,       24:9       47:20;49:11,18;50:4;       186:8,16,23;188:5         accuracy (1)       20;33:23;34:1,48,12;       52:10;79:3;186:2       administrator (3)       57:7;66:6;25;67:7;0:6;       190:6;191:18;193         accuratel (3)       37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;       76:8       139:21;142:18;149:12,       48:18;119:6,9,13;         accuratel (1)       25;41:4;46:2,45;47:8;       41:5       199:14:4:21:1       46:25       airings (1)         accuratel (1)       25;74:8,12;76:14,21;					
11:5:10       80:2       77:17       affects (3)       97:19;105:6:106:3         43:8,17;76:18,23       addresse (3)       adjudicating (2)       15:2;29:11;125:15       107:9,19;108:1;10         86:25       addressed (3)       adjust (2)       78:7,11       affects (3)       23:11;22:14:7;6         accepted (2)       10:12;89:7;192:4       9:19;12:10       affects (3)       15:2;29:11;125:15       107:9,3;192:14:15:12         accomplished (1)       24:52:4;98:11,11       29:4       afternoon (1)       19:20;23;155:8,9       19:20;23;155:8,0       19:20;23;155:8,0       19:20;23;155:16:10:12         accourdig (4)       5:13,14,15,16,16;       34:5       administers (1)       167:1       13;156:15;160:12         accoura (3)       12:24;26:24;27:3,4,5,1       administers (1)       24:9       47:20;49:11,18;00:4;       186:8,16,23;188:5         105:4,16;129:17       22;53:19;32:3,9,13,19,       administerator (3)       57:7,66:25;67:7,70:6;       190:6;191:18:193         accurate (3)       37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;       76:8       139:21;142:18;149:12,       146:2         accurate (4)       57:7,66:25;67:7,70:6;       190:6;191:18:193       19:19:4:4;201:8       19:19:4:4;201:8         accurate (1)       25;74:8,12;76:14,21;       admission (1)       17;15:17;179;4:4       146:2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
acceptable (1)       address (3)       adjudicating (2)       15:2;29:11;125:15       107:9,19;108:1;10         acceptable (1)       22:17;192:21;193:10       adjust (2)       15:2;29:11;125:15       107:9,19;108:1;10         acceptable (1)       addressed (3)       adjust (2)       17:6:13,16;177:6;       121:11,11;124:8;         accepted (2)       10:12;89:7;192:4       adjust (2)       178:24;180:23;182:3,       145:6,78,21;146:         accomplished (1)       45:24;98:11,11       29:4       afternoon (1)       19;20,23;155:89,         according (4)       5:13,14,15,16,16;       administered (1)       34:5       again (30)       21;167:17;168:23         according (4)       5:13,14,25,16,16;       administers (1)       4:16;10:16;35:6;       174:6;9;177:318:         accuracy (1)       20;33:23;34:1,48,112;       administrator (3)       57:7;66:25;67:7;70:6;       190:6;191:18;193         accurate (3)       37:4,11,15,21;38:2,16;       76:8       139:21;142:18;149:12,       48:16;2;188:3;         accurately (1)       25:54:1:4;46:2,45;47:8;       admission (1)       17:154:17;156:4;       146:2         accurately (1)       25:7:7:7:38:16;129:17       adjust (2)       admission (2)       age (2)       alleged (1)         69:3       11:62:17;73:14:15,16;48;172:7;       admission					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
acceptation       addressed (3)       adjust (2)       176:13,16;177:6;       121:11,11;124:8;         accepted (2)       10:12;89:7;192:4       9:19;12:10       178:24;180:23;182:3,       145:67,8,21;146:         accomplished (1)       45:24;98:11,11       29:4       afternoon (1)       19;20,23;155:8,9,         according (4)       5:13,14,15,16,16;       34:5       administered (1)       167:1       13;156:15;160:12         according (4)       5:13,14,15,16,16;       34:5       administered (1)       167:1       13;156:15;160:12         account (3)       14,20:29:3,11,18;30:1,       24:9       41:6;10:16;35:6;       174:6,9;177:3;182         accuracy (1)       20:33:23;34:1,48,12;       52:10,79:3;186:2       78:8;102:24;106:1,18;       199;69:191:18;193         accurate (3)       37:4,11,5,21;38:2,6;       76:8       199:21;142:18;149:12,       atmission (1)       17;154:17;156:4;       atriborne (5)         acknowledge (1)       25;74:8;12;76:14,21;       69:3       39:6,7,9,13;40:1,2,21,       admit (2)       80:14;162:19       30:6;13,18;         actnowledge (1)       25;74:8;12;76:14,21;       151:15;168:6       age (2)       atmit (2)       38:13,36;6,10;84:10,22;       35:13         acturately (1)       19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,       atmit (2)       24:22,22;42:4;					
accepted (2)10:12;89:7;192:45:19;12:10178:24;180:23;182:3,145:6,7,8,21;146:18:3;40:22addresses (3)45:24;98:11,1129:4afternoon (1)19;20;23;155:8,9,accomplished (1)ADELMAN (225)administered (1)167:113;156:15:160:12according (4)5:13,14,15,16,16;34:5again (30)21;167:17;168:23according (4)5:13,14,15,16,16;34:5again (30)21;167:17;168:23according (4)5:13,14,15,16,16;34:5again (30)21;167:17;168:23according (4)5:13,14,15,16,16;34:5again (30)21;167:17;168:23according (4)5:13,14,15,16,16;34:5again (30)21;167:17;168:23accuracy (1)20;33:23;34:1,48,12;52:10,79:3;186:278:8;102:24;106:1,18;19:19:19:18:193accurate (3)37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;76:8139:21;142:18;149:12,airborne (5)accurate (3)37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;76:8139:21;142:18;149:12,48:18;119:6,9,13;accurate (1)25:74:8,12;76:14,21;admission (1)17;154:17;156:4;airings (1)69:311:62:17;73:14,15,16,admitted (2)24:22,22;44:25;airings (1)acknowledge (1)25:74:8,12;76:14,21;161:25;168:6age (2)alleged (1)75:2077:10,13,21;78:4,5,14,admitted (2)24:22,22;44:25;alleged (1)75:1385:13,68:6:6,10,15,19,admitted (2)24:22,22;44:25;35:13acquaintance (1)23:83:6,10;84:10,22;42:13;89:576:21;107:19;154:9,					
accomplished (1)       addresses (3)       ADLEMAN (1)       8,9       149:19,20;154:2,1         accomplished (1)       45:24:98:11,11       29:4       afternoon (1)       13;156:15;160:12         accounding (4)       51:3,14,15,16,16;       administered (1)       34:5       again (30)       21;167:17;168:23         accounding (4)       51:3,14,15,16,16;       administers (1)       41:16;10:16;35:6;       174:6,9;177:3;188:2         account (3)       12.22;53:1:9;32:3,9,13,19,       administers (1)       41:16;10:16;35:6;       190:6;191:18;193         accuracy (1)       20:33:23;34:1,4,8,12;       administrator (3)       57:7;66:25;67:7;70:6;       190:6;191:18;193         accurate (3)       37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;       administors (1)       17;154:17;156:4;       199:194:4;201:8         accurately (1)       25;74:8,12;76:14,21;       76:8       139:21;142:18;149:12,       48:18;19:6,9,13;         acknowledge (1)       25;74:8,12;76:14,21;       admissions (2)       180:22;187:21;194:14       146:25         as:1       38:1,3,68:6,10,15,19,       admitted (2)       24:22,22;44:25;       35:13         accurately (1)       23;83:6,10:84:10,22;       80:14;162:19       70:14         accurately (1)       23;83:6,10:84:10,22;       42:13;89:5       76:21:107:19:154:9,       30:93:12					
accomplished (1) 21:2245:24;98:11,11 ADELMAN (225)29:4 administered (1) 34:5afternoon (1) 167:1 again (30)19,20,23;155:8,9, 167:1 again (30)according (4) 40:2,3;98:11;158:85:13,14,15,16,16; 21:24;26:24;27:3,4,5, alt-20:29;3,11,18;30:1, 2,25;31:9;32:3,9,13,19, accuracy (1) 138:1 accurate (3) 55:15;103:10;166:13 accurately (1) 69:321:24;26:24;27:3,4,5, administers (1) administers (1) administers (1) administers (1) administers (1)167:1 again (30) 41:6;10:16;35:6; 57:7;66:25;67:7;70:6; 190:6;191:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;61:91:18;193 199:0;121:21;137:9; admission (1) 199:21;142:18;149:12, 199:21;142:18;149:12, 48:18;119:6,9,13; 199:0;14:18;19:6,9,13; 199:0;14:18;19:6,9,13; 199:0;14:18;19:6,9,13; 199:0;14:18;19:6,9,13; 199:1;164:8;172:7; airings (1) 146:2 agencies (10) 19:79:14,15,17:80:1,6, 161:25;168:6 199:1;164:8;172:7; alleged (1) 19:79:14,15,17:80:1,6, 199:79:14,15,17:80:1,6, 161:25;168:6 199:1;164:8;172:7; 180:22;187:21;194:14 146:25 146:2 146:2 146:25 142:22;24:425; 151:1 130:10;31:122 167:10,13,21;72:20;11, 13,18;155:5,8 130:9;31:21;32:2 13,18;155:5,8 130:9;31:21;32:2 13,18;155:5,8 130:9;31:21;32:2 13,18;155:5,8 130:9;31:21;32:2 13,18;155:5,8 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:21;32:2 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 130:9;31:22 140:02 140:21;					
Accompliance (1) 21:22ADELMAN (225) 5:13,14,15,16,16; 40:2,3;98:11;158:8administered (1) 34:5167:1 again (30) 4:16;10:16;35:6; 4:16;10:16;35:6; 47:20;49:11,18;50:4; 174:6,9;177:3;18 22;3;34:1,48,12; 32:3;34:1,48,12; 32:3;34:1,48,12; 32:3;34:1,48,12; 38:1167:1 34:5 administers (1) 4:16;10:16;35:6; 4:16;10:16;35:6; 47:20;49:11,18;50:4; 190:6;191:18;193 57:7;66:25;67:7;70:6; 190:6;191:18;193 191:94:4;201:8 airborne (5)accurate (3) accurate (3) 55:15;103:10;166:13 69:337:4,11,15,21;38:2,6; 39:6,7,9,13;40:1,2,21, 25;41:4;46:2,4,5;47:8, 69:3admission (1) 17;154:17;156:4; 11;62:17;73:14,15,16, admissions (2) 11;62:17;73:14,15,16, 69:3161:25;168:6 38:24 25;74:8,12;76:14,21; 161:25;168 161:25;168 38:24161:25;16 38:6,010,84:10,22; 42:13;89:5161:25;16 38:13,3;82:1,3,8,21, 42:13;89:5161:25;16 38:14;162:19 30:9;31:21;32:2acquaintance (1) 88:24 87:1323;83:6,01,84:10,22; 22;587:2,5,10,22; 22;587:2,5,10,22; 28:8,924:23;89:5 28:8,9 28:8,930:9;31:21;32:2 30:10;31:22 30:10;31:22 30:10;31:22146:2 31:11 30:10;31:22 30:10;31:22across (1) 48:2522;587:2,5,10,22; 29,23;91:13,21;92:15; 30:10;31:2230:10;31:22 30:10;31:2230:10;31:22 30:10;31:22across (1) 48:2593:8;18;94:2,4,14,16, 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 180:393:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,30:10;31:22 30:10;31:22across (1) 180:393:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,30:10;31:22 30:10;31:2230:10;31:22 30:10;31:22across (1) 180:3 <t< th=""><td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			. ,		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
acturate (a) $35:1,6,14;36:1,20,21;$ $37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;$ admirable (1) $119:7;121:21;137:9;$ $139:21;142:18;149:12,$ airborne (5)accurate (3) $37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;$ $55:15;103:10;166:13$ $37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;$ $39:6,7,9,13;40:1,2,21,$ admirable (1) $119:7;121:21;137:9;$ $139:21;142:18;149:12,$ airborne (5)accurate (3) $37:4,11,15,21;38:2,6;$ $55:15;103:10;166:13$ $39:6,7,9,13;40:1,2,21,$ $25;41:4;46:2,4,5;47:8,$ $41:5$ $41:5$ $139:21;142:18;149:12,$ $17;154:17;156:4;$ $48:18;119:6,9,13;$ $146:2$ accurately (1) $25;74:8,12;76:14,21;$ $75:20$ $11:62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $77:10,13,21;78:4,5,14,$ $161:25;168:6$ $88:24$ $admissions (2)$ $19:79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $age (2)$ $80:14;162:19$ $ailleged (1)$ $70:14$ acquaintance (1) $23;83:6,10;84:10,22;$ $87:13$ $42:13;89:5$ $85:1,3,6;86:6,10,15,19,$ $88:1;89:10,17,22;90:1,$ $48:25$ $ADMS (2)$ $29:23;91:13,21;92:15;$ $30:10;31:22$ $agent (2)$ $196:25;201:17$ $4:7;90:14;102:1;$ $143:11$ $140:2$ across (1) $2,9,23;91:13,21;92:15;$ $180:3$ $30:10;31:22$ $93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,$ $93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,$ $93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,$ $19:021,51$ $146:2$ $146:2$					
133.137:4,11,15,21;38:2,6; 55:15;103:10;166:1337:4,11,15,21;38:2,6; 39:6,7,9,13;40:1,2,21, 25;41:4;46:2,4,5;47:8, 41:576:8139:21;142:18;149:12, 48:18;119:6,9,13; 17;154:17;156:4; 159:1;164:8;172:7; atrings (1)48:18;119:6,9,13; 146:2accurately (1) 69:325;41:4;46:2,4,5;47:8, 25;74:8,12;76:14,21; 75:2011;62:17;73:14,15,16, 25;74:8,12;76:14,21; 77:10,13,21;78:4,5,14, admit (2)161:25;168:6 admit (2)age (2) alleged (1)alleged (1) 70:14acknowledged (1) 88:2419;79:14,15,17;80:1,6, 88:2474:7;125:16 admit (2)agencies (10) 24:22,22;44:25; 35:13allergi (1) 35:13acquaintance (1) 87:1323;83:6,10;84:10,22; 22,25;87:2,5,10,22; 48:159:10,17,22;90:1, 87:13ADMS (2) 28:8,913,18;155:5,8 agent (2)allergy (3) 30:9;31:21;32:2acronym (1) 48:252,9,23;91:13,21;92:15; 30:10;31:2228:8,9 adolescent (2)agent (2) 196:25;201:17allow (4) 43:11 allowing (1)across (1) 180:3193:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 193:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,adopt (1) 100146:2allowing (1)					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
accurately (1) $69:3$ 25;41:4;46:2,4,5;47:8, $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $acknowledge (1)$ $75:20$ 41:5 $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $75:20$ 41:5 $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $11;62:17;73:14,15,16,$ $11;62:17;73:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $88:24$ 159:1;164:8;172:7; $180:22;187:21;194:14$ $80:14;162:19$ airings (1) $146:25$ $146:25$ $11:62:51,73:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $74:7;125:16$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14,15,17;80:1,6,$ $19;79:14;102:1,$ $13,18;155:5,8$ $30:9;31:21;32:2$ $30:10;31:2230:10;31:2230:10;31:2230:10;31:2230:10;31:2230:1$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
obsection25;74:8,12;76:14,21; 75:20161:25;168:6 admit (2)age (2) 80:14;162:19alleged (1) 70:14acknowledged (1) 88:2419;79:14,15,17;80:1,6, 7;81:1,3;82:1,3,8,21, 85:1,3,6;86:6,10,15,19, 87:1374:7;125:16 admited (2)agencies (10) 24:22,22;44:25; 85:1,3,6;86:6,10,15,19, 13,18;155:5,8allergies (1) 30:9;31:21;32:2acquaintance (1) 87:1322;25;87:2,5,10,22; 28:8,942:13;89:5 28:8,976:21;107:19;154:9, 13,18;155:5,8allergy (3) 30:9;31:21;32:2acronym (1) 48:2522,25;87:2,5,10,22; 29:11,3,21;92:15; 180:388:1;89:10,17,22;90:1, 29:23;91:13,21;92:15; 30:10;31:22adolescent (2) 30:10;31:22196:25;201:17 agents (1)allow (4) 413:11 146:2180:393:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,adopt (1)146:2allowing (1)					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					5
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
$\begin{array}{c} \text{across (1)} \\ 180:3 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 88:1;89:10,17,22;90:1, \\ 2,9,23;91:13,21;92:15; \\ 180:3 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \text{adolescent (2)} \\ 2,9,23;91:13,21;92:15; \\ 93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16, \\ 30:10;31:22 $					
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$					
across (1)     93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,     adopt (1)     146:2     allowing (1)       180:3     93:8,18;94:2,4,14,16,     59.2     152.25     152.25					
act (1)					
	act (7)	17,25,75.1,0,10,17,20,	57.2	·	152.25

almost (9) 27:17;40:12;58:9; 75:23;80:9;88:24,24; 150:16:174:2 along (5) 39:16;42:4;77:3; 93:11:129:11 although (3) 43:11;154:24;165:12 always (4) 76:17;154:23; 165:10:194:4 AMA (2) 27:25:28:1 Ambient (18) 48:23;50:2;51:16; 52:17;58:21;59:22; 69:19;70:3;146:3; 185:23;186:8,16,23; 188:5;190:6;191:18; 193:16,19 ambiguous (1) 125:17 amend (2) 19:15;37:4 amended (5) 6:12;15:16;18:7; 69:9;71:22 amendment (2) 20:3:101:18 amendments (1) 19:12 American (3) 24:6:28:2.5 amount (7) 57:5;58:2;72:7,11; 83:14,17:181:16 ample (1) 67:18 amply (1) 43:6 AMPR (1) 156:23 Amtrak (2) 44:22;106:21 analysis (15) 17:22;20:21;41:15, 20;42:15;47:18;70:17, 22,24;71:19;93:16; 150:22;177:20;201:19; 202:14 analyze (3) 60:15;61:21;93:25 analyzed (1) 60:21 and/or (1) 129:21 animals (1) 133:14 announce (1) 17:1 announced (1) 105:10

WHOLESALE CORI OF	KATIO.
announcement (1) 156:2	190: 197:
annual (8)	applyi
76:25;103:7;106:2;	154:
156:3;158:5;164:5,11, 17	<b>Appre</b> 10:6
another's (1)	approj
76:18	8:20
answered (10)	172:
29:22,25;76:3,12; 81:22;84:16;123:13;	197: 22;1
169:8;197:8;198:3	approv
antecedent (1)	141:
77:20 anticipate (2)	<b>approv</b> 84:1
63:9;110:11	approx
anticipated (1)	33:6
56:9 anxiety (3)	<b>April</b> ( 4:13
34:22,24;35:7	4:15
apologies (1)	166:
73:8	arbitra
<b>apologize (2)</b> 81:17;163:23	37:1 arcane
apparent (1)	150:
43:1	archite
apparently (4)	24:2
14:19;148:2;161:3; 175:16	archite 41:1
Appeals (13)	area (2
4:5,18,21,23;6:7,23;	12:4
7:2;8:7;9:3;141:17; 142:7,16,21	43:1 49:2
appear $(1)$	19:6
193:18	71:1
<b>appears (3)</b> 40:14;100:16;149:15	92:1 125:
appendix (6)	125:
178:12,20,23;179:1,	187:
6;180:15	areas (
<b>apples (1)</b> 178:25	28:2 18,2
applicable (3)	40:1
32:15;154:15;155:21	70:1
<b>applicant (8)</b> 9:10;10:10;14:8;	arguin 58:2
19:2,15;96:6,6;134:10	argum
applicants (1)	79:2
193:15	<b>argum</b> 81:5
<b>applicant's (5)</b> 6:6,20;9:21;134:24;	arise (1
191:17	35:2
application (1)	arithm
20:11 applied (8)	55:9 Arling
69:15;70:12;71:23;	92:2
80:5;158:15;184:16;	arms (
191:13;192:11	75:1
<b>applies (2)</b> 44:10;172:21	<b>Army</b> 24:2
apply (12)	aroma
51:19;58:25;59:14;	119:
136:3,4;153:1;171:21;	arose (

21,25;191:14; 18.21 ng (2) 24:182:13 ciate (1) priate (14) :17:5:32:3.6; 15;183:18;196:3; 4,7,18,21;198:9, 99:4 ve (3) 17;142:8,21 ved (2) 9:143:18 ximately (2) ,7 (7) ;31:2;156:6; 10;158:22,23; 9 arily (1) 2 e (1) 22 ect (3) 5;41:11;154:4 ecture (2) 2.1429) :29:4:41:23; 3.15:44:24:45:1: 1:50:7,18:67:3,15, 9:17:70:5.18: 5;79:23;89:22; 4;93:5;112:14; 23;138:8;139:2; 16;152:13;153:10; 25 (13)3:29:12:30:14. 0:31:5:32:24; 2,23;50:23;69:19; 5;162:2 **ig** (1) C ent (3) 3;136:6;195:19 entative (1) 1) netic (3) ;68:19,21 ton (1) 5 1) 4 (2)3:154:3 tic (1) 19 (3)

Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

84:13:191:22.23 around (9) 13:7:52:11:57:3; 69:17:75:14:124:8: 148:20,22;174:1 art (3) 84:3,4;124:16 arterial (1) 36:6 article (13) 11:22;75:23;130:16; 131:24;132:6,8,11,16, 18,19;133:23;146:23; 160:17 articles (15) 46:21,23;74:17,19, 21,23,24;75:2,8;76:4; 97:25;98:18,22; 100:10;130:14 ASAP(1) 203:18 aside (1) 67:1 aspect (2) 32:23;139:17 assembled (1) 76:4 asserted (1) 62:23 assertion (2) 62:18;193:22 assess (2) 83:19:191:13 assessment (1) 84:17 assigned (2) 34:11:60:13 assignment (3) 8:25;34:10;52:8 assignments (1) 34:15 assistance (3) 43:13;89:20;95:25 associate (2) 38:9;189:3 associated (7) 56:10;61:9;121:18; 122:23;123:3;159:2,11 Associates (3) 23:15,17;97:18 Association (3) 5:20:28:2:176:12 Association's (1) 6:6 assume (15) 7:21,23;24:19;65:23; 70:20;94:10;112:19; 127:21;137:19;177:12; 182:7;183:7;184:16; 200:12;201:8 assumed (1) 102:2 assumes (1)

127:19 assuming (7) 75:11:130:2.13; 184:9.13.19.20 assumption (4) 8:11;37:12;179:17; 182:19 assumptions (28) 51:9,10;68:22,24; 69:2,24,25;71:2,4,5,21; 72:12;173:5,14,19,22, 24;174:2,18;175:22; 181:16,19,20,21,25; 182:1,2,14 assures (1) 66:18 asthma (16) 34:23;35:12,17,23; 36:4;53:6,7,14;54:1,3; 161:3,8;162:11,13,15, 16 asthmatics (1) 83:4 Atlantic (1) 107:17 attached (2) 130:4;176:13 attaching (1) 6:11 attachment (1) 98:10 attachments (2) 21:3.4attack (1) 161:3 attempted (1) 93:20 attempting (4) 76:9,9;84:13;93:24 attend (4) 17:15;25:7;31:3,7 attendant (1) 195:7 attending (3) 50:6,7;54:11 attorneys (1) 117:20 audible (3) 5:25;22:8;133:6 audience (2) 5:23:189:13 August (20) 4:15;14:3;15:10; 17:20;51:10;54:25; 55:3,14;68:20;69:25; 73:6;172:23;173:20; 174:15;175:7;178:13, 16;179:20,24;181:21 authority (1) 7:12 Auto (4) 121:9;122:11,16,16 automobile (6)

4:7:35:3,3:98:4,15; 132:13 automobiles (1) 124:8automotive (9) 40:9:119:13.14: 123:18,20,25;124:4,7; 131:17 available (4) 86:16;94:20;187:15; 201:15 avenue (1) 30:7 average (27) 26:8;146:1,1,4,7; 157:24;158:1,7,8; 159:13;161:13;164:4, 13,15,23;178:14,18; 180:18,21;183:4,5,9 12;184:9,10,16;187:22 averaged (5) 158:20:162:21: 164:6,12;165:1 await (1) 9:9 aware (27) 55:9;69:6;96:5; 103:2;104:17,18; 108:21;114:3;119:5,8, 11,16,16;124:24;125:2, 7:126:3.4.5.8:173:18. 21;174:20;175:3,14; 181:10.23 away (3) 29:15:102:8:162:8 awfully (1) 88:11 awhile (1) 100:10 B Bachelor's (1) 25:6 back (47) 7:4;8:12;19:4,23; 25:2;44:13;57:25; 64:11;72:15,22;74:9; 75:19;77:6;84:12; 85:21:86:6,9,12,18; 90:16:92:18:100:10: 106:12;107:14,15; 116:25;117:15,25; 142:22,24;144:12; 153:19,20;156:22; 160:23,24;167:5,16,17, 23;169:16;180:23; 194:20;195:25;197:15; 202:19;203:3

179:1,7,11,11,11,15,17, 18.22:180:3.4.6.8.16: 181:17 backwards (1) 172:16 backyard (1) 92:21 bad (3) 66:14,20;116:9 bag (1) 90:21 base (2)15:6:100:6 based (40) 37:12,18;40:15; 41:18;48:11;50:21; 51:2;52:1,17;55:19; 57:8;62:1;65:19;67:22; 69:8,23;71:6,12,16; 72:11;73:17;88:7,8; 95:10;127:13;129:20; 132:2;152:21;158:6; 164:4;176:14;177:10; 178:10,11,12;179:17; 187:21;201:12,18; 202:13 baseline (1) 142:10 basic (1) 125:13 basically (2) 90:5:142:4 basis (9) 23:12:24:23.24: 36:14:37:7:38:15; 100:18;103:7;138:1 beam (1) 143:14 bear (1) 39:25 beat (1) 93:9 became (4) 156:5,5;157:10; 158:4 become (6) 27:17;158:22;186:4. 5,18,19 begin (3) 43:18;72:24;73:14 beginning (2) 10:12:124:15 begins (5) 126:12,12;127:8; 130:24;147:4 begun (1) 4:13 behalf (4) 4:20;5:5;13:10; 46:11 bell (1) 176:18 below (4)

103:12:108:23; 161:23:168:4 benchmark (1) 136:9 benzene (13) 118:25;119:9,23,24; 120:3,25;121:1,5; 129:21:130:5:147:14; 150:2,2 Bertel (1) 108:13 besides (2) 25:7;67:18 best (1) 108:17 better (6) 37:16;76:5;86:20; 110:12;198:10;199:5 bewitching (1) 200:9 beyond (13) 8:14;38:23;40:19; 43:12;67:7,17;89:8; 136:24:152:22.23: 177:3;191:15;196:9 biased (2) 68:9,14 **big** (4) 70:9,11;71:25;92:20 billion (22) 158:6,7,11;162:21; 164:23:167:25:168:11. 15;169:2,17,20;170:10, 16:172:2.17:178:12: 184:22,25;188:4; 189:19,20,21 bit (15) 7:9:9:20:23:22:25:2: 33:2:37:21:49:4:51:14: 57:23;73:20;86:8; 109:4;139:7;174:4; 196:16 black (7) 90:21;92:5,6;108:11; 203:11,13,14 blank (1) 38:11 blue (1) 159:12 Board (26) 4:4,18,20,23;6:7,23; 7:2,3;8:3,7;9:3;18:1; 20:17;24:6,9,9;28:5, 24;40:11;59:5;77:7; 85:17;141:17;142:7, 16,20 board-(1) 29:12 **Board-certified (9)** 24:6:27:9:28:17: 30:3,7,13;38:19;97:15; 139:9 boarded (4)

23:7,23,24:24:5 bodies (3) 11:8:78:7.11 body (1) 195:8 bold (1) 183:16 booklet (1) 188:22 boot (1) 88:16 botched (1) 49:4 both (20) 12:8:27:10,12,14; 28:23;36:13;44:10; 47:22;51:8;59:9;71:1; 96:2;97:12;99:19; 127:4;155:9;166:12; 179:2;190:10,15 bottom (5) 21:16:132:24.25: 133:9;153:17 boundaries (1) 111:16 BRANN (9) 5:1,1;42:9;65:5,6; 87:24;92:4,8;141:13 Brann's (2) 65:8,13 break (11) 68:16:72:15:115:25: 116:11.18.25:120:18: 160:5;163:11,14;167:1 Brevsse (9) 44:6;98:25;99:10; 100:1,2,4;101:19; 102:4:136:2 Brevsse's (3) 99:19,20:100:11 brief (1) 76:10 bright (1) 167:18 bring (2) 9:11;16:7 brings (1) 172:23 broad (1) 54:11 broaden (1) 54:4 broader (2) 134:23;148:16 broadly (1) 139:18 broke (1) 118:17 bronchitis (4) 34:23:35:19.21.22 Brysse (1) 93:2 **Bucksport** (1)

107:3 budadine (1) 119:25 building (4) 4:19,19;56:6;108:10 buildings (1) 155:14 **built** (10) 92:21;109:5;112:21; 113:9,11,20;125:1,1; 141:5;142:9 Bureau (1) 107:20 bureaucratic (1) 192:10 buried (1) 55:11 business (4) 17:14,15;22:17; 86:23 buttress (1) 194:6 butts (1) 50:11 buy (1) 114:1 С C-2(1)4:11cafeteria (1) 116:2 calculate (1) 169:21 calculated (1) 57:1 calculation (3) 55:11;181:13;182:19 calculations (4) 129:16:171:25: 176:14:193:2 California (2) 59:3,4 call (8) 22:11;29:8;76:7; 85:9,11;101:8;105:9; 130:21 called (9) 6:2:29:9,15:48:18, 22;53:9;59:4;85:22; 87:18 calling (1) 78:12 calls (1) 183:5 came (9) 11:22;21:20;79:1; 90:17,19;99:10; 103:22:194:8.12 can (126) 7:18,20;8:16;23:5, 21;24:13,22;27:6;29:7;

background (26)

55:16;57:2,3,5,6;

22;174:5;178:24;

58:18;69:11;140:17,

# Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

PETITION OF COSTCC	WHOLESALE CORPO	RATION	F	
	20 10 21 24 22 2		24 105 14 100 12	100.12
32:10;37:8,21;38:4;	30:12;31:24;32:2	causative (1)	24;105:14;129:13;	108:12
43:12,12,15;46:2,22;	cardiovascular (8)	120:16	136:11;173:21;175:21;	children (15)
47:13;51:17;56:8,21;	30:10;31:23;36:7;	cause (3)	181:20,21	33:20,21,25;34:6,21;
58:10;60:4,12;61:17,	123:7.8,10,11,13	54:3:55:5:76:1	changes (9)	35:5,8;53:8,22,25;
18;63:24;64:1;65:16,	careful (1)	caused (5)	22:5;69:4;103:25;	54:3;83:4;161:3,8;
17,18;75:19,19;76:24;	137:16	40:9;118:24;119:6,8,	138:6,8;173:19,19;	162:11
	cars (10)	40.9,110.24,119.0,8, 9		child's (1)
78:18;79:16,24,25;		-	174:21,22	
80:10;85:4;86:7,19;	54:7,8,10;122:9,13,	causes (1)	changing (2)	35:12
90:14,20;91:6,23;92:7,	20,21;138:15;145:4;	198:20	20:1;36:22	choose (3)
13,17;93:21,22;96:8;	195:9	caveat (1)	characteristics (1)	7:12;17:9;21:25
100:25;107:6,7,22,24;	carve (1)	102:2	151:16	chronic (4)
108:3,4,17;110:15;	83:9	Cayman (1)	characterization (2)	34:23;35:17;53:6;
112:11;114:17;116:18,	CASAC (42)	18:17	29:24;107:11	83:5
18;117:4,8;119:5,8;	48:20,20,21,25;51:3,	cement (1)	characterize (4)	CI (1)
120:12,14;121:17,23;	15;52:6,8,18,19;59:21;	152:17	56:8,12,13;173:22	189:16
125:1;126:15,18;	60:4;70:7;76:25;77:7;	Center (1)	characterized (5)	cigarette (1)
131:20,22;133:5,20,22;	78:25;79:3;80:17;	108:12	68:25;96:25;120:3;	50:11
	81:22;82:12,14;		150:21;179:2	
134:6,11,25;135:3,8;	· · · ·	Century (1)	,	circle (1)
136:6;144:9,22;145:4;	104:20;129:8,8,15,16;	58:9	characterizes (1)	151:15
146:13;147:16,18;	185:13,14,16,18,21,25;	certain (10)	179:21	circles (1)
148:8;149:11;150:8,	186:1,10,12,13,15;	68:22;69:19;70:15;	characterizing (1)	104:19
17;151:1;152:11;	187:1;188:2;196:2;	95:24;96:12;134:11;	63:1	circulated (1)
155:1,20,23;161:2;	201:6,13	153:22;154:2;176:14;	charge (1)	14:13
162:7,24;163:13;	CASAC's (2)	181:16	106:21	circumstance (1)
174:14;175:11;177:6,	51:2;79:10	certainly (24)	chartarum (1)	69:3
9,10,11,21;182:6;	CASC (1)	7:18;17:17;18:21;	108:12	citations (2)
183:9,15;187:6;189:9;	77:4	20:5;32:10;33:12;34:2;	charts (2)	98:23;196:8
190:11,11;194:25;	case (66)	38:4;41:25;42:10;43:3,	153:18;172:1	cite (2)
195:15,19;199:8;	4:24;9:3;10:15;	11,14,15;45:8;46:13;	Chase (73)	129:20;166:13
200:19	11:20;12:14;18:5;20:6;	64:14;66:9;70:23;	6:17;22:12,13,14,16,	cited (7)
cancer (17)	34:25;38:5;40:13,23;	115:12;134:1;139:8;	18,18;23:5;26:16,23;	83:4;99:25;100:17;
36:4;60:14;76:1;	43:22;44:10,19;45:15,	153:2;163:23	27:6;29:5,12;32:21;	132:6,10;144:23;154:5
83:8;98:2,6;118:24;	15;46:22;47:9,18,20,	certainty (1)	38:7;40:3,16,22;41:16,	citing (2)
119:5,8;123:5;127:15,	24;48:13;50:3;54:17;	68:6	18;43:22;45:6;46:11,	132:21;154:14
21;129:11,21;130:11;	55:5,19;61:2;66:9,25;	certificates (2)	20;49:18;57:22;58:2;	<b>City</b> (1)
134:16;198:20	67:2,24;69:15;72:10;	28:6,7	65:23;67:22;68:8,17;	107:17
capacity (1)	74:14,18;75:6,17;	certification (3)	73:16;78:20;86:8,16;	Civic (3)
154:19	76:16;77:15;80:15;	24:10;28:24;40:12	87:2;92:4;93:4,9;	5:20;6:5;176:11
Capitol (3)	82:14;89:16;91:20;	certifications (2)	94:20;95:7;99:8;	claim (2)
24:25,25;154:4	93:13,17,20;94:1;99:4;	32:5;40:4	101:20;105:3,21;	152:2;193:23
caption (1)	100:5;124:18;125:13;	certified (5)	107:23;108:17,19;	claimed (1)
147:11	129:23;134:5,24;	29:5,13;30:9;41:11,	112:10,19;114:3,22;	152:13
car(11)	135:1;137:13,19;	11 actors (7)	116:21;118:6,6,20;	clarification (4)
100:6,20,23;113:25;	141:11,15;154:15;	cetera (7)	126:18;128:22;135:16;	21:25;46:9;47:8;
114:1;133:24;134:5,	155:18,21;156:11;	23:9;24:3;53:14;	144:6;167:16;175:12;	105:22
11,24;135:7;138:13	161:7;191:18;194:14	82:10;88:25;89:1;	178:23;179:19;183:6;	clarifies (1)
CARB (2)	cases (9)	127:12	188:17;189:3,5;	55:14
59:4,6	9:2,2;33:12;44:14;	Chair (2)	190:18,19;202:20;	clarify (9)
<b>C-A-R-B</b> (1)	79:19;92:22;106:19,	8:4;77:2	203:4,23	25:24;36:15;37:21;
59:4	20;107:8	chairman (1)	Chase's (6)	100:25;101:17;105:13;
carbon (13)	catalyzed (2)	8:5	6:11,12;45:10;49:16;	148:9;170:15;180:21
47:20,21;48:17;	66:13;136:14	chairs (1)	51:8;194:12	clarity (1)
91:20;123:16;145:10,	catch (1)	86:21	chats (1)	179:23
12;146:5;147:14;	66:20	chance (3)	35:9	classified (1)
157:5,23;164:14;	catching (1)	13:12;114:25;118:20	check (1)	131:10
198:17	130:9	change (19)	157:19	clauses (1)
		18:4;19:15,17;20:3;		143:9
carcinogenic (6)	categories (2)		chemicals (2)	
60:17;131:11,12,17;	28:6;33:19	34:10;55:6;68:18;70:8;	60:13,17	Clean (9)
135:9,11	category (6)	75:15;76:6;104:18,21;	chest (1)	53:18;65:2,3,10,24,
Carcinogenicity (5)	34:17,18;51:1;	105:5,15,16;156:14,21;	23:9	25;66:2;67:2;82:11
130:19;133:13;	148:16;150:4,6	165:2;191:19	child (2)	cleaned (1)
134:19;146:24;160:17	caught (1)	changed (11)	35:16,23	66:15
cardiology (3)	55:10	55:2;103:18;104:14,	Childcare (1)	cleaner (6)

66:6,7,7,11,11,19 clear (9) 8:9:12:3:24:4:30:6: 33:16;67:22;77:25; 173:1;190:3 clearing (1) 132:13 clearly (3) 81:21;177:14;200:15 client (7) 104:6;107:17;110:8, 9:111:6,14,18 clients (1) 74:4 clinic (3) 23:8;32:22;38:14 clinical (7) 38:9;72:2,7,11; 83:14,18;201:12 Clinically (2) 81:2,4 close (5) 83:16;97:18;116:1; 158:20;200:8 closely (1) 88:22 closer (3) 86:13,19,19 closest (3) 91:3.10:92:17 **CME (2)** 31:17.20 **CME's** (2) 31:2.18 CO (8) 156:11;157:12,13, 21;187:23;198:9,10; 202:3 Coalition (8) 5:10,14,17;13:10,13, 15;40:25;41:1 code(2)19:14;22:3 cognizable (1) 78:18 **Cole** (12) 55:10;175:4,15,17; 176:13,19;180:23; 181:13;182:2,7; 184:15;196:11 Cole's (3) 178:24:180:23:184:4 collaborate (3) 173:11,13;175:5 collaborating (1) 175:15 colleague (1) 92:3 colleagues (1) 30:23 color (4) 159:6,10:167:4,18 colored (2)

161:9:166:24 colorful (2) 166:19:203:7 Columbia (1) 97:16 column (4) 132:25:133:4: 134:14:166:5 combination (1) 155:10 coming (5) 56:3:70:7:104:17: 122:9:191:9 comma (2) 109:9.20 comment (9) 18:22;21:18;143:21, 22,24;164:5;189:9; 190:11,12 comments (2) 164:20:183:3 commercial (1) 4:12 committee (12) 17:15;48:21;49:2,2, 3;70:7;78:25;80:17; 82:12;129:8;165:4,5 common (1) 75:18 community (2) 6:18;140:1 **Community-wide** (2) 161:22;168:3 companies (1) 44:24 company (4) 23:14,19:44:25; 85:22 comparable (3) 89:1:91:3:93:10 compare (1) 183:18 compared (1) 189:20 compares (1) 93:14 comparing (2) 51:3;178:25 comparison (1) 60:21 compelling (1) 136:5 complained (1) 62:14 complaints (1) 154:21 complete (4) 10:8;54:22;107:15; 190:16 completed (2) 12:25:25:11 completely (1) 36:24

complicated (2) 146:3:192:6 complication (2) 46:3.9 comply (2) 10:25;12:7 components (2) 36:8:122:17 compound (2) 83:21:120:17 compounds (2) 60:19;120:11 comprehensive (3) 144:8,17;145:3 conceivable (1) 81:18 conceivably (1) 142:17 concentration (7) 56:5;123:2;164:6,12; 179:8;182:15;183:13 concentrations (11) 146:1;153:22; 161:21,22;165:1; 168:3;176:22;178:24, 25;180:25;189:25 concept (6) 67:4;112:13;114:3; 135:10;139:10;195:25 concepts (1) 67:20 concern (4) 40:8;62:18;101:8; 162:9 concerned (2) 112:21;113:21 concerns (7) 40:13:53:24:109:22: 110:6:111:3:113:13.14 conclude (2) 70:13;71:5 concluded (3) 106:8;181:1;184:10 concludes (2) 176:20;182:13 conclusion (14) 40:21;62:2;68:5; 78:12;79:21;96:19; 97:5;105:21;108:24; 128:23;130:24;131:7; 177:19:184:3 conclusionary (4) 96:7.13.15.16 conclusions (17) 41:19;55:19;56:3; 58:3;61:2,6,7,17;62:1; 84:14;90:5;96:14; 100:19;103:18;104:14; 105:15;194:7 condition (3) 141:17,22;142:20 conditions (8) 33:5;35:1,10;36:13;

40:8;53:15,17;142:16 conduct (1) 47:18 conducted (3) 4:20;40:6;97:24 conducting (1) 155:7 confidentiality (1) 32:24 confirm (1) 24:19 confusing (1) 112:2 connection (5) 18:25:19:10,11:98:3; 101:17 Conrail (1) 44:23 consensus (1) 77:18 **Conservation** (4) 44:21.23:45:2.4 conservative (3) 68:25:69:2:174:2 conservatives (1) 127:14 consider (8) 18:10:42:1:45:20: 68:8;141:16,22;197:3, 6 considerably (1) 162:7 consideration (5) 18:7;29:17;82:12; 83:2;195:5 considered (10) 27:19;30:22;36:23, 24:59:21:60:4.17: 105:5;142:20;152:22 considering (2) 133:6:137:3 consistent (2) 9:5;169:17 constant (1) 10:20 constitute (7) 106:8,10;119:17; 123:21;124:8;184:12; 193:5 constraints (1) 17:18 construct (1) 4:7 **Construction** (1) 108:13 constructive (1) 53:6 consultant (6) 85:14;87:20;88:20, 21;89:1;90:3 consulted (4) 85:24,25;92:24; 107:19

**Consulting (8)** 14:10:23:11:41:20: 88:23;90:6;91:3;92:22, 23 contacted (4) 84:17;85:7;87:11; 88:3 contain (2) 14:15;122:17 contained (2) 144:11;149:20 contaminants (1) 60:15 contention (4) 177:24;194:4,5,6 context (3) 59:14;129:16;131:24 contingent (1) 94:6 continue (3) 30:19:51:7:142:24 continues (2) 12:4;147:15 continuing (5) 30:17,19;31:2,11,15 contract (1) 85:13 contrary (1) 65:17 contrast (1) 134:1 contribute (1) 57:4 contribution (1) 139:25 contributions (2) 56:14:69:11 control (5) 64:24:122:1.4.12: 125:4 controlled (1) 192:1 controls (4) 65:16;124:16;125:5, 17 controversy (1) 172:15 conversations (1) 175:6 conversely (1) 58:11 conversion (4) 170:5,8;171:13,14 conversions (2) 171:21,24 convert (2) 169:20,25 conveyed (1) 109:25 cooler (1) 9:20 COPD (2) 36:4;53:6

copies (8) 73:2;115:2;167:1,2, 3,8;203:14,18 **copy** (40) 7:19:9:13:10:3:14:2. 5,7,9;16:5;18:13,13,17; 20:7,12;21:16,21,22; 39:16:73:3.5:94:10.20, 21;95:2,7;104:4,7; 109:6;129:23;144:12; 155:1;160:1,4;163:11; 164:9,21;177:1,15,22; 203:12.14 CORDRY (59) 5:7,7;6:14,17;8:15, 19;10:19;11:2,18; 20:14,19,25;21:3,8,13; 72:17;89:18;90:13; 100:1,3;101:24;112:5; 117:10,12,18;132:22; 133:5.8,12,17,21,25; 134:9:137:8:141:13: 142:11,14;159:15,19, 22.24:166:16:167:10: 171:1,5,6,8,25;172:4; 176:1;182:25;192:5,8, 22,24;193:9;194:17; 200:13,15 Cordry's (1) 6:8 cords (1) 129:24 corner (1) 183:24 **Corporation** (1) 4:4 Corps (2) 24:23:154:3 corrected (3) 73:3:179:22:193:1 correcting (1) 182:14 correction (3) 68:19,21;71:23 corrections (1) 11:25 correctly (2) 72:8;105:17 Costco (52) 4:4;5:1,2,5,11,16; 14:3;22:11;43:23,24; 44:1;48:5,14;54:2; 56:7,9;57:4,7;58:16; 59:9;61:8;62:4,4,16; 63:6;64:12;65:1,9,24; 67:25;68:1;69:11; 84:17;85:8,14;88:3,6; 94:5;97:21;110:1; 112:20;125:7,9,20; 126:3;136:5;139:5; 141:4;144:9,18; 147:12:151:17 Costco's (1)

124:17 cough (2) 34:23:35:17 Council (5) 4:19;17:14;49:3; 126:4,5 counsel (3) 96:6;134:24;172:16 count (1) 183:18 countries (1) 59:19 country (5) 25:21;28:13;52:3,11; 80:15 County (5) 41:10;51:20;82:5; 126:4,5 couple (7) 16:13;66:17;109:7; 118:7;136:15,17; 200:21 course (12) 9:8;31:11;43:9;45:2, 4;46:4;94:8;114:5; 143:4;192:7;195:8; 201:22 courses (2) 30:17;31:12 Court (7) 77:5,12;79:4,5,7,20; 98:1 courts (1) 50:25 covers (1) 50:19 create (3) 62:15;107:9;108:1 creating (1) 107:10 credentials (1) 32:18 credits (2) 31:2,20 criteria (9) 48:12,15;49:25;56:5; 57:18;145:8;152:21; 156:15;192:16 criticized (1) 74:3 cross (1) 117:9 cross-(6) 65:16;68:16;72:24; 73:13;144:2;202:19 cross-examination (8) 12:9;65:18;72:16; 74:11;89:14;115:21; 167:12;200:10 cross-examine (5) 43:15;47:13;61:17; 137:23;138:1 crystal (1)

173:1 cube (4) 158:2;164:17; 197:13:199:11 cubed (3) 172:6;180:13;187:21 cubic (13) 57:4:103:6:169:3.21; 170:10,18;172:18; 176:23;182:16,18,20; 183:13;184:11 current (8) 8:1:37:23:38:24.24: 144:11;158:4;184:24; 197:14 currently (2) 39:24;120:24 curriculum (2) 38:8;42:5 cut (3) 38:22;89:23;153:7 cut- (1) 37:1 cut-off (1) 37:8 CV (5) 26:12;40:2,3,5;88:10 D daily (3) 164:5,11:165:1 damage (3) 81:6,7,8 data (21) 10:13;14:15,17,21, 25;15:5;16:2;20:4,20; 132:21;133:23;144:8, 10,18,20,21,25;145:2, 3.4.25 database (1) 61:1 date (5) 109:14;132:16; 146:15;156:1;165:24 dated (5) 95:13;96:1;103:11, 14;136:3 dates (2) 166:4,4 **David** (10) 44:7:85:9.11.23: 87:21;88:8;111:6; 128:12;144:21;175:14 David's (1) 88:8 day (5) 4:3;6:19;127:20; 195:8,9 days (6) 10:17,21;11:23; 14:14;15:15;159:15 DC (6)

22:19:23:10:44:24; 77:5:79:5.7 deal (1) 67:19 dealing (3) 21:5;24:1;74:4 deals (1) 12:22 dealt (1) 47:21 dearth (1) 191:15 death (1) 93:9 debate (1) 82:17 decades (3) 47:21;53:9;159:12 December (10) 15:7;54:24;103:2; 155:22;156:12;165:18, 21,22;166:6,12 decide (4) 7:13;76:23;126:1; 142:21 deciding (1) 164:18 decision (4) 4:24;8:6,21;9:4 decisions (1) 9:1 decrease (1) 168:8 defer (3) 23:2;27:4;29:20 define (6) 80:13,22;82:14; 140:1:151:15:165:11 defined (4) 112:6:129:8,17; 145:8 definition (7) 82:25;111:14,19,23; 112:3,9;129:9 definitionally (1) 82:20 definitions (1) 111:12 definitively (1) 121:4 degree (6) 25:5:43:10:59:3: 60:10:68:6:189:10 degreed (1) 43:11 deliver (1) 63:18 delivered (1) 64:12 delivering (6) 54:9,10;64:24;65:4; 75:21:137:11 delivery (5)

64:9,22;65:24; 137:15:138:19 demonstrate (4) 140:16,18,19,20 demonstrated (1) 43:6 demonstrating (1) 29:12 denial (1) 17:23 deny (1) 8:13 **Department** (2) 38:10:108:9 dependent (3) 122:25;123:2;135:19 depending (7) 17:12;31:18;52:8; 134:6,25;135:17; 195:19 depends (5) 33:1;80:14;138:3; 142:15;196:24 **Depression** (3) 34:22,24;35:7 derives (1) 53:18 describe (5) 139:18;144:10; 145:4;174:14;175:1 described (2) 25:15:150:13 describes (1) 159:11 description (1) 50:18 design (8) 64:2;66:5;75:16; 122:3;125:6;136:10, 22;139:24 designed (5) 44:21,22;53:2,22; 201:21 despite (4) 103:19;104:14; 124:15,16 detail (4) 40:16,17;69:5; 102:22 detailed (1) 17:21 detect (1) 81:19 determination (2) 184:3;201:5 determine (3) 15:6;70:24;125:1 determined (1) 52:2 determining (1) 172:14 develop (3)

12:4;54:3;162:16

PETITION OF COSICO	WHOLESALE CORPO	KATION		
developing (3)	directly (2)	100:9	131:4	during (2)
54:1;129:11;173:14	114:23;202:21	distant (2)	doubt (2)	78:25;92:12
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
development (1)	director (2)	162:2;168:7	156:9;162:14	duties (2)
51:16	175:18;186:17	distinction (3)	down (4)	24:17,19
developments (2)	disagree (3)	36:19;37:19;93:24	116:1;120:18;	duty (4)
38:25;39:22	7:15;77:16;139:6	District (3)	142:11;174:4	24:1,2,13,18
devices (5)	disagreed (1)	31:6;93:1;98:1	downward (2)	
66:12,17;122:12;	79:19	districts (1)	104:15,24	E
136:16,19	disagreement (1)	92:24	Dr (133)	
diabetes (1)	135:23	divide (3)	5:13,15;6:11,12,17;	earlier (18)
36:7	disagreements (1)	170:24;171:4,4	22:11,13;23:5;26:16,	13:12;54:25;68:22,
diameter (1)	52:21	divided (2)	23;27:4,6;29:3,5,12;	23;80:25;82:11;
48:19	disappointed (1)	55:13;181:8	32:21;35:6;36:20;38:7;	129:18;135:16;136:8,
diesel (77)	110:24	dividing (2)	39:7;40:1,3,16,22;41:4,	22;137:6;150:11;
62:13,15,19;63:6,13,	disciplines (2)	70:9;172:7	16,18;43:22;44:6,6;	152:5;157:16;164:25;
16;64:6,8,9;65:2,3,10,	52:3,12	division (1)	45:5,9;46:4,8,11,20;	185:2,25;196:15
25,25;66:3,5,5,13;67:3,	discovered (1)	175:18	49:16,18;51:8;55:10;	early (3)
	161:1	docket (1)	57:22;58:2;65:23;	
10;75:15,21,22,23,24,				99:17;158:21;175:14
25;76:7;98:2,12;99:24;	discrepancy (1)	196:7	67:22;68:8,17;73:14,	easier (1)
100:17;101:8,11,12;	196:11	doctor (3)	16;78:20;79:4,14;86:8,	120:20
106:21;107:17;121:3,	discuss (3)	80:13;100:2,3	16;87:2;90:1;92:4;	ed (1)
4,5,6,7,8,9,12,13;130:6,	173:5,6,10	doctors (1)	93:4,9;94:20,25;95:7,	35:9
10,19;131:10;132:24;	discussed (3)	73:21	17;97:8;98:11,23,25;	edited (1)
133:1,9,12,15,18,18;	48:13;80:17;185:2	doctor's (1)	99:8,9,10,21,25,25;	95:6
134:2,18;135:25;	discussing (1)	49:15	100:4,16;101:14,19,20;	Editors (1)
136:10,15,16;137:5,6,	109:24	doctrinaire (1)	102:4,10;105:3,21;	108:14
11,13,14,17;138:5,7,9,	discussion (25)	12:11	107:23;108:17,19;	education (5)
14,14,19;139:3;	20:16;27:2;45:9,25;	document (15)	110:11;112:10,12,19;	30:17,20;31:2,11,15
146:24;160:17	65:11;82:17;86:17;	56:21,23,24;57:1;	114:3,8,22;115:20;	educational (1)
diesels (1)	95:5;104:5;110:4;	60:3;84:13;115:18;	116:21;117:16,21;	26:11
136:12	114:20;115:19;126:25;	165:6;166:18;167:5;	118:4,6,6,20;126:18;	effect (14)
difference (12)	129:25;144:14;149:8;	169:18;177:1,2;178:6;	128:21;130:3;135:11,	6:12;7:8;45:21;
29:17,19;37:9;58:12;	157:20;159:8;176:9;	190:18	16;142:24;144:6;	48:10;62:3;71:13;72:2,
64:16;70:10,16;72:1;	178:21;179:25;195:12;	documentation (1)	153:14;167:16;175:4,	8,11;81:11;134:23;
93:25;125:10;132:4;	197:9;199:21;202:10	189:6	12,15,17;176:13,19;	135:15;166:9;177:10
189:21	discussions (2)	documents (5)	178:23,24;179:19;	effective (4)
different (19)	43:2;196:8	48:1;62:24;115:4;	180:23,23;181:13;	107:17;134:18;
41:6;65:15;76:22;	disease (8)	172:14;185:13	182:2,7;183:6;184:4;	156:5;158:22
77:16;79:18;93:11;	30:10,11;31:23;36:7;	domestic (1)	188:17;189:3,5;	effects (22)
95:21;104:12;108:24;	53:6;83:5;162:10,18	44:11	190:18,18;194:12;	45:18;67:25;69:10;
143:9;155:1,5;179:5,5;	diseases (2)	done (24)	202:20;203:4,23	80:12,12;90:22;106:8;
181:18;182:5;192:19;	36:3;98:6	18:19,20;19:23;	draft (1)	130:5;134:6,11;135:1,
198:6.7	disk (11)	35:11;38:17;43:4;51:3;	54:21	8,9,11,19;137:13;
,				
difficult (3)	14:2,7,13,16,17,19,	55:3;67:23;73:7,9;	draw (1)	142:17;153:9;159:11;
11:23;29:20;78:15	23;15:5;16:1,4,10	80:16;87:7;88:9,22;	45:14	162:25;163:6;184:25
difficulty (1)	disorders (2)	99:6;106:4;132:2,12;	drawing (1)	eight (4)
134:18	35:5;161:11	140:5;143:13,16;	77:7	42:7;91:17,17;195:7
dioxide (18)	dispersal (1)	172:1;200:16	drawn (2)	either (10)
48:17;55:12;123:24;	114:7	door (1)	147:16;176:20	18:14;20:11;34:9;
124:1,3;145:10,13;	dispersion (9)	50:10	drilled (1)	65:18;85:24;135:5;
148:10;149:11,13;	69:16,16;70:12;	dosage (4)	139:11	146:15;154:5;169:4;
158:3;160:13;161:2;	71:12;151:6;152:15,	134:6,25;135:17,19	driver (1)	176:4
164:22;167:17;189:25;	21;153:1,10	dosages (1)	75:14	elaborate (5)
199:1,14	disposition (4)	134:11	drop (1)	23:22;24:14;36:10;
dire (7)	6:8,25;7:5;8:2	<b>Dose</b> (11)	89:11	38:4;51:17
26:23;39:21;40:19;	dispute (4)	58:6,10,11;121:21,	dropped (1)	elderly (2)
89:11,13;93:20;143:18	134:7;176:24;177:7;	23;122:25;139:11,12,	157:10	53:5;83:4
DIRECT (4)	193:14	15,17;187:17	DUCKETT (2)	Eleanor (1)
23:3;83:15;89:9,23	disputed (3)	<b>DOT</b> (1)	5:19,19	5:19
directed (2)	134:5,10,24	107:20	due (1)	electronic (3)
89:15;135:11	disputes (1)	double (2)	29:18	10:2;73:3;203:18
direction (2)	59:5	117:20;157:19	duplicate (3)	elements (2)
165:10;170:11	disputing (1)	double-sided (1)	14:9,11;115:6	131:16;179:9

elicits (1) 78:17 else (7) 5:23;23:22;87:7; 93:7:113:12:196:7; 203:16 elsewhere (1) 170:3 e-mail (5) 6:10,14;16:25;73:1, 12 e-mailed (4) 13:3,7;14:14;21:20 e-mails (1) 21:19 emergency (3) 36:14;161:24;168:5 emission (3) 124:16;125:5,17 emissions (40) 54:2,5,6;56:9,17; 57:1;58:2,17;63:10.13; 64:8;67:10;92:19;98:4, 5,5,12,15;99:24;100:6, 20,23;101:12,13; 119:14;121:2,5,9,10, 11,11;122:5,11,16,17; 133:24;135:18,18; 138:13;179:9 emitting (1) 75:23 emphysema (3) 36:4:53:5:83:5 employed (3) 70:7;85:24,25 employee (1) 154:21 employees (4) 112:20;113:7,11; 190:21 employer (1) 24:18 employment (1) 25:14 empowered (1) 8:1 end (4) 33:2;34:14;134:21; 196:16 endeavor (1) 10:25 ended (3) 77:3,4,11 endorse (1) 13:16 ends (1) 126:13 enforced (1) 59:19 engagements (1) 92:23 engine (15) 67:10;75:15;130:19,

20,22;131:11,12;133:1, 3.12:137:6:138:20: 146:24,24;160:18 engineering (1) 85:23 Engineers (2) 24:23:154:3 engines (15) 66:5;130:6;132:2,13, 24;133:15,18,19,24; 134:3;136:10,16,23; 137:8;138:23 England (2) 39:15,18 enough (14) 10:24;53:3;58:10,11; 83:16;99:5;121:23; 123:7,9,13;158:20; 162:16;185:2,7 enter (1) 17:1 entire (2) 126:11:158:24 entirely (1) 96:3 entirety (3) 102:14,15;156:7 entitled (3) 14:9;65:19;150:23 enumerated (1) 119:12 environment (1) 182:22 **Environmental (22)** 14:9;16:2;23:25; 24:2,11;26:6,17,20,22; 27:10,18;28:12;30:21, 23:38:25:39:17:41:19: 42:12;43:7;85:23;86:1; 139:10 environments (1) 183:15 EPA (78) 12:22;48:2,13,21; 50:1,2;51:15;52:9,10, 16;53:16;58:21;59:6, 21;60:6;69:15;77:2; 79:2;80:18;81:22; 103:3,19;104:14,18; 106:1;107:20;108:22; 126:4,5;145:8;146:3,4, 9;156:2,19;158:8; 159:12;160:12,21,25; 162:24;163:4;166:9; 167:24;168:10,13; 169:6;175:17;178:11; 181:2;183:5;184:22; 185:23;186:1,1,2,6,9, 17,23,25;188:4;190:1, 5.5:191:8.15.25; 196:16;197:3,18,21,23; 198:13;201:2,4,9; 202:12

EPA's(5)159:3:165:17: 182:17;184:24;189:20 epidemiology (1) 52:5 epi-studies (1) 134:17 **EPM** (1) 200:6 equate (1) 72:2 equipment (1) 67:10 equipped (1) 66:12 equivalent (1) 27:17 Erich (2) 5:1;87:24 error (4) 55:9;182:11.15; 191:23 especially (1) 10:14 essence (4) 82:24;97:24;100:16; 119:2 essential (1) 80:9 essentially (3) 90:3:182:23:192:9 establish (5) 29:7:32:17:142:9; 170:4:196:18 established (3) 89:4;162:24;177:2 establishes (1) 185:14 estimate (5) 25:22:33:6:46:22; 199:8,10 estimates (3) 55:15;56:4;163:4 estimations (1) 127:15 et (7) 23:9;24:3;53:14; 82:10;88:25;89:1; 127:11 ethyl (1) 150:1 evaluate (3) 35:16;37:8;152:21 evaluated (1) 134:20 evaluation (2) 34:18;78:22 even (6) 46:14;67:8;105:17; 106:3;115:25;162:15 event (6) 8:24;9:7;20:6;21:16; 65:13;96:10

eventually (3) 24:17:171:9:186:4 everybody (6) 10:7;12:12;43:25; 50:19;73:2;138:18 everybody's (2) 44:2,4 everyone (2) 88:24;91:2 everywhere (3) 152:17;158:17,18 evidence (12) 4:22;18:4;19:17; 20:10;40:6;43:12; 65:17;134:19;137:4, 18;194:8,19 Evidently (1) 149:24 evolved (1) 70:25 exact (3) 69:1;96:10;171:11 exactly (9) 24:14;28:19;56:16; 89:22;96:20;111:11; 112:14;128:2;135:22 exam (1) 23:9 **EXAMINATION (7)** 23:3:43:18:68:17: 72:25;73:14;144:3; 202:20 examine (2) 12:14:65:17 Examiner (3) 4:22;9:1;176:12 Examiner's (1) 13:18 example (14) 34:11,14:44:20:57:2; 76:24;77:15,21;82:3; 92:17;98:23;107:16; 122:19;169:24;180:3 examples (3) 47:16;53:15;83:3 exams (1) 33:15 exceed (5) 50:1;181:1;182:16; 187:21;191:25 exceedance (9) 69:18;70:20;72:1,7; 83:13,17;161:16; 164:19;184:21 exceedances (5) 70:2;71:6,10,12,13 exceeded (7) 48:14:61:22:77:22: 157:24;158:2;191:7,9 except (1) 71:23 exception (11) 4:6;17:23;19:16;

48:7:56:18:97:20: 124:18:141:18:142:21: 146:5:150:13 exchanges (1) 6:5 exclusively (1) 40:15 excuse (6) 35:3;62:4;97:5; 126:3;130:9;136:18 exercise (1) 83:22 exhaust (28) 35:3:40:9:66:14: 76:7;106:21;107:17; 119:13;121:6;123:18, 20,25;124:4,7;130:20, 22;131:11,12,16;133:1, 3,12;134:5,11,16,19; 135:8;136:11;146:25 exhausts (2) 134:25:160:18 Exhibit (44) 6:5,8,10,13;9:17,21, 23;11:19;13:8,20;16:1; 26:15;38:8;41:8;42:5; 94:16;96:7;97:8; 102:13;103:12,13,14; 124:12;146:25,25; 147:2;160:7,11,12; 165:7,12,19:166:19: 167:16:168:23:169:14: 170:16:179:24:183:22, 22:184:2.4.4:185:20 exhibitize (1) 15:11 exhibits (5) 11:21,25;203:3,10, 15 existing (7) 97:19;124:17;125:5, 18,18,19;162:18 expand (1) 99:2 expect (9) 83:20;110:23; 115:23;139:13,15; 184:25;185:3,7,9 expectation (1) 168:6 experience (12) 37:19;40:7;45:14; 67:23;90:3,6,7,25; 91:4;94:3;97:11;162:7 experimental (1) 133:14 expert (50) 25:16,23,25;26:16, 17;40:11,22;41:5,10, 11,12,13,14,25;42:2, 11,13,17,23,25;43:6,8, 11,14,16,17;67:9;78:9; 82:15;89:5,7,14;

107:25;112:8;125:12; 131:21:136:16:137:4. factors (2) 21:138:8,9:139:9: 60:14.14 143:18;152:1,2;153:9; facts (2) 174:9;177:2;190:15; 196:21 factual (2) expertise (15) 26:2;40:20;43:5; faculty (1) 44:1;67:9;88:3;125:13; 25:12 138:22;152:13,14,20, fail (1) 22;153:11;174:6;188:1 74:6 experts (9) fair (10) 42:8,10;43:9;52:2, 10,12;59:6;135:23; 198:7 explain (7) 200:12 75:19;93:12;96:22; fairly (4) 126:18;127:17;128:16; 19 181:12 explained (1) fairness (7) 185:25 exposed (3) 127:20;162:16;200:7 fall (6) exposure (11) 35:2;75:25;106:23; 121:18;126:13;129:12; falling (2) 139:14;161:2,20; 188:3;198:19 familiar (14) exposures (6) 162:2,3,7,9;163:5; 168:2 express (1) 152:5 families (1) expressed (2) 34:15 109:22;183:19 Fannie (3) expression (1) 187:8 far (5) extensively (2) 11:7:44:9 **FBI** (4) extent (10) 12:5;32:14;46:16; 78:6,10;79:24;90:6,25; 154:4 107:10;137:7 February (2) extra (2) 104:4;159:5 Federal (17) extracts (2) 133:2,13 extrapolated (1) 145:25 190:20 F fee (1) 94:5 feedback (2) fact (29) 7:4;32:21;43:14; feel (5) 70:8;76:6;77:17,18,19; 78:1,11;79:19,21; 83:17,19;87:11;93:19, 23;100:17;101:19; feeling (1) 103:19;104:14;125:7; 102:17 132:1;138:25;140:17; fellows (1) 141:17;168:1;181:25; 38:15 183:16 felt (3)

61:2:171:13 feral (2) few (6) 93:17:125:13 field (10) 195:11.13 fields (5) 43:6,17 11:11;12:12;37:14; 46:10,14;107:10; 165:5 116:21;120:21;160:6; figure (8) 12:14;92:25;132:18, 199:13 file (7) 12:8;139:1;143:24; 153:6,8,11;177:5 filed (25) 33:18;34:17;45:21; 101:7;150:4,6 175:23;176:1 files (2) 4:3;28:7,10;29:23; 35:8;43:25;59:11;60:6; 65:25;67:4;68:23;69:4, filing (5) 20:155:11 filings (5) 24:24;108:7;154:4 filling (3) 59:1;62:21;87:7; 195:6;200:7 95:3 filters (5) 24:24;34:10,14; 23 final (5) 156:4:160:12 166:13 find (12) 24:22;48:1;76:16; 105:11;107:19;155:19. 21;156:1,8,18;158:3, 25;159:7;186:3,11,18; finder (1) 43:14 190:24;195:3 fine (12) 24:17;35:25;37:16; 163:5;195:3 finely (1) 112:11 finish (3) 75:5;99:3;139:18

30:11;31:24 44:25;48:2;95:23; 134:17;142:25;200:19 26:2,17;28:17,18; 35:9:36:22:41:12.13, 14;164:5 24:10;26:3;30:14; fighting (1) 80:4;100:10;151:11, 12,19;171:12;177:11; 10:5;17:4;20:20,22, 23;32:4;129:20 6:25;9:2;15:4;17:13, 20;19:6,24,25;20:24, 25;21:5,11;46:11; 62:25;73:4;76:10;98:1; 99:7,8,12,17,22; 102:23;176:12;194:5 107:16:118:8 13:9.13:15:17: 101:19;103:18 6:4,8,14;43:2;99:9 4:8;41:21,24 filmed (1) 66:13,14,20;136:15, 8:6,21;9:1;68:8; 44:16;49:15;106:13; 149:9;150:17;156:19, 22;161:15;177:18; 185:11,18;187:6 finding (3) 7:4;55:22;149:3 27:3;30:1;38:6; 76:13;78:14;91:13; 93:21;94:9;118:14,16; 119:5;132:20 46:24;163:21;175:12

finishes (1) 133:18 firm (2) 79:17:175:19 first (34) 10:10;25:9;26:25; 27:3;33:20;62:16;71:4; 86:2:87:18:99:17; 101:4;109:8,11,13,19, 20;116:12,15;124:13, 13;125:16;126:14; 130:2;132:25;133:10; 144:19;156:12;164:14; 167:24;174:1,1; 194:12,13;199:22 fit (3) 24:13;34:25;200:13 fitness (1) 24:1fits (1) 20:5 five (20) 18:1;26:8;36:22; 42:7;52:14;54:21; 80:19,19,19;97:10; 145:12;156:15,17,20, 22;157:4;167:2;186:2; 189:18:200:14 five-year (1) 78:24 flashy (3) 159:10:160:11.11 flipside (4) 159:10:161:9: 165:14;167:23 floor (1) 4:18 Florence (1) 108:12 flow (1) 114:7 Flvnn (3) 41:14;112:1;117:11 focus (3) 73:11;119:2;193:8 focused (2) 192:25;193:7 focusing (1) 76:4 folder (5) 92:4,5,6;94:24;102:8 folks (2) 64:8:136:10 follow (2) 77:6;143:22 followed (1) 54:23 following (7) 25:12;30:8;31:20; 33:19;34:22;36:3; 83:13 follows (1) 41:17

force (2) 48:24:59:18 forced (1) 126:3 forget (4) 66:16;160:23; 183:23;203:18 forgot (1) 81:17 form (5) 45:14;47:17;48:4; 146:23:172:25 formal (4) 6:23;7:22;20:16; 102:9 Formaldehyde (2) 121:20,23 formally (3) 8:24;17:1,1 forming (2) 44:19:59:22 formula (4) 171:20,21;172:11,15 formulates (1) 186:15 formulating (1) 52:13 Fort (1) 108:13 forth (6) 11:24;12:1;41:19; 74:9:137:18:192:13 forward (3) 66:6:73:4:139:23 fossil (1) 135:25 found (8) 23:19;95:24;108:1; 119:13;150:20;155:14; 172:5;185:20 founder (1) 23:18 four (6) 7:3;23:9;42:7; 119:11;146:6;167:2 fourth (3) 99:18;164:5,11 fourth-hand (1) 176:5 fractions (1) 140:7 frame (2) 33:2;78:16 frames (1) 100:9 free (1) 59:2 Freeman (1) 7:20 frequently (1) 36:23 Friday (8) 4:17;6:21;10:3;16:8,

factor (2)

19;202:24,25;203:25				
	gave (7)	68:12,14;70:19;71:8,	39:3,7,12,13,20;40:2,	22,24;166:4,11,17,21,
front (12)	82:13;89:16;130:16;	10;73:1;81:25;82:2;	18,24;41:1;42:1,4,16,	23,25;167:8,11,21;
50:10;93:2,2;104:3;	144:12;153:22;169:12;	87:24;89:3;120:17;	20,23;43:1,20;45:5,11;	169:9,14;170:2,5,7,20;
114:14;128:2;129:15;	198:5	126:6;131:18;169:8;	46:2,4,8,18;47:1,3,6,	171:3,7,10,16,19;
132:25;154:10;159:10;	general (31)	176:25;183:6,8;202:22	10,12;49:7,13,15,23;	172:3,10,13,20,25;
170:16;203:4	4:12;27:11,14,17,21,	Goecke's (1)	50:4,12,15;51:6;54:4;	173:2;175:9,20;176:2,
fuel (17)	24;28:4,6,24;29:8,9,15,	7:15	55:1,23;56:11,15,20,	6;177:5,21;178:1,4;
54:10;63:6,18;64:6,	24;30:3,15;33:3;34:18;	goes (14)	22;57:9,13,16,20,22;	179:23;182:4,12;
7,12;66:6,19;75:21,22,	40:4;41:22;45:18;49:5,	38:23;40:18;41:15;	61:12,15;62:6,20;	183:2,8,21,24;184:1,7;
25;98:2;136:12;	6,20;53:3;97:7;112:2;	46:16;66:14;67:15;	63:15,20,23;64:9,19,	185:6;186:20;188:17,
137:12,13,14;138:20	118:23;153:14;181:15,	89:13;125:12;133:17;	25;65:7,12;67:12,16;	20,25;189:4,8,11,15,
fuels (4)	22;202:12	136:22,23;139:23;	68:13,15;69:7,14,22;	17,22;190:9,13,22;
132:2;133:14;	generally (5)	142:12;178:24	70:11,19,23;71:9,11,	191:3,11,21;192:7,14,
135:25;136:23	117:20;150:14;	Good (23)	18;72:3,6,10,14,19,21,	23;193:7,12,22;194:1,
full (6)	162:3;168:2;201:2	5:2,4,11,13;12:1;	24;73:10,13,23;74:6;	3,16,22;195:13,18;
22:17;24:16,19;	generate (3)	23:5;27:6,8;31:17;	76:12,20;77:19,23;	197:20,25;198:2,4;
144:7,19;162:22	92:19;96:2;133:14	32:16;34:11,14;53:15;	78:8,15;79:12,16,22;	199:7,12,16;200:3,8,
full-time (2)	generated (1)	106:1;115:25;130:16;	80:3,6,21;82:18,22,25;	12,17,23,25;202:16,18,
25:12;38:19	54:7	151:22;161:12;168:24;	84:6,8,20,23;85:2,4;	24;203:1,3,7,9,13,23,
fumes (6)	gentleman (2)	169:25;190:11;194:9;	86:7,12,18,23;87:15;	25
40:9;62:13,14;75:23,	91:15;189:5	202:16	89:3,6,13,18,25;90:10,	ground (1)
25;134:6	geographically (1)	govern (1)	12;91:5,11,14,25;92:3,	24:2
functioning (1)	158:16	155:17	12;93:4,7,11,21;94:12,	grounds (1)
67:10	George (4)	governing (1)	15,18,21,25;95:2,6,17;	41:6
fundamentally (1)	25:13;31:4;38:10;	154:2	96:9,16,19,24;98:9,14;	Group (5)
90:2	39:24	Government (2)	99:14,21;100:2,4,12,	51:4;52:2;131:10,11,
furnished (1)	Georgetown (1)	23:11;44:25	15,25;101:2,4,10,14,	13
20:7	25:11	governs (1)	15,16,23,25;102:10;	groups (4)
further (10)	geriatric (2)	71:3	103:13,23,24;104:4,6;	76:17;77:16;79:18;
19:2,5,11,25;37:22;	30:9;31:22	graduated (2)	105:1,8,12,20,24;	162:10
39:23;58:14;68:12;	germane (2)	143:3;174:7	106:5,15,17,25;107:4,	GSA (3)
143:24;194:5	175:11;176:8	grand (3)	13,21;108:4,6,8,16;	24:25;108:13;154:5
Furthermore (2)	gets (4)	31:3,3,10	109:14,16;110:10,13,	guarantee (1)
40:10,13	80:18;146:2;180:11;	grant (1)	15,18,20,22,25;111:17,	167:4
future (1)	192:5	8:2	20,22;112:4,6,16,17;	guess (27)
141:21	Gifts (1)	granted (2)	113:2,10,14,16;114:13,	8:10;16:23;17:13;
		90.22.190.25		
a	107:18	89:23;180:25	16;115:4,8,12,16,20,	39:17;55:15;66:4;69:7;
G	given (16)	graph (1)	24;116:5,8,11,14,19,	79:4,24;87:3;100:15;
	<b>given (16)</b> 15:15;20:6;22:6;	<b>graph (1)</b> 159:6	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12;
Gang (2)	<b>given (16)</b> 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1)	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14;
<b>Gang (2)</b> 41:9;111:25	<b>given (16)</b> 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9,	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23;
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61)	<b>given (16)</b> 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1)	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10;
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1)	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21;
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5,	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555)	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3)	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13,	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24; 127:2,5,7,11,24;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15,	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24; 127:2,5,7,11,24; 128:10,17;129:2;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1)	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23;	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24; 127:2,5,7,11,24; 128:10,17;129:2; 130:3;131:3,5,20;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6,	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24; 127:2,5,7,11,24; 128:10,17;129:2; 130:3;131:3,5,20; 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1)	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16;	24;116:5,8,11,14,19, 21,23;117:5,6,7,15,25; 118:3,9,12,15,17; 120:1,6,8,20;121:7,9, 13;122:6,10;123:9,12; 124:3,22;125:10,14,25; 126:7,10,15,21,24; 127:2,5,7,11,24; 128:10,17;129:2; 130:3;131:3,5,20; 132:7,10;133:5,11,16, 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5,8,11,14,19,\\ 21,23;117;5,6,7,15,25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6,8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13;122:6,10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15,21,24;\\ 127:2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5,20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135:6,15;136:7,18,20, \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82)	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7;15;25;\\ 118;3,9;12,15;17;\\ 120:1;6;8;20;121;7;9,\\ 13;122;6;10;123;9;12;\\ 124;3;22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126;7;10,15;21;24;\\ 127;2;5;7;11;24;\\ 128:10,17;129;2;\\ 130;3;131:3;5;20;\\ 132:7;10;133:5;11,16,\\ 20;22;134:4;10,13;22;\\ 135:6;15;136;7;18;20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138:3;21;\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11,	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7,15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7;9,\\ 13;122;6;10;123;9,12;\\ 124;3;22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15;21;24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11;24;\\ 128:10,17;129;2;\\ 130;3;131:3,5;20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134;4,10,13;22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18;20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138;3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7;15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7;9,\\ 13;122:6;10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15;21;24;\\ 127:2,5;7,11;24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5;20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135:6,15;136:7,18;20,\\ 25;137:2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139:8,13,15;140:3,9,\\ 18,23;141:7,10,15,25;\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24;	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7;15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7;9,\\ 13;122:6;10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15;21;24;\\ 127:2,5;7,11;24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5;20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13;22;\\ 135:6;15;136:7,18;20,\\ 25;137:2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139:8;13,15;140:3,9,\\ 18,23;141:7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6;13,15;143:8,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7,	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10,	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7;15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7;9,\\ 13;122:6;10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15;21,24;\\ 127:2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5,20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135:6,15;136:7,18,20,\\ 25;137:2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139:8,13,15;140:3,9,\\ 18,23;141:7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143:8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12,	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24;	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7,15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13;122:6;10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15;21,24;\\ 127:2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5,20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135:6,15;136:7,18,20,\\ 25;137:2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139:8,13,15;140:3,9,\\ 18,23;141:7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143:8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ 146:18,22;148:8,13,16,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23;	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7,15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120:1,6;8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13;122:6;10;123:9,12;\\ 124:3,22;125:10,14,25;\\ 126:7,10,15;21,24;\\ 127:2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130:3;131:3,5,20;\\ 132:7,10;133:5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135:6,15;136:7,18,20,\\ 25;137:2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139:8,13,15;140:3,9,\\ 18,23;141:7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143:8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ 146:18,22;148:8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149:2,18;150:17,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1) 108:13
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24 gasoline (16)	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14; 49:7,11,14,17,24;51:7,	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23; 23:1;25:24;26:2,16,19,	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7,15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120;1,6;8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13;122;6,10;123;9,12;\\ 124;3,22;125;10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15;21,24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129;2;\\ 130;3;131:3,5,20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18,20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ 18,23;141;7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143:8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ 146;18,22;148;8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149;2,18;150;17,\\ 20,25;151:3,6,8,18,24;\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24 gasoline (16) 54:9;67:10;101:9,12;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14; 49:7,11,14,17,24;51:7, 11,12;54:15;55:25;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23; 23:1;25:24;26:2,16,19, 22,25;27:12;29:1,6,7,	$\begin{array}{c} 24,116;5,8,11,14,19,\\ 21,23,117;5,6,7,15,25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120;1,6,8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13,122;6,10,123;9,12;\\ 124;3,22;125;10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15,21,24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128;10,17;129;2;\\ 130;3;131;3,5,20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134;4,10,13,22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18,20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138;3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ 18,23;141;7,10,15,25;\\ 142;2,6,13,15;143;8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144;2;\\ 146;18,22;148;8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149;2,18;150;17,\\ 20,25;151;3,6,8,18,24;\\ 152;3,7,10,12,19,24;\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1) 108:13 H
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24 gasoline (16) 54:9;67:10;101:9,12; 130:19,22;131:12,16;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14; 49:7,11,14,17,24;51:7, 11,12;54:15;55:25; 56:1,13,17;57:11,15,	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23; 23:1;25:24;26:2,16,19, 22,25;27:12;29:1,6,7, 14,18,21;30:25;32:4,6,	$\begin{array}{c} 24,116;5,8,11,14,19,\\ 21,23,117;5,6,7,15,25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120;1,6,8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13,122;6,10,123;9,12;\\ 124;3,22;125;10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15,21,24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130;3;131;3,5,20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18,20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ 18,23;141;7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143;8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ 146;18,22;148;8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149;2,18;150;17,\\ 20,25;151;3,6,8,18,24;\\ 152:3,7,10,12,19,24;\\ 153:6;156;24;159;14,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1) 108:13 H half (7)
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24 gasoline (16) 54:9;67:10;101:9,12; 130:19,22;131:12,16; 133:2;134:16,19;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14; 49:7,11,14,17,24;51:7, 11,12;54:15;55:25; 56:1,13,17;57:11,15, 18;58:1;61:20;62:8,10;	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23; 23:1;25:24;26:2,16,19, 22,25;27:12;29:1,6,7, 14,18,21;30:25;32:4,6, 10,14;33:22,24;34:24;	$\begin{array}{c} 24;116;5;8;11,14,19,\\ 21;23;117;5;6;7,15;25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120;1,6;8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13;122;6,10;123;9,12;\\ 124;3,22;125;10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15;21,24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129;2;\\ 130;3;131;3,5;20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18,20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ 18,23;141;7,10,15,25;\\ 142;2,6,13,15;143;8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144;2;\\ 146;18,22;148;8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149;2,18;150;17,\\ 20,25;151;3,6,8,18,24;\\ 152:3,7,10,12,19,24;\\ 153:6;156;24;159;14,\\ 16,21,23;160;3,6,10,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1) 108:13 H half (7) 31:25;32:1;92:21,23;
Gang (2) 41:9;111:25 Gas (61) 5:11,16;48:5,14; 49:9,19;50:5,21;54:2,5, 7;56:7,9,10;57:4; 58:16;61:8;62:4,4; 63:7,11,16;64:7,24; 65:4,9;67:25;68:1; 69:12,17;71:20;75:20; 81:19;84:18;88:25; 91:1;93:10,15;111:9; 112:21;113:6,8,10,11, 20;121:24;122:5,7; 124:24;125:18;136:5; 139:22;141:5;142:7, 11;144:9,18;146:11; 151:17;160:18;189:24 gasoline (16) 54:9;67:10;101:9,12; 130:19,22;131:12,16;	given (16) 15:15;20:6;22:6; 31:16;44:3,6;69:23,25; 75:20;88:16,18;89:8,9; 104:11;115:2;191:16 gives (1) 55:15 giving (3) 14:13;68:25;183:20 glad (1) 197:1 goal (1) 12:15 Goecke (82) 5:4,4,6;6:10;7:9; 9:11,14,16,25;10:2,5; 14:6,8,11,22;22:11,14; 23:1,2,4;26:1,3,7,10, 14,21;43:20,21;45:12, 13;46:17,19;47:2,14; 49:7,11,14,17,24;51:7, 11,12;54:15;55:25; 56:1,13,17;57:11,15,	graph (1) 159:6 graphs (1) 153:15 great (1) 13:1 GROSSMAN (555) 4:2,21;5:3,6,12,13, 15,18,21,23;6:1;7:7,15, 17,21,24;8:8,10,18,23; 9:7,12,15,17;10:1,4,6, 11,23;11:3,6,11,16; 12:5,16,17,20;13:1,3,6, 8,14,17,22,24,25;14:7, 24;15:11,20,23;16:1,3, 6,9,13,15,20,23;17:6, 10,25;18:9,12,16,24; 19:10,19,22;20:13,18, 22;21:2,7,10,15,24; 22:3,9,13,16,20,23; 23:1;25:24;26:2,16,19, 22,25;27:12;29:1,6,7, 14,18,21;30:25;32:4,6,	$\begin{array}{c} 24,116;5,8,11,14,19,\\ 21,23,117;5,6,7,15,25;\\ 118;3,9,12,15,17;\\ 120;1,6,8,20;121;7,9,\\ 13,122;6,10,123;9,12;\\ 124;3,22;125;10,14,25;\\ 126;7,10,15,21,24;\\ 127;2,5,7,11,24;\\ 128:10,17;129:2;\\ 130;3;131;3,5,20;\\ 132;7,10;133;5,11,16,\\ 20,22;134:4,10,13,22;\\ 135;6,15;136;7,18,20,\\ 25;137;2,10;138:3,21;\\ 139;8,13,15;140;3,9,\\ 18,23;141;7,10,15,25;\\ 142:2,6,13,15;143;8,\\ 11,14,17,23;144:2;\\ 146;18,22;148;8,13,16,\\ 19,24;149;2,18;150;17,\\ 20,25;151;3,6,8,18,24;\\ 152:3,7,10,12,19,24;\\ 153:6;156;24;159;14,\\ \end{array}$	79:4,24;87:3;100:15; 101:7;102:1;105:12; 113:7;114:1;117:14; 123:22;132:14;134:23; 150:21;165:5;166:10; 188:25;190:14;191:21; 192:2 guessing (1) 55:10 guide (3) 160:13,21;167:17 guidelines (5) 59:12,14,17,19,22 gun (1) 166:9 guy (1) 44:22 gym (1) 108:13 H half (7)

14:4;22:20;41:16; 43:25;92:7;93:20; 135:5;160:7,23;181:23 handed (2) 115:4;177:14 handing (1) 14:4 hands (1) 6:3 happen (3) 111:2;143:6;161:4 happened (5) 7:10;18:7;19:13; 138:5;169:11 happily (1) 22:9 happy (4) 37:4;162:13;163:17; 190:8 hard (2) 39:16;87:4 hardly (1) 44:1 harm (1) 81:20 harmful (2) 58:10;80:10 HARRIS (35) 5:2,2;10:11;11:14; 14:5:16:3,7:18:13,15, 23;22:24,25;23:2;73:1, 8.11:74:2:87:24:96:22. 25;100:25;101:3,5,15, 16,17;104:7;111:4,25; 117:6,8,23;135:2,4; 203:22 hazard (6) 107:10:108:1: 182:21;183:14;184:5, 12 hazardous (1) 101:12 hazards (1) 135:25 head (7) 21:11;102:20,21; 141:14;150:14,21; 175:18 Headquarters (1) 108:10 health (111) 17:23;23:15,17; 32:25;33:10;41:22; 45:18,21;46:6,7,12; 48:5;49:20;50:6,17,22; 52:1,25;58:8,16,22; 59:11;61:10,14;62:3, 15;67:18,25;69:10; 70:3,17;71:14,14,20; 72:2,7,11:81:11:83:14, 18,20,20;84:21,21,25; 86:1;90:22;97:7,16; 101:12;106:8,11;

107:10;108:2;112:22; 119:17.22:120:4.12.13. 14,16,23,25;121:18; 122:23:123:21:124:9. 11;125:15;131:21; 134:6,11,23;135:1,8, 15,18;136:13;137:1,4, 5;138:4,10,12,24; 139:4,12,19,22,25; 140:19,21;153:9; 159:11;161:19;162:25; 163:6;182:21;183:14; 184:5,12,25;191:14,19; 193:6,10,12,21;194:18; 201:21 health-based (6) 201:18,23;202:3,5,7, 14 health-related (1) 17:22 hear (20) 7:11;27:6;35:20; 51:8;71:1;72:5;86:3,6, 8,20;91:24;121:22; 138:15,22;168:12; 175:10;185:4;190:15; 194:9;200:14 heard (9) 5:24;55:1;87:16,17; 98:7:192:19:193:14, 15:195:9 hearing (32) 4:3,13,18,20,21;9:1; 10:8.12.24:12:12.21: 13:18;14:1;15:14,15; 17:2;20:17;22:9;41:8; 44:21,22;45:2,2;57:24; 86:14;87:4,8;96:5; 155:2;176:12;191:20; 204:1 heart (1) 123:14 heated (1) 196:8 heavily (1) 97:8 Heights (4) 5:7,9;6:5;176:11 Heights's (1) 6:7 held (1) 151:20 help (4) 35:12;93:13;125:21; 135:22 helped (4) 45:14;47:17,17;90:4 helpful (4) 44:19;46:9;61:5; 175:14 here's (2) 95:7:188:21 high (9)

58:10:80:9:121:21, 23:123:7.9.13:162:16: 193:4 high-efficiency (2) 66:13;136:14 high-efficient (1) 66:12 higher (3) 162:8;171:11;188:4 highest (2) 164:5,11 highly (2) 43:11;108:22 **Hippocratic** (4) 84:2;143:4,7,19 hire (1) 43:23 hired (5) 85:14;88:6,20,21; 94:5 history (3) 26:11;88:12;162:15 Hold (5) 45:5;90:12;137:2; 145:15;183:8 holding (3) 150:25;151:1;183:21 hone (1) 93:16 Honor (3) 72:18;74:2;200:15 honors (2) 25:6;174:8 hope (5) 12:18;13:15;16:20; 174:20;195:17 Hopefully (1) 187:6 hospital (2) 161:24;168:5 hour (9) 92:13:115:23; 117:16;161:19;180:4; 182:21;200:9,11,18 hours (6) 103:21;117:14,17; 127:20;145:4;195:8 huge (2) 64:16;132:3 human (3) 61:9:101:12:137:1 humans (4) 60:18;131:11,12; 198:17 hundred (1) 111:12 hundreds (1) 28:22 hydrocarbons (1) 119:20 hygiene (1) 52:4 hypothetical (2)

177:10:184:20 hypothetically (1) 102:2 Ι IARC (2) 146:23;160:17 ICU's (1) 36:14 idea (7) 49:5,6;69:1;106:1; 166:14;169:1;174:18 identical (3) 44:17;88:13;91:7 identification (4) 9:24;13:21;147:3; 165:20 identified (10) 41:6,9,17,25;42:8,9, 11;60:13;146:2;154:1 identify (6) 4:24;24:22;42:2; 45:16;163:25;189:1 identifying (1) 45:16 ill (1) 69:10 ill-founded (1) 43:5 illogical (1) 73:20 immediate (1) 182:22 immediately (1) 37:13 imminent (3) 105:7,8,18 immune (1) 162:15 immunization (1) 33:4 immunizations (1) 34:6 immunology (2) 30:9;31:22 impact (17) 29:2;46:7;50:6;51:2; 62:15;83:14,18,20,20; 98:4.5:106:10:114:4.4: 138:10:140:19.21 impactful (1) 137:14 impacts (26) 45:25;46:12;50:17, 22;58:16;70:3,17; 71:14,20;84:18,21,23, 25;97:5,6;109:23; 113:22;136:23;137:5; 138:4,12,24;139:4,19, 22:147:15 impending (3) 104:18;105:5,8

implausible (1) 127:20 important (6) 10:14;51:18;56:3; 58:2:66:18:104:25 imposing (1) 120:25 imprecise (1) 186:21 impressive (1) 121:25 inactive (1) 90:17 inadequate (2) 134:20;193:18 Inc (1) 107:18 include (14) 4:8;45:20;52:25; 53:5;54:6,12;60:19; 66:21:83:7:98:19; 111:19;112:10;148:10; 179:8 included (8) 112:7,9;127:22; 135:25;146:15;147:13, 24;179:10 includes (6) 62:6;148:20,23; 179:11,15;180:7 including (10) 33:14:36:4:53:13: 62:8:63:17:68:2:74:19: 111:23:112:13:162:10 incorrect (1) 72:25 increase (2) 140:14:141:1 increased (1) 54:1 increases (1) 141:19 incremental (2) 139:25;140:21 increments (2) 12:22;13:18 independent (10) 19:22;48:21;52:9; 80:18;97:19,24;98:3; 128:23;185:25;187:15 index (1) 168:23 indicate (3) 32:24;40:10;166:12 indicated (2) 130:4;139:17 indicates (1) 165:13 indicating (1) 91:11 indiscernible (3) 80:8;84:12;94:7 individual (5)

13:9.13:56:16:83:19; 127:19 individually (1) 56:15 individuals (2) 53:14;162:6 indoor (5) 90:18:155:8,11,13, 14 industrial (1) 52:4 industry (1) 66:16 information (15) 6:24;10:18;16:11; 31:21;37:24;60:7; 137:23,25;145:24; 159:17;175:4;176:5; 181:24;183:20;184:2 initial (6) 19:23;20:21;85:9,11; 88:10;99:23 inject (1) 43:4 injury (3) 24:15;33:5,12 inpatient (1) 36:13 inquiring (3) 32:16:39:23:89:22 in-service (1) 33:14 inside (1) 155:14 insignificant (2) 81:2,4 insisted (1) 161:13 instance (1) 11:19 instances (3) 33:11:95:23:107:25 instead (4) 63:1;70:9;142:23; 181:8 instructing (1) 7:13 insufficient (1) 58:22 Integrated (1) 60:6 intend (1) 143:10 intended (7) 7:25;18:18;51:23; 52:25;53:4;120:10; 135:14 intends (2) 62:16;63:6 intent (1) 28:3 interested (2) 120:12;191:20

interesting (3) 162:14;166:2;190:2 internal (20) 23:8,23;26:4,4,18, 22;27:9,17;28:20; 30:11,15;31:24;33:3; 36:12;38:20,20,25; 40:4;42:12;43:7
internal (20) 23:8,23;26:4,4,18, 22;27:9,17;28:20; 30:11,15;31:24;33:3; 36:12;38:20,20,25;
23:8,23;26:4,4,18, 22;27:9,17;28:20; 30:11,15;31:24;33:3; 36:12;38:20,20,25;
22;27:9,17;28:20; 30:11,15;31:24;33:3; 36:12;38:20,20,25;
30:11,15;31:24;33:3; 36:12;38:20,20,25;
36:12;38:20,20,25;
40:4;42:12;43:7
Internet (1)
159:5
internship (1)
25:9
interpreted (1)
110:13
interrupt (3)
39:4;50:4;194:16
interrupted (1)
195:20
interrupting (1)
194:15
interruption (2)
195:21,21
interview (1)
88:11
into (28)
21:4;33:18;34:17,25;
61:2;71:1;82:12;83:2,
25:105:4.16:108:10:
25;105:4,16;108:10; 109:5:113:25:129:17:
109:5;113:25;129:17;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 <b>introduced (1)</b> 87:23
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 <b>introduced (1)</b> 87:23
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24;
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3)
$\begin{array}{c} 109:5;113:25;129:17;\\ 138:13,15;139:11;\\ 143:17,19;150:4;\\ 166:9;172:6;194:21;\\ 195:8,19;200:13;\\ 203:15\\ \textbf{introduced (1)}\\ 87:23\\ \textbf{investigated (1)}\\ 134:17\\ \textbf{investigations (1)}\\ 154:11\\ \textbf{invited (2)}\\ 21:18;52:10\\ \textbf{involved (8)}\\ 44:14;88:12;108:11;\\ 120:24;154:10,24;\\ 156:10;196:25\\ \textbf{involvement (1)}\\ 77:12\\ \textbf{involving (2)}\\ 78:21;97:25\\ \textbf{IRIS (4)}\\ 60:7,8;61:1,22\\ \textbf{irrelevant (1)}\\ 36:24\\ \textbf{irritation (3)}\\ 121:20,24;123:4\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} 109:5;113:25;129:17;\\ 138:13,15;139:11;\\ 143:17,19;150:4;\\ 166:9;172:6;194:21;\\ 195:8,19;200:13;\\ 203:15\\ \textbf{introduced (1)}\\ 87:23\\ \textbf{investigated (1)}\\ 134:17\\ \textbf{investigations (1)}\\ 154:11\\ \textbf{invited (2)}\\ 21:18;52:10\\ \textbf{involved (8)}\\ 44:14;88:12;108:11;\\ 120:24;154:10,24;\\ 156:10;196:25\\ \textbf{involvement (1)}\\ 77:12\\ \textbf{involving (2)}\\ 78:21;97:25\\ \textbf{IRIS (4)}\\ 60:7,8;61:1,22\\ \textbf{irritation (3)}\\ 121:20,24;123:4\\ \textbf{Ishida (1)}\\ 87:25\\ \end{array}$
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3) 121:20,24;123:4 Ishida (1) 87:25 isopath (1)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3) 121:20,24;123:4 Ishida (1) 87:25 isopath (1) 151:3
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3) 121:20,24;123:4 Ishida (1) 87:25 isopath (1) 151:3 isoplats (4)
109:5;113:25;129:17; 138:13,15;139:11; 143:17,19;150:4; 166:9;172:6;194:21; 195:8,19;200:13; 203:15 introduced (1) 87:23 investigated (1) 134:17 investigations (1) 154:11 invited (2) 21:18;52:10 involved (8) 44:14;88:12;108:11; 120:24;154:10,24; 156:10;196:25 involvement (1) 77:12 involving (2) 78:21;97:25 IRIS (4) 60:7,8;61:1,22 irrelevant (1) 36:24 irritation (3) 121:20,24;123:4 Ishida (1) 87:25 isopath (1) 151:3

	isoquest (1)	
	172:1 issuance (1)	
	159:3 issue (30)	
	6:18;7:21;10:13,19; 11:9;15:1,13,18;16:24;	•
	21:6,14,19;40:1;46:6, 6;62:23;76:1;134:8;	•
	135:1,2,4;137:16; 155:13;190:16;191:22;	
	192:15,17,20;193:6; 194:8	
	<b>issued (2)</b> 19:1;155:4	
	<b>issues (14)</b> 11:9;17:22;24:1,2;	•
	29:6;32:15;33:10;	
	43:25;154:20;155:11; 188:10;189:24;193:8,	
	13	
	J	•
	<b>Jackson (2)</b> 77:2,5	
,	Jacksonville (1) 107:3	1
;	<b>January (8)</b> 54:23,24;69:9;71:22;	1
	99:17,18;156:4;158:22 <b>Jeff (1)</b>	1
	87:24	
	<b>Jison (8)</b> 44:6;93:3;98:23;	
	99:10,17,25;100:11; 136:2	
	<b>job (3)</b> 24:20;32:16;108:5	
	<b>Joe (1)</b> 41:10	]
	<b>join (1)</b> 41:4	
	<b>joined (1)</b> 25:12	]
	<b>Jonathan (1)</b> 77:1	]
	<b>Journal (3)</b> 39:15,16,18	]
	<b>journals (1)</b> 201:13	1
	judge (2) 77:5,12	
	judged (2) 40:11;193:20	
	judgment (4) 83:23,25;84:4;	• •
	117:24	]
	judicial (1) 78:22	]
	July (4) 4:15,15,15;23:20	
	jump (1)	

75:19 jumping (2) 74:8;166:9 juncture (1) 8:14 June (4) 4:14,14,14;146:23 jurisdiction (1) 191:10 jurisdictional (2) 191:1,6 K Kamen (1) 73:5 Karen (1) 5:7 keep (7) 17:17;18:8;37:23; 38:24;86:7;98:22; 101:6 Kenneth (3) 6:17;22:18;41:16 Kensington (7) 5:7,8,19,22;6:5,7; 176:11 kept (1) 39:22 kilometer (1) 151:15 kind (7) 9:3;78:18;139:18; 157:19;159:9,24; 198:18 kinds (2) 9:2;88:14 Kiplinger (1) 108:14 knew (4) 42:20,24;88:9,10 Knolls (3) 51:13;53:21;68:3 knowing (1) 183:10 knowledge (1) 122:12 known (5) 4:11;35:1;57:3;60:7; 104:19 knows (2) 170:5.6 L LA (1) 199:23 label (1) 169:18 labeled (3) 102:13;169:5;182:10 land (3) 41:10;112:2;151:15

landscape (2) 41:13:73:3 landscaping (1) 18:15 language (1) 69:1 large (3) 82:6;88:25:91:1 largely (2) 29:5;73:17 larger (1) 23:10 Larry (1) 5:10 last (34) 6:4,14,20;10:12; 12:21;14:1;15:14; 20:15;30:16;32:22; 33:7,22,25;35:20; 36:16,17,19,19;37:2; 52:14:90:1:96:5; 100:14;101:7;129:4; 130:24;131:5;142:25; 164:8,22;165:18,25; 188:12;199:18 lasting (1) 81:6 late (1) 52:14 later (6) 14:14:23:24:69:24; 87:24:92:18:99:18 latest (2) 54:24:194:13 latitude (1) 199:24 law (7) 48:24;59:18;156:5; 186:4,5,18,19 lawyer (2) 190:14.23 lawyers (1) 73:23 layman's (3) 126:19;127:10,18 laymen (1) 43:13 lead (13) 48:17;55:23;97:13, 14;145:10,12;146:6; 147:22,24;157:5; 158:1;164:14;199:4 leading (1) 50:10 learning (1) 72:18 lease (1) 125:20 leased (2) 125:9,9 leasing (1) 125:21

least (11)

	THOLED.ILL
0 4 50 45 55 40	
8:1;52:17;55:19;	25;128:22;142
60:10;74:4;90:21;	153:11;157:9;1
132:12;140:4;149:24;	24;164:23;178
195:3;200:11	188:3;201:3
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
leave (6)	limited (6)
31:17;78:24;114:1;	42:14;44:2;161
117:19;155:1;163:16	162:17,18;168
leaving (1)	limiting (2)
113:23	153:12;161:20
led (2)	limits (1)
62:22;108:23	165:11
left (2)	line (9)
103:9;145:14	21:16;54:8;79:
left-hand (1)	89:11;93:12;14
166:5	153:17;200:22
legal (4)	link (1)
78:9,12,12;86:23	169:6
legitimately (1)	linked (2)
46:16	161:23;168:4
length (1)	links (1)
31:18	160:18
	lion's (1)
lengths (1)	
159:5	23:25
less (5)	Lisa (1)
47:19;48:19;69:2;	77:2
81:8;106:19	list (28)
letter (25)	6:15;33:17;35:
6:11,13;74:22;94:10,	
	38:8;73:4;74:2
10,11,12;95:10,11,18;	24;90:16,18,19
97:4;99:11;101:19;	12,22;92:1,18;
102:4,7;103:14,22,25;	24;99:3;106:13
104:18;105:18;109:6,	7,23;120:2,23;
11;119:12;124:12;	154:9;155:20
126:14	listed (11)
letterhead (1)	26:11;35:6;53:
95:13	67:17;75:10,17
letters (2)	154:9;180:3,4,
98:10;102:3	listing (2)
level (18)	154:18;155:4
56:8;77:8;80:10;	litany (1)
123:20;140:4;141:1;	4:2
123:20;140:4;141:1; 142:12;158:18;162:16;	4:2 liter (1)
142:12;158:18;162:16;	liter (1)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17;	<b>liter (1)</b> 170:18
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b>	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7,	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7,	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13,	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b>	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b>	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23;
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 levels (23) 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 life (1) 199:23 likely (5) 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12 <b>limine (6)</b>	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2 72:17;86:4,8,1
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 levels (23) 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 life (1) 199:23 likely (5) 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;76 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12 <b>limine (6)</b> 9:8,22;15:4;16:17;	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2 72:17;86:4,8,1 139:7;146:2;15
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12 <b>limine (6)</b> 9:8,22;15:4;16:17; 18:11;71:3	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2 72:17;86:4,8,1 139:7;146:2;15 190:18;196:16
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12 <b>limine (6)</b> 9:8,22;15:4;16:17; 18:11;71:3 <b>limit (16)</b>	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2 72:17;86:4,8,1 139:7;146:2;15 190:18;196:16 live (2)
142:12;158:18;162:16; 167:25;168:7;181:17; 184:10,11;193:4; 196:15;201:3,3 <b>levels (23)</b> 55:16;56:5;57:3,7, 10;61:22;62:2;67:3; 70:10,15;123:7,9,13, 19;124:5;141:20; 146:4;161:23;168:4; 172:5;176:22;179:6; 191:24 <b>life (1)</b> 199:23 <b>likely (5)</b> 56:4,5,18;117:12; 197:12 <b>limine (6)</b> 9:8,22;15:4;16:17; 18:11;71:3	liter (1) 170:18 literature (22) 44:10;74:14;79 82:17;97:25;98 15;99:24,24;10 17,19,22,23;13 187:15;196:9;1 201:16,16 litigation (4) 92:22;106:19,1 108:15 littered (1) 50:11 little (18) 9:18,20;11:23; 40:7;49:4;57:2 72:17;86:4,8,1 139:7;146:2;15 190:18;196:16

LESALE CORPO	RATION
128:22;142:17;	living (1)
:11;157:9;162:21,	23:6
164:23;178:11,12;	local (9)
:3;201:3	50:8;53:25;54:3;
d (6)	92:24;109:21,25;
14;44:2;161:23;	111:7;112:10,12
:17,18;168:4	located (2)
ng (2)	4:9;179:18
:12;161:20	locomotive (1)
(1)	106:21
:11	logical (4)
)	29:11;73:21;74:3,5
16;54:8;79:13,17;	long (9)
11;93:12;141:24;	10:24;33:17;88:11;
:17;200:22	92:25;102:14;117:8;
1)	137:16;143:2;161:10
:6	longer (4)
 I (2)	36:24;72:17;115:21;
:23;168:4	200:9
(1)	long-standing (1)
:18	87:13
(1)	look (29)
25	11:17;17:4;41:7;
1)	91:9,12,23;92:13;
-	95:11;100:22;107:6;
2	
8)	110:10;116:18;118:7,
5;33:17;35:6;	20;130:17,23;146:14;
8;73:4;74:23;75:24,	156:18;160:5,20;
90:16,18,19;91:9,	164:24;177:21;180:2;
22;92:1,18;98:20,	185:11;186:10;187:3;
99:3;106:13;107:6,	192:2;196:1,6
3;120:2,23;130:17;	looked (5)
:9;155:20	17:8;127:22;187:1;
(11)	194:21;196:9
11;35:6;53:15;	looking (26)
17;75:10,17;153:9;	14:15,21,25;34:25;
:9;180:3,4,7	44:15;77:8,8;90:18;
g (2)	107:22;108:17;115:20;
:18;155:4	132:22;146:22;147:25;
(1)	148:8;149:5,7;153:25;
	155:8;168:22;170:15;
1)	184:18;186:8;190:7;
:18	194:8;195:15
ture (22)	looks (1)
10;74:14;79:1;	115:2
17;97:25;98:3,10,	lose (1)
99:24,24;100:5,6,	167:4
19,22,23;136:2;	Lot (18)
:15;196:9;199:5;	4:10;21:3;66:7;
:16,16	72:18;88:22,25;91:1;
ion (4)	99:5;113:19,20,21;
22;106:19,19;	114:8;119:19;138:17;
:15	150:24;151:19;160:22;
ed (1)	194:20
11	loud (3)
(18)	45:20;57:23;114:24
8,20;11:23;33:1;	louder (1)
7;49:4;57:23,24;	87:1
17;86:4,8,13;109:4;	low (7)
:7;146:2;155:23;	33:13;58:11,11,17;
:18;196:16	62:12;123:19;124:5
	lower (6)
:8;112:13	57:2;77:8;106:2;
,	5,.2,,,.0,100.2,

	108:23;162:3;201:3	31:5;151:14;154:12
	lowered (2)	March (3)
	103:3;164:16	99:19,19;158:23
	lowering (2)	margin (25)
	76:25;156:2	53:2;70:6;109:4;
	luck (1)	129:5,7;185:1,6,11,1
	190:11	187:1,8,11,19,23;
	lunch (6)	195:25;196:3,14,17,1
	31:6,10;92:13;116:1,	197:18,22;198:9,22;
	25,25	199:4,13
	lung (7)	Maria (1)
	36:3,4;83:5;121:24;	99:17
	123:5;162:10,18	Mark (4)
	lungs (1)	5:14;41:12;86:22;
	123:4	165:7
		marked (7)
	Μ	9:23;13:20;146:23;
		147:2;165:19;166:18
	ma'am (2)	203:15
	16:15;117:7	market (1)
	MAAQS (1)	41:15
	165:17	Martin (1)
	Mae (3)	4:21
	24:24;108:7;154:4	Maryland (8)
	Maine (1)	4:10;25:15;51:20;
	107:3	59:1,7;82:5;93:2;
	maintain (1)	124:17
	32:21	master's (1)
	major (4)	189:10
	119:2;161:21;162:6;	<b>material (4)</b>
	168:2	11:4;18:4;19:16;
	<b>majority (2)</b> 33:9;137:12	194:19
	makes (12)	<b>materials (1)</b> 18:18
	28:17;29:16,19;37:9;	math (1)
	58:6,7;64:16;80:20;	174:7
	93:25;132:3;173:1;	mathematical (5)
	186:1	68:20;71:23;171:12;
;	making (2)	182:14;191:22
,	176:13;201:4	mathematics (2)
	Mall (11)	25:6;174:8
	4:11;88:25;91:1;	matter (10)
	111:23;176:23;182:16,	4:4;12:19;17:19;
	22;183:14,15;192:12,	46:7;48:19;51:22;
	17	66:21;96:24;164:21;
	man (1)	196:17
	24:15	matters (8)
	management (2)	6:3;10:9;13:23;22:7;
	33:5,12	88:21;90:4;97:14;
	manager (1)	136:13
	189:3	max (1)
	manner (1)	164:11
;	10:14	maximum (9)
	manufactured (1)	158:18;162:1;164:6,
	64:13	11;165:1;168:11,14;
	many (20)	180:25;182:17
	25:22;33:6,15;35:9; 39:10,10;43:4;44:12;	<b>may (69)</b> 4:2,14,14,14;9:11;
	46:22;54:19;62:24;	11:15;17:12,20;18:10
	40.22,34.19,02.24, 91:9;119:6,9,18,21;	19:8;20:2;21:25;22:2
	136:1;167:2;187:5;	24:15,17,18;26:15;
	193:15	35:4;44:7;45:23;46:1
	map (3)	48:5;49:3;54:6;56:24
		,,

### Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

arch (3) 99:19,19;158:23 argin (25) 53:2;70:6;109:4; 129:5,7;185:1,6,11,14; 187:1,8,11,19,23; 195:25;196:3,14,17,18; 197:18,22;198:9,22; 199:4,13 aria (1) 99:17 ark (4) 5:14;41:12;86:22; 165:7 arked (7) 9:23;13:20;146:23; 147:2;165:19;166:18; 203:15 arket (1) 41:15 artin (1) 4:21 aryland (8) 4:10;25:15;51:20; 59:1,7;82:5;93:2; 124:17 aster's (1) 189:10 aterial (4) 11:4;18:4;19:16; 194:19 aterials (1) 18:18 ath (1) 174:7 athematical (5) 68:20;71:23;171:12; 182:14;191:22 athematics (2) 25:6:174:8 atter (10) 4:4;12:19;17:19; 46:7;48:19;51:22; 66:21;96:24;164:21; 196:17 atters (8) 6:3;10:9;13:23;22:7; 88:21;90:4;97:14; 136:13 ax (1) 164:11 aximum (9) 158:18;162:1;164:6, 11;165:1;168:11,14; 180:25;182:17 ay (69) 4:2,14,14,14;9:11; 11:15;17:12,20;18:16; 19:8;20:2;21:25;22:23; 24:15,17,18;26:15; 35:4;44:7;45:23;46:15; 48:5;49:3;54:6;56:24;

62:22;70:12,13,14,15, 19:72:1.6:73:6.20.22: 77:16:83:13:87:6: 88:16.18:90:8:91:9: 101:20,20,20;112:20; 117:5;119:8;130:7,8; 134:12;137:25,25; 141:15;163:12;171:22; 190:22,24,24;192:20; 193:7:194:17:195:1.1. 18,18;196:8;203:3 maybe (18) 19:3,3;20:23;39:14; 54:23;86:3,14;93:2; 115:24;116:8,8; 132:24;134:3;135:10, 10,22;145:15;194:22 **MCI**(1) 108:15 **MD** (4) 22:18;38:17;40:3; 97:15 mean (50) 10:17;12:5;24:5; 27:22;34:18;37:13; 39:4,20;44:20;46:13; 53:11;56:12,13,15; 58:7;62:21;66:2;77:20; 79:23;80:24;81:4,5,7,8, 9:93:15:96:17.23: 106:20:108:7.16; 118:9:122:6:125:22: 127:7,8,24,25;129:7; 142:4,15;151:19,20; 156:14;159:21,23; 171:14;193:9;196:19; 200:19 Meaning (1) 149:22 means (8) 4:22;24:14;96:20; 112:14;126:20;127:17; 164:17;172:7 meant (2) 81:11;130:10 meanwhile (1) 92:14 measure (4) 58:16;82:23;140:3; 168:24 measured (3) 150:1:158:11.12 measurement (2) 140:25;168:24 measurements (5) 51:4;140:11,12,25; 192:17 measures (1) 122:1 measuring (1) 69:16 mechanical (2)

mechanics (2) 106:22:137:5 mechanism (1) 80:15 mechanization (1) 52:23 medical (30) 25:8,11;26:17;27:11, 15,21;28:2,5,18,24; 29:6:30:4,17,19:31:2,3, 11,15;37:22;38:13; 39:9,22,25;40:13;44:9; 74:13,20;82:16;143:3; 201:16 medicine (51) 23:8,24,25;24:7,11; 26:4,4,18,18,23;27:9, 10,17,18,19;28:12,20; 30:10,10,11,15,21,22, 24;31:22,23,23,24; 33:3;34:19;36:12,21; 38:9.10.11.20.20:39:1. 16,17,18;40:5,5,23; 42:12,12;43:8;52:4,4; 84:3;139:10 meeting (1) 6:4 meets (1) 59:9 members (7) 7:3:8:3:18:1:52:6.7; 53:13:58:20 membrane (1) 121:24 memo (1) 12:23 memorize (1) 114:18 memorized (2) 60:11:157:14 memory (3) 91:16:147:8:197:11 mention (6) 55:1;72:25;120:14; 132:1;136:14;146:23 mentioned (15) 7:25;24:12;48:20; 54:25;64:9;68:17,18; 76:15;91:19;97:12; 99:13,25;103:6;136:8, 11 messed (1) 111:21 met (3) 86:2;87:24;175:16 meteorological (4) 69:16;150:22;151:6; 152:15 meteorologist (1) 87:20 meteorology (2) 153:10:174:12 **meter (22)** 

57:4:103:7:156:3; 158:2:164:17:169:3. 21:170:10;172:2,6,18; 176:23;180:13;182:16, 18,20;183:13;184:11, 20;187:21;197:13; 199:11 methodology (6) 170:2,7;171:11,14; 172:13:177:3 metropolitan (2) 44:24:45:1 Michael (1) 5:4 Michele (2) 5:8;144:15 Michigan (1) 25:10 micrograms (23) 57:3;103:6;156:3; 158:2;164:17;169:3, 21;170:9,18;172:1,6, 18;176:22;180:13; 182:15,17,20;183:13; 184:11,19;187:21; 197:13;199:10 microns (1) 48:19 microphone (1) 86:15 mics (1) 197:13 middle (3) 15:9:134:14:138:11 might (24) 8:15;16:18;50:17,19; 69:18;72:25;75:16; 81:9,10,19;83:20; 86:20;112:21;113:12, 21;120:20;125:16; 145:18;150:22;185:9; 187:6;191:25;196:10, 15 Mike (1) 87:24 Mill (1) 4:9 million (3) 164:4;189:18;198:12 mind (11) 15:1:17:18:18:8: 22:1;76:1,15,16;82:14, 15;101:6;111:11 minds (1) 171:12 mine (1) 171:12 minimal (2) 64:1;69:11 minimally (3) 18:19;103:11;104:12 minimize (1) 106:22

minimum (1) 39:19 minister (1) 77:3 minor (3) 33:4.12:95:23 minute (2) 169:5:187:21 minutes (3) 163:8;200:14,19 mis- (1) 128:2 miscellaneous (1) 74:20 mischaracterization (2) 7:10:104:16 mischaracterized (1) 105:25 misconception (1) 101:7 misheard (1) 154:7 missed (2) 160:14;168:16 missing (1) 132:24 mis-spoke (1) 130:8 mistake (1) 68:21 mistaken (3) 130:7:149:15.18 misunderstand (4) 135:20,21;155:3; 187:2 misunderstanding (1) 30:6 modeled (2) 140:6;180:6 modeling (16) 51:3;69:8,25;173:5, 14,19;174:5,6,6,10,18; 175:18;177:3;181:16, 24;182:1 modern (1) 137:6 modifications (1) 174:14 modified (5) 51:10;69:24;95:18; 174:19:181:25 mold (1) 108:11 moment (8) 24:12;30:25;51:14; 55:1;76:3;91:14;148:4, 6 money (1) 140:16 monitor (2) 142:5:179:18 monitoring (6) 9:19;141:4,5,18;

Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

146:9;154:19 monoxide (13) 47:21,21:48:17; 91:20:123:16:145:10. 12:146:6:147:14; 157:5,23;164:14; 198:17 Montgomery (3) 41:10;51:20;82:5 month (1) 38:18 months (4) 38:19;43:4,4;141:6 more (51) 12:6;17:1;23:22; 26:5;29:20;51:14;54:3; 55:15;68:20;69:2;78:9; 79:23;81:14;82:18; 85:21;86:4;89:6;98:19; 101:8,11;106:2; 131:16;133:18,24; 135:9;139:18;157:24; 160:22;162:2,19,19; 163:24;164:20;168:7; 170:12;171:13;173:23; 174:23,25;181:24; 190:14,16;192:6; 194:15;197:13;198:16; 199:23;200:7,7,21; 201:16 morning (8) 5:2.4.11.13:12:25: 13:4:23:5:27:6 mortality (1) 81:13 most (19) 11:24;28:15;30:14, 20,22;52:15;55:4,5; 56:2;66:18;82:12,15, 24,25;83:3;102:24; 107:1;136:10;154:24 mostly (5) 26:6;48:1;60:16; 74:20;138:14 motion (14) 6:7;7:11,13,20;9:8, 22;15:4,17,18;16:17, 17;18:10;71:3;176:12 motions (6) 6:25;7:4,6;8:6,12,17 move (11) 29:14;46:17,25;47:1; 86:19,19;93:7,11; 125:24,24;163:18 moving (1) 165:9 much (19) 10:6;57:2;59:20; 75:23;89:23;92:10; 102:17:113:23,24; 115:21;136:2;144:4; 162:25;183:1;191:12; 192:5;196:21;198:16;

67:11;136:22

200:9 mucous (1) 121:24 multiple (1) 132:11 multiplied (2) 55:13:181:8 multiply (6) 170:1,9,17;171:4,5; 172:18 multiplying (2) 70:8;172:8 Myer (1) 108:13 myself (2) 44:8;70:13 Ν N-631 (1) 4:10 NAAQ(1) 70:16 NAAQS (1) 48:22 nabbed (1) 80:8 name (11) 4:21;22:17;23:14; 25:20;87:19;106:23; 111:7:120:11.12: 121:17:189:1 named (1) 30:14 names (2) 88:19;111:16 National (19) 48:23;50:2;51:16; 52:16:58:21.25:59:22; 69:18:70:2:107:20: 146:3;185:23;186:8, 16.23:190:5:191:18: 193:16,19 nationwide (1) 23:12 nature (6) 8:25;20:6;75:15; 96:7;143:19;154:12 near (4) 93:2;161:21;162:6; 168:2 nearby (4) 50:22,23;112:7; 183:15 necessarily (3) 43:10;88:12;163:15 necessary (1) 142:18 need (15) 6:18;16:7;21:1,6; 33:19;56:23;83:19; 95:1;114:24;157:13; 167:2;172:11;183:10,

11:200:15 needed (1) 37:24 needs (3) 11:8;21:14;112:2 neglected (1) 16:4 Negligible (8) 62:9;80:11,12,13,22, 23,24;81:11 neighborhood (10) 45:19;62:5;111:8,11, 19,23;112:7,9;140:1; 198:11 neighbors (2) 48:6;68:1 Nevertheless (1) 30:14 New (15) 39:15,18;65:2;72:18; 76:6,7,9;80:20;87:8; 96:1:103:5:104:11: 158:6;166:3;184:22 news (1) 11:22 next (18) 4:16;17:2;22:10; 38:17;88:2;93:5; 130:23;131:5;144:2; 163:11;164:3,16,20; 166:5:168:1:195:9; 197:2:200:13 **NIH** (1) 25:10 Nimby (1) 92:21 nine (1) 157:19 nitro (2) 146:25;160:18 nitro-airings (1) 130:20 nitrogen (16) 48:17;55:12;123:24; 124:1,3;145:10; 148:10,21,23;157:5; 158:3,5;160:13;161:2; 167:17;199:14 nitrous (3) 148:13,17;189:25 NO2 (30) 55:12.16:69:19:70:2. 10;71:6;148:10,20,23; 158:4;160:22;161:21, 22;162:5,7,16,21; 168:3,7;176:21; 178:23;179:22;181:17; 182:15,17,21;183:13; 185:19;188:3;191:25 noise (23) 41:20:42:15.15: 44:20;45:9,17,20;46:1, 6,7,13;47:17;57:7,7,9,

11,13,15;58:18;89:24; 92:19:147:14:198:20 noises (1) 45:20 none (6) 22:9;44:17;48:12; 49:25;91:7;137:20 non-leading (2) 55:24;63:22 non-occupational (1) 47:22 non-workers (1) 188:7 noon (1) 17:13 Nope (1) 149:14 nor (1) 61:13 normal (3) 98:15;100:6,20 normally (1) 188:23 Northern (1) 85:22 note (3) 11:1;80:9;194:10 notes (2) 74:9.9 notice (2) 46:12;156:25 noticed (4) 4:16,17:50:10:58:24 notify (1) 16:25 November (44) 15:8:38:18:54:22; 69:8;71:22;94:14; 95:13;96:1;99:8,9,22; 100:7,24;101:22; 102:5,5,12,24;104:17; 105:4,14,17:109:7,15; 117:2;124:12;127:1; 128:12;146:13,20; 150:12;173:20;174:15; 175:7;176:15,21; 179:21;180:24;181:6, 7,9,14;182:2,3 NOX (24) 145:13;148:1,9,10, 20,22;156:11;157:5; 158:10:159:3.9:161:5: 176:14;180:3;181:1; 184:10;187:10,11,13, 13,14;201:23,25; 202:13 NTDE (1) 76:7 nuisance (1) 46:6 number (38) 11:7:30:20:33:13; 37:11,16;41:8;45:8,9;

55:13:73:16,19:76:15: 77:22:78:6:80:11:82:6: 92:24;103:12;108:20; 109:3;122:17;124:20, 22;145:3;147:15; 151:2;154:1;160:7; 169:25;176:24;177:8, 18:180:16:183:22; 187:20;196:12;200:1; 201:14 numbers (26) 15:6;60:21;70:8; 79:19;109:5;114:18; 115:13;117:20;153:25; 157:14;169:1;171:23; 172:6,7,8;176:14,20; 180:24,24;181:5,14; 182:3;191:15;193:1,2, 3 numerous (5) 44:23;46:20;80:19; 106:7;107:19 NW (1) 22:19 0 02(1)159:11 03(1)157:7 **Oakland** (1) 47:19 oath (4) 143:2,4,7,19 object (5) 40:21;41:5;42:13; 89:3;176:25 objected (1) 47:3 objecting (2) 132:6.7 **Objection** (18) 45:3,6;47:4;61:11, 18:62:17:64:15.19; 65:14;67:7,13,16; 90:14;126:6;131:18; 136:21;169:8,10 objectionable (1) 46:16 objections (1) 45:7 objective (1) 138:12 obligations (1) 19:12 observation (3) 37:14;71:17;152:19 obtain (1) 25:5 obtaining (1) 30:19 obviate (1)

83:18 obviously (3) 73:11;112:13:198:5 occasion (2) 35:12;74:3 occasionally (5) 23:12;31:3;48:2; 52:21:189:5 occupants (1) 68:2 **Occupational** (22) 23:15,16,24;24:10; 26:5,17,19;27:9,16,18; 28:12;30:20,23;33:9; 38:25;39:17;40:5; 42:11;43:7;47:22;86:1; 139:10 occur (4) 161:21;162:8;168:2; 175:6 odor (3) 42:15;81:19;147:14 odors (3) 81:14,17;82:10 off (31) 21:10;27:2;37:2; 38:22;64:11;65:11; 86:17;89:23;95:5; 104:5;114:20;115:19; 125:16;126:25;128:5; 129:25;138:20;141:23; 143:14:144:14:149:8: 153:7;157:20;159:8; 176:9;178:21;179:25; 193:3;197:9;199:21; 202:10 offer (5) 26:16;43:12;90:8; 152:14.25 offered (1) 138:11 offering (2) 152:6,7 offers (1) 137:3 offhand (1) 129:10 office (4) 4:19;23:10;35:11; 107:15 Officer (1) 155:2 official (1) 169:14 offload (1) 138:20 often (6) 26:5;30:20;59:5; 74:6;77:17;83:4 older (4) 64:14;133:24; 162:11,12 onboard (1)

Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

33:14 once (5) 50:4;78:8;142:18; 157:24:186:5 one (113) 8:3;10:21;11:19,21; 17:18;31:17;33:19; 38:15;42:6;44:7;45:5. 8;50:5;53:24;54:21,22, 24,24,25;58:15;59:5; 66:18;68:8;71:5;76:18, 23;82:23;83:21;88:22; 90:12;91:18;93:1;94:9; 95:1;98:18;99:11,18, 18,18;100:25;103:1,11, 25;106:20;107:16,24; 115:5,7;117:14,17; 119:25;120:23;121:17; 126:22;127:8,14; 129:23;131:16;132:10; 134:22;137:2;139:23; 140:10;141:1;143:21; 145:14,17;151:3; 152:16;153:2;155:22; 156:16;157:3,7;158:6; 161:19;164:3,8,16,20, 22,25;166:19,20,22,24; 167:2,18;169:4,11; 175:4;180:18;183:4,8; 187:9;188:21;189:24; 190:13:192:15:193:12, 13:195:15:196:19: 197:8,12,19;199:18; 200:22;201:3;203:5,6, 6.7 one-day (1) 31:6 ones (9) 44:8;75:9,10,17; 99:1,1:164:15:174:23; 175:3 ongoing (1) 34:2 only (32) 28:13;40:4;45:1; 51:19;58:25;59:17; 73:2;98:12;99:23,23; 100:17;103:21;104:12; 117:9;129:22;132:10, 22;133:8;134:17; 137:14:140:14:141:3; 149:6;161:7;162:21; 164:13;174:23;179:1, 7;180:19;184:22; 192:14 onto (1) 193:3 open (3) 68:16;86:21;157:18 opening (1) 87:3 operate (2) 4:7;138:23

operating (2) 56:6.6 operation (4) 139:3,4;140:12; 145:4 operational (3) 32:22;142:10,16 opine (2) 61:14;70:21 opinion (38) 37:17;48:9;49:16,16, 19:50:16.21:55:2; 67:24;70:1;71:1,14; 72:11;76:23;82:15; 89:21;104:21,22,23; 105:4;106:4;131:21; 152:5,6,8,14,25;153:2, 4;162:1,17;187:10,18; 190:23;192:3,23; 196:21;198:6 opinions (10) 44:19;45:15;47:17, 24;48:4;51:8;55:5; 125:15;140:24;144:8 opponents (1) 10:13 opportunity (12) 11:17;12:8,13,14; 17:3,4;18:22;20:8; 22:4,6:38:3:116:1 opposed (3) 27:24:28:20:92:20 opposition (16) 6:6;9:15;16:16;19:4; 20:24;40:8;46:5;53:24; 58:20;62:14,17,22,24, 25:63:2:70:15 opposition's (1) <u>9</u>:22 oral (1) 130:10 oranges (1) 179:1 order (7) 6:18;15:5;16:24; 142:19,22;172:12; 198:11 Ordinance (5) 4:6;18:20;20:2,9; 192:16 ordinary (1) 133:24 organic (1) 60:19 organization (4) 44:14;45:1;59:4,12 organizations (1) 31:8 organized (1) 98:22 original (22) 15:7;51:9;69:24,25; 71:21;72:12;94:15,16,

22;95:16;96:1;99:2; 103:18,25;104:13; 108:20,24;180:23; 182:14;192:25;193:1,5 originally (2) 23:7;53:19 **Orlando** (2) 31:1:107:18 **OSHA (20)** 188:3.5.12.17.24; 190:1,4,17,20;191:6; 192:1,8,19;194:12,14, 18,24;195:1,12,15 ostensibly (1) 74:13 others (10) 25:1;48:2;81:15; 88:3;91:19;123:6; 154:5;156:11;161:11; 198:6 otherwise (1) 44:11 ought (6) 141:16;160:11; 177:5;190:9;193:20; 194:20 out (48) 6:18;10:24;11:19,22; 12:6;18:1;49:15;52:22; 53:9,10;58:18;66:14; 78:24;80:4;83:9;90:20; 95:7:99:3:100:10: 113:24,25;114:24; 122:9;129:15,16; 130:21;131:24;136:2; 140:7;141:24;142:19, 19:145:14:152:16.17: 159:6,12;160:10; 161:1,15;164:12; 171:12;174:1;175:23; 176:1;187:25;192:12; 194:11 outcome (1) 94:6 outdoor (4) 90:19;155:9;190:6; 191:8 outdoors (1) 190:5 outpatient (1) 36:14 outside (2) 23:12;24:16 outward (1) 103:20 over (39) 10:24;12:1;25:21; 31:5;36:12;52:2;70:16; 79:20;80:19;90:16; 98:21:102:20,21; 106:13:115:1:129:24: 135:24;140:13;141:20; 142:12;150:14,21;

154:12;158:20;160:5; 162:22.25:164:6.12: 165:1;181:7;187:22; 196:16,19,21,21;197:3, 6:201:6 overall (1) 37:19 overlapping (1) 25:14 overly-broadened (1) 135:10 overrule (2) 90:14;169:9 overruled (2) 61:19;131:22 overseas (2) 34:11,15 own (8) 65:19;117:23;125:7; 175:19;186:13;187:14; 193:20:198:5 owned (1) 125:20 oxide (3) 158:5;198:25;199:1 oxides (8) 145:11;148:14,17, 21,23;157:5,6;198:22 **OZAH** (2) 4:5,18 Ozone (9) 145:15.17:157:7: 164:3;197:4;199:18, 19,20;200:5 Р pack (1) 114:1 page (33) 109:10,11:114:18; 115:13:118:21:126:14: 130:23,23;131:1,3; 132:25;133:3,10,19; 134:14;147:4;150:25; 151:1,2;165:13,14,15; 167:17,23;168:22; 173:1;177:25;178:2, 20;179:20;182:8,12; 183:4 pager (1) 169:12 pages (10) 99:12;114:11; 115:11;116:24;117:2; 118:4,24;147:15; 182:9,10 paper (1) 31:16 papers (1) 192:18 paragraph (26) 53:12;109:19;

126:12,14;129:4; 130:24,25;131:6,15; 132:11:133:4:144:7. 20;161:18;167:24; 168:1;177:12,13,23,25; 178:3,3;182:8,13; 183:19;184:4 parallels (1) 44:15 parameters (1) 193:20 paraphrasing (1) 78:22 Parcel (4) 4:10;176:23;182:16; 183:14 pardon (3) 38:18;39:6;200:3 parenthetical (1) 53:12 parents (1) 34:7 Paris (1) 58:8 parking (6) 88:25;91:1;113:19, 20,21;114:8 parse (1) 112:11 part (26) 18:3:23:10:30:15.23; 46:21:52:17:55:20: 73:12:74:24:86:21: 88:7,8;89:23;119:4; 125:6;128:23;134:2; 137:19;152:20;156:16, 17;175:7;190:25; 194:12,24;195:1 participate (1) 188:2 particular (10) 12:2:24:9.25:31:7: 37:8;43:13;60:13; 151:19;155:18;162:9 particularly (3) 75:6,6;191:8 particulate (6) 48:19;66:13,21;67:3; 136:15;164:20 parties (8) 4:24;6:2;12:24; 141:16,22;194:9,23; 195:4 parts (28) 6:9;102:18;131:23; 158:6,7,10;162:21; 164:4,23;167:25; 168:11,14;169:2,17,20; 170:10,16;172:2,17; 178:12;184:22,24; 188:4:189:18.19.20.20: 198:12

part-time (2)

25:13:97:16 passages (3) 102:20;109:7;150:13 passed (2) 126:4,5 passes (2) 86:24;186:16 past(2)44:15;47:16 Pat (1) 5:2 patho-(1) 198:16 paths (1) 50:10 patient (2) 32:24;35:17 patients (8) 32:23,25;33:4,7,17, 18;36:15;40:7 Patricia (2) 87:23:111:4 patronize (1) 113:19 patterns (1) 114:7 peak (2) 161:20;168:1 pediatric (2) 30:12:31:24 pediatrician (2) 34:3:35:25 peer (1) 201:12 pending (1) 45:6 Penn (5) 106:24,25;107:1,2,2 people (24) 16:25:24:13:34:11; 50:7,17;51:25;62:6; 67:19;81:14;82:6,9; 92:20;112:13;113:1, 18,21;115:25;140:3; 162:10,18,24;165:4; 182:22;192:12 people's (1) 161:20 per (51) 57:4;62:24;103:6; 153:17:156:3:157:24; 158:2,6,7,10;162:21; 164:4,17,23;167:25; 168:11,14;169:2,3,17, 20,21;170:10,10,16,18; 172:2,2,6,17,18; 176:22;178:12;180:13; 182:15,17,20;183:13; 184:11,19,22,25; 187:21;188:4;189:18, 19.20.20:197:13: 198:12;199:10 percent (8)

102:19,25;103:1; 127:11,23,25;128:22; 196:19 percentage (2) 197:3.6 percentile (6) 158:20;164:24,25; 165:3,3;184:17 Perdue (1) 8:4 perform (1) 24:16 perhaps (5) 86:20;115:24; 145:17;166:21;182:4 period (11) 10:18,24;11:20; 24:17;25:14;140:13; 141:20;158:2,21; 162:25;164:18 periodic (1) 38:15 periodically (1) 66:15 permanent (2) 52:7;81:11 permissible (1) 188:3 person (3) 44:21;81:18;113:25 personal (3) 35:25:71:17:198:6 personally (2) 97:12:114:6 persons (2) 53:5;83:4 perspective (1) 188:2 perspectives (1) 91:9 pertains (1) 53:20 petition (2) 4:5;19:16 petitioner (1) 4:7 PhD (2) 39:9;97:15 Philadelphia (1) 107:2 Philly (1) 106:23 philosophical (1) 84:8 phonetic (1) 119:25 photo (1) 95:19 photos (1) 50:14 phrase (2) 83:21;196:14 phrased (1)

123:22 physical (2) 33:15:150:8 physician (6) 23:7,21;34:3;39:5,8; 143:10 physicians (1) 28:13 physiology (1) 198:17 pick (2) 37:16;129:22 picked (3) 37:11,15;74:9 picking (1) 131:23 picture (1) 190:16 piece (4) 21:5;31:16;158:4; 194:19 PIERRE (10) 106:14,16;157:15, 17;159:7;169:13; 188:23;189:2,2,7 place (4) 125:6;149:6;164:19; 184:23 placed (1) 85:11 plan (3) 20:4:73:4:93:14 Planning (7) 17:21;18:6;19:18; 20:17;22:1;41:10; 194:20 plans (7) 18:7,15;20:1,3,10; 22:6:141:4 plant (5) 73:3;92:20;93:10; 107:3.18 plants (4) 91:17,17;92:19; 93:23 plausible (1) 114:2 play (4) 50:7;83:25;194:24; 195:1 Plaza (1) 4:10please (27) 4:25;22:15,17,21; 30:8;47:18;57:22;73:2, 4;83:12;95:9;101:6; 109:8;114:25;120:18; 124:14;126:11;127:17; 130:22,25;131:9; 151:11,25:164:2; 189:1;197:11;203:4 plus (2)52:11;180:6

pm (1) 204:1 PM10(1) 166:12 PM2.5 (22) 48:18;57:2;103:3; 108:21;122:19,24; 145:11,13:148:3; 156:2,8,14,16;157:3,8; 164:16:166:8,12; 187:18;197:7;202:5,13 **PMQ5**(1) 76:25 pockets (1) 92:9 point (38) 11:12,12;13:13;18:2, 8;20:14;22:1,5;28:21; 37:21;42:10;43:3; 46:10;61:17;63:2; 70:25;79:13,25;80:10; 81:21:84:1:85:20:87:6: 98:19;108:19;112:15; 122:4;128:23;129:19; 132:14;137:11,15; 150:14;175:4;192:24; 194:11;199:23;202:17 pointed (2) 129:16;152:16 points (3) 12:13,15:47:13 poison (2) 58:6,7 political (1) 74:4 pollutant (11) 56:16:120:15.24; 121:17.19:141:1.20: 166:5;179:5;196:15; 201:3 pollutants (26) 35:2:48:12,15:50:1; 56:5;57:6;69:17;82:10; 97:19;114:7;119:6,9, 13,17;120:3,15;140:4, 11;145:8,9;147:13; 149:20;155:14;156:10. 15;187:9 pollution (7) 12:23;13:19;59:20; 107:9;108:1;179:6; 201:8 polycentric (1) 119:19 pool (3) 50:8,24;68:3 population (11) 53:3,13;81:24,25; 82:1,2,3,4,4,5;83:1 populations (4) 53:1,4;82:13;129:17 portion (2) 83:1:197:22

portions (1) 56:2 portray (1) 69:3 pose (4) 61:9;116:12,16; 194:24 posed (1) 116:5 position (1) 38:12 possession (1) 101:21 possibility (1) 75:25 possible (13) 70:1;112:23,24; 113:3,4,11,15,16,18, 23;114:2;117:19;140:2 possibly (3) 6:17;131:12,17 post (1) 66:9 potential (26) 45:21;54:2;60:17; 62:3;71:14,20;80:12; 84:18,23,24;97:5,6; 98:5;109:22;113:22; 119:17,22;120:4,13; 121:1;123:21;124:9; 139:14:141:16,22; 142:20 potentially (4) 101:11:118:24: 123:3;127:19 power (10)75:22;91:17,17; 92:19,20;93:10,14,23; 107:2.18 powers (1) 8:14 **PPM (2)** 157:21,23 practice (2) 30:15;36:12 practiced (1) 38:20 practicing (1) 23:21 preceded (1) 101:18 precedence (2) 76:19,21 precipitate (1) 161:3 precisely (11) 7:19;34:1;77:14; 80:6,6;82:21;112:15; 120:5,5;135:13,13 precluded (1) 11:20 predicate (2) 195:12,14

predicted (1) 69:3 predictions (1) 117:22 pre-employment (1) 33:14 prefer (2) 110:19;116:16 pre-hearing (1) 41:7 preliminary (8) 6:3:10:9:12:18: 13:22;17:19;22:7; 34:18:156:2 preparation (4) 11:5;16:19;46:22; 47:9 prepare (3) 12:9;47:23;103:21 prepared (5) 12:23:15:7:101:22; 173:4.6 preparing (1) 95:25 presence (1) 124:7 present (7) 7:3;12:13;38:11; 123:20,24;124:4;136:4 presented (1) 77:15 presently (1) 120:15 preserve (1) 15:25 president (2) 23:18:97:13 Presumably (1) 140:3 presume (3) 38:12:140:10.11 pretend (1) 152:2 pretty (7) 11:11;28:18;54:21; 92:10;104:19;121:25; 176:18 **Preventative (4)** 24:7;30:21,22;34:19 previous (4) 46:24;90:6;108:19; 118:10 previously (2) 14:5;124:13 primarily (2) 40:15;161:21 primary (2) 64:3;76:1 principle (2) 40:9;202:12 print (1) 161:1 printed (1)

159:6 printing (1) 44:23 printout (1) 188:24 prior (7) 10:17,18;44:18; 45:14:100:23:102:5: 161:4 private (2) 23:11;175:19 probably (14) 33:13;66:18;75:22; 78:24;86:13:102:8; 106:19;108:12,13,14; 117:17;145:1;156:22; 159:4 problem (3) 32:25;39:11;86:21 problems (1) 59:20 procedural (3) 10:9;18:8;43:3 procedure (1) 170:11 proceed (3) 6:3;8:11;22:23 proceeding (1) 78:18 process (11) 21:4;77:16;78:21,25; 80:16:82:19:84:9: 100:13;124:25;137:22; 201:4 produce (6) 32:8,8;81:7,10,12; 121:23 produced (3) 102:3;132:3;133:15 Producing (2) 81:6;92:3 product (2) 77:16;98:6 productive (2) 34:23;35:17 professional (7) 49:19;67:24;83:23, 25;97:11;104:22,23 professor (2) 38:9;39:24 proffer (4) 29:4:93:18:112:8: 175:6 proffered (5) 29:25;42:24;43:7; 61:13;99:13 Program (2) 44:21,23 progression (1) 29:11 project (4) 86:5;92:25;108:11; 189:3

projections (2) 127:15:137:20 projects (10) 44:18:88:12.13: 89:20:90:17,17,21; 97:12;107:3;155:2 promulgate (1) 185:16 promulgated (5) 154:3,15:156:12; 186:9;192:9 proper (2) 7:5;189:25 properly (1) 78:23 property (6) 111:24;124:17; 125:8,18,19,20 proposed (26) 48:5,6,14;49:9,19; 50:5,21;56:18;59:9; 61:8;62:4,4;63:10; 67:24;69:11,17;75:20; 76:25;97:20,21;111:9; 124:25;136:4;139:4; 151:17;156:25 protect (11) 51:25,25;52:25;53:4, 17,22;58:22;106:22; 161:19;188:10;201:21 protection (1) 177:13 protections (1) 127:21protective (2) 106:2;136:13 prove (1) 93:22 proved (1) 80:18 proven (1) 200:15 provide (6) 11:23;14:2;16:4,12; 114:15,17 provided (12) 10:16;11:5;14:5,16; 17:21;18:4;19:17; 33:11;95:21;159:19; 176:14;196:17 provides (3) 126:23;127:9;128:13 providing (3) 16:4;127:14;137:24 public (12) 4:3;20:17;51:25; 52:1,25;58:22;92:25; 97:16;161:19;193:9, 12;201:21 publication (2) 132:16;158:25 publications (2) 74:20;156:8

published (6) 13:160:13.21:167:5. 97:17:158:21:186:3. 17:168:23:174:6: 10,12,18 185:24:186:9,16,23; Puerto (1) 190:6;191:18;193:16, 91:18 19 quality-related (1) pull (2)90:20;107:16 154:14 quantity (1) pulled (1) 160:10 56:17 pulmonary (6) queued (1) 30:11;31:23;32:2; 54:8 53:6;121:20;123:4 queues (2) pump (1) 179:9;181:17 122:7 quick (1) pumping (1) 47:15 122:5 quickly (1) pumps (4) 187:7 4:8;54:8,9;113:1 quite (5) purportedly (1) 18:24;43:1;79:13; 45:20 100:9;106:12 purposes (2) quotation (1) 129:13:172:9 83:15 pursuant (1) quote (10) 4:6 42:11;52:9;79:20; pushed (2) 80:8;83:12;96:10; 70:14,15 150:14;181:24;196:16, pushing (1) 16 142:23 quotes (2) put (4)128:6;134:21 21:4;51:1;160:7,24 quoting (3) puts (1) 72:8;84:22;97:4 45:2 R putting (1) 67:1 radically (1) 0 136:11 radius (1) **QED** (1) 151:15 200:17 raise (6) qualification (2) 22:20:43:3:65:17: 37:10:105:2 88:13;137:15;192:14 qualifications (5) raised (15) 32:12,15;89:4,7,14 12:21;40:13;46:5,7; 47:13;53:24;62:18; qualified (4) 25:23;28:4;43:16; 63:2;122:4;135:7; 137:11;189:23;192:16; 174:9 qualifier (4) 195:2,3 157:22,22,23;164:13 raises (2) qualifies (1) 46:10;100:18 43:14 raising (1) qualify (3) 132:14 31:11,13;177:8 random (1) quality (58) 75:7 41:20;42:15;45:24, range (1) 119:17 25;48:23;49:3;50:2; 51:16,20;52:17;57:16, rapidly (1) 19,20;58:21;59:12,23; 36:22 67:14,15;69:19;70:2,3; rates (4) 71:7:84:18:90:18,18, 71:12;152:15,21; 19.21.22:105:6:106:8. 153:1 10;107:19;109:9,23; rather (4) 113:22;146:4;154:3, 22:14;45:15;89:7; 11,20,20;155:8,9,11, 138:13

rationale (1) 165:10 reach (7) 68:5;79:20;84:14; 89:21:90:4:96:19; 176:22 reached (2) 78:21:194:7 reaching (4) 32:23;61:5;97:4; 144:7 read (54) 11:7;39:15;40:17; 44:2;46:14,20,23;47:8; 60:3;74:16,25;75:3; 85:3;99:13;102:12,13, 14,18,18,19,22,24; 103:1;107:5;109:8,8; 114:8,11,24;115:1,15; 124:13,14;126:11,13, 15,16:130:13,25; 131:8:138:18:147:8: 150:12;151:1,9; 153:19;156:7;158:4, 24;159:2,4;161:9; 164:8;178:5 reading (13) 39:18;40:5,14;44:2; 73:18;95:11;133:7,8; 151:22;152:2;163:1,3; 165:7 reads (1) 161:18 ready (6) 24:18,19;72:21; 118:3;159:20;167:11 realistic (4) 173:24;174:23,25; 181:24 realize (2) 16:3;88:22 really (14) 17:6;37:9;50:12; 72:3;93:12,12,15,24, 24;96:24;134:5; 178:25;191:5;200:19 reams (1) 187:5 reason (12) 39:20;73:20;79:2,2; 105:12;130:21;153:12; 176:23:177:7:178:6: 189:22;192:14 reasonable (2) 68:5;104:13 reasonably (1) 119:21 reasoning (1) 77:6 reasons (4) 17:24;66:9;85:25; 192:10 recall (21)

17:21:18:25:20:3; 65:1:75:11:77:9:83:7: 85:7:97:1:107:6.7; 108:20:111:2.15: 130:7;137:1;143:6; 145:2;159:2;163:4; 181:9 receive (2) 10:18;20:11 received (8) 6:23;7:7;14:3,8; 15:9;18:17;21:21; 31:21 receiving (1) 10:13 recent (9) 12:6;55:4,5;132:18, 19;133:24;155:19; 176:18:201:16 recently (8) 19:13:31:21:37:12, 13;52:15;164:16; 197:16.19 Recess (4) 72:20:118:1.2:167:7 re-characterization (1) 7:17 recognized (2) 87:19:162:24 recollection (7) 65:4,7,13:107:7; 163:7:188:2:199:13 recommend (1) 201:14 recommendation (11) 4:23;7:5;8:17,21; 52:19;79:1;80:20;88:8; 196:4:201:9.18 recommendations (7) 52:18;76:18;154:11; 186:1,15,22;196:2 recommended (2) 17:23;52:13 recommending (1) 48:22 record (41) 4:25;6:22,24;8:5; 14:2;15:8,22;17:2; 22:17;24:4;26:15;27:2; 65:11;72:22;86:17; 95:5:104:5:111:17; 114:20;115:19;126:25; 129:25;138:6;144:11, 14;149:8;157:20; 159:8;160:12;176:7,9; 178:21;179:23,25; 188:25;189:12;197:9; 199:21;202:10;203:10, 16 recovery (1) 64:4 recreation (2) 50:23;62:7

redirect (1) 202:20 reduced (4) 180:16:181:15: 197:19:202:13 reduces (1) 201:2 reducing (1) 67:3 refer (8) 35:24;56:21,23;59:6; 109:6;118:24;129:4; 130:21 reference (6) 75:24;99:2;132:23; 133:8;194:11,14 referenced (4) 74:24;99:23;147:1; 180:15 references (13) 6:13:75:10:76:11; 88:16,19;98:20;99:12, 12;129:20,23;130:4, 17:180:20 referencing (4) 128:20;133:23; 178:15;179:7 referred (5) 19:18;95:24;96:6; 156:16;189:5 referring (11) 27:25;44:5;48:16; 56:23:57:1:63:19; 109:3:128:10.13: 133:2;165:24 refers (1) 128:11 reflect (1) 129:21 reflected (2) 186:22;190:17 reflects (1) 189:13 refresh (3) 147:8;197:11;199:12 refreshing (1) 107:7 regard (9) 15:2;29:10;51:8,9; 68:21;69:4;91:2; 192:17:194:21 regarding (17) 11:8;13:18;46:12; 93:23;98:15;99:24; 100:6,20,23;109:22; 116:24;117:1;118:4; 132:12;138:12;160:17; 189:24 regardless (1) 162:19 regenerated (1) 66:15 Register (13)

48:1:105:11:155:20, 21;156:1,8,18;158:3, 25;159:7;186:3,11,18 Registry (1) 76:16 regulate (2) 188:5;191:6 regulated (3) 48:13;156:11;202:8 regulates (1) 190:5 regulating (1) 191:12 regulation (9) 77:20,21;78:1,1,2,7, 10;186:9,12 regulations (5) 185:16,18;186:14, 21,22 regulatory (2) 48:1:155:4 reiterate (1) 43:9 relate (2) 47:16;172:5 related (10) 33:10;35:10;46:21; 56:19;85:23;86:1; 90:21;129:21;130:5,6 relates (2) 103:25:156:8 relating (2) 172:12:180:22 relatively (2) 51:5;161:2 relaxation (1) 68:24 relaxed (1) 68:22 relevance (6) 45:8;76:6;90:9; 126:6,7:196:10 relevancy (1) 36:18 relevant (17) 29:5;38:5;39:14; 40:12,23;47:25;52:3, 12;74:14,17;75:6,16; 93:19;125:25;155:19, 20;195:4 relied (6) 97:7,10,11;144:8,17; 153:23 rely (2) 11:15,16 remained (1) 104:22 remand (1) 7:4 remanded (1) 18:5 remember (14) 19:4;21:10,11;54:19;

### Case No. S-2863/OZAH No. 13-12

60:3:69:1:88:18,19: 96:10;109:3;115:13; 145:9;158:24;171:11 remembers (1) 171:21 remind (2) 10:7:51:7 reminded (1) 87:19 reminding (1) 111:18 rendered (1) 8:7 Renee (1) 73:4 renew (1) 136:21 repeat (2) 104:9;151:25 rephrase (2) 78:3,4 reply (3) 6:6;20:8;195:16 report (117) 4:22;6:12;7:14;8:17, 20;11:2;15:7,8;17:20; 18:2,5;19:1,7,9,24; 20:15;21:1,9,17;45:10, 17,24;46:1,11;51:10; 55:3:56:2:68:20.23; 69:4;73:6,18;76:10; 85:1:95:22:96:1.2: 97:8:98:2:99:7.8.11.17. 23:100:7.19.24: 101:22:102:5,9,12; 103:11;108:21,24; 114:9,12,23;117:2; 118:21:119:3.4: 126:13,22,23;127:9,13; 128:1,6,7,9,12,13,13, 19,19,20,24;129:15; 130:5;136:24;137:21; 138:25;139:21;144:6, 22:146:14,18,19; 149:21,25;150:12; 153:16;154:6;173:5,6, 15,20,20;174:15,16; 175:7,8;176:15,19,21; 178:13,16;179:7,20,24; 180:20,24;181:6,9,14; 194:5,11 reported (5) 59:3;135:24;144:21; 158:14;178:13 reporting (1) 71:22 reports (29) 10:13,16;11:14; 15:16;40:16,17;42:15; 44:2,3,4,8:46:21:48:4; 54:16,19;55:3,20; 61:21:68:18:74:20: 96:13;97:10;100:11;

31:3.3.10

PETITION OF COSICO	WHOLESALE COR
102:23;127:6;171:24;	rognanding (2)
· · · ·	responding (3)
179:10,16;192:9	45:13;154:21;159:1
represent (4)	responds (1)
182:21;183:14;	116:3
184:21;193:4	response (20)
representative (1)	5:25;9:9,21;13:17;
85:8	17:22;19:1,2,5;20:1
represents (1)	16,20,23;22:8;94:9,
184:5	134:12;139:11;159:
request (2)	187:17;195:20
11:18;20:12	responses (1)
require (4)	19:25
8:19;20:6;32:8;65:1	responsibilities (1)
required (7)	99:5
22:2;32:7;53:16;	responsible (1)
77:12;83:1;138:20;	48:22
143:4	responsive (3)
requirement (1)	46:15;50:13,15
53:18	rest (2)
requires (6)	11:24;175:10
19:14;22:3;65:2,9,	restrict (1)
24;146:4	36:17
re-read (1)	restricted (1)
113:9	138:25
re-reviewed (1)	result (4)
44:13	54:7;56:6;63:10;
research (3)	184:19
40:6;59:5;189:3	results (4)
residences (2)	179:16,21,22;180:2
111:19;112:7	resume (7)
residency (3)	4:16;32:16;42:4;
25:9,11;38:17	167:11,12;202:19;
residents (19)	203:17
38:14;41:23;48:6;	resumed (1)
49:10,21;50:19;53:25;	4:14
54:3;62:3;70:4;97:7;	retain (1)
109:21,25;110:5;	12:8
111:3,7,8;112:11,12	retained (2)
resolution (3)	7:12;91:18
7:8,22;8:24	return (7)
resolve (2)	24:2,13,18;124:11,
196:10;203:17	12;129:19;163:11
resolved (1)	revealed (1)
79:10	40:6
resolving (1)	reverse (3)
93:13	168:22,22;170:11
respect (9)	review (17)
17:19;29:18;33:20;	13:12;18:6;43:24;
36:2,5;88:23;98:1;	50:21;82:16;91:15;
120:13;161:8	97:25;98:3,15;100:7
respectfully (1)	144:20;150:15,19;
139:6	153:15;187:15;201:
respiratory (6)	15
36:5;161:11;185:3,5,	reviewed (13)
7,9	11:4;41:8;44:9,9;
respiratory-related (2)	47:25;48:1;54:16;
161:24;168:5	74:13;98:23;100:11
respond (9)	101:21;155:19;176:
21:25;22:2,4,5;	reviewing (3)
45:12,23;58:23;67:12;	44:8;48:3;78:25
45.12,25,58.25,07.12, 118:6	revised (6)
responded (1)	103:11,19;104:15;
19:5	112:1;178:23;194:5
17.5	112.1,170.23,194.3

	revision (1)	16;122:2
159:16	55:14	10,122.2
139.10	revisions (1)	Road (2)
	95:23	4:9;179:8
	<b>Rico (1)</b>	roads (6)
.17.		54:10;16
:17; ;20:14,	91:18	· · · ·
	<b>right (138)</b>	7,8;168:2
94:9,9;	5:3,18;6:1;8:8,10,18;	roadway (1
;159:17;	9:7,17,20;10:23;11:6,	168:14
	16;12:5,15;13:2,8,14;	roadways (
	15:23;16:6,12;17:10,	162:2;16
(4)	25;20:22;21:13,13;	role (4)
(1)	22:7,13,20,23;24:8,12;	12:11;23
	26:23;28:11;29:14;	51:15
	38:16;40:1,19;41:2;	rolling (1)
	43:17;45:5;46:8;49:7;	158:1
	51:13;56:20;62:20;	room (8)
5	63:23,25;64:18;65:12;	4:17,18;3
	66:4;71:11;72:14,21;	55:11;94
	79:22;85:4;87:9;89:25,	168:5
	25;90:13;92:10;93:4;	rooms (2)
	94:18,25;95:7;98:13;	23:9;36:1
	99:14;105:8;106:16;	ROSENFE
	107:12,21;108:16;	5:8,8;7:1
	110:18,25;112:16;	8:3,9;9:5
0;	114:6,16;115:13;	13:24,25
	116:14;117:15,25;	15:3,19,2
	118:3,5,18;124:21;	16,22;17
180:2	126:15,21;127:5;	10;19:8,1
	128:5;133:11,16;	27:1,4;41
4;	134:22;135:6;136:7;	16,18,22
:19;	137:24;139:8;140:10;	46:10;61
,	141:25;143:4,20;	72:5,23;1
	147:25;151:24;152:3;	11;136:1
	159:14,22;160:24;	20;143:2
	165:9;166:11,18;	16;146:1
	167:3,11,12;171:10;	148:6,12
	172:10,20;173:13;	23;150:3
	175:17;178:4;179:19;	152:4,9;1
	184:7;189:4,8;190:9;	157:2,25
4:11,	193:25;194:2,16,22,23;	4,9,14,19
:11	195:9,20;196:12;	163:10,1
	197:23;198:2;200:8,	164:1,7;1
	17,18;202:18,18;	20,22;16
	203:16	170:4,6,8
:11	righty (1)	171:15,1
	73:13	19,22;17
24;	ring (2)	176:10;1
1:15;	54:10;179:8	24;178:2
100:7;	ringing (1)	182:11,2
,19;	176:17	184:8;18
;201:13,	risk (25)	190:2;19
,201110,	54:1;60:7,14,14;	23,24;19
	80:13;98:2;106:9,11;	8;199:3,1
9,9;	118:24;119:22;120:23,	200:4,10
:16;	25;121:18;122:23;	201:1;20
)):11;	123:21;124:9,11;	Rosenfeld'
;176:16	127:15,21;129:11,21;	117:9
, 0.10	130:11;134:16;191:14;	rotate (1)
.5	193:21	38:14
	risks (14)	roughly (1)
:15;	61:10;80:12;112:22;	37:22
194:5	119:17;120:4,13,13,14,	rounds (3)
	117.17,120.1,13,13,17,	- Junus (J)

16;122:23;123:3,6,10,
12 Road (2)
4:9;179:8
roads (6)
54:10;161:22;162:3,
7,8;168:2 roadway (1)
168:14
roadways (2)
162:2;168:7
role (4) 12:11;23:16;43:22;
51:15
rolling (1)
158:1
room (8)
4:17,18;38:16,16; 55:11;94:23;161:24;
168:5
rooms (2)
23:9;36:14
<b>ROSENFELD</b> (156)
5:8,8;7:1,2,16,18,23; 8:3,9;9:5;11:1,4,10;
13:24,25;14:1,12,20;
15:3,19,22,25;16:13,
16,22;17:3,8,17;18:1,
10;19:8,14,21;20:9;
27:1,4;41:2,4;42:3,6, 16,18,22,24;45:3,7,23;
46:10;61:11,13;67:7;
72:5,23;117:14;123:8,
11;136:18,21;137:9,
20;143:25;144:1,4,5,
16;146:19;147:5; 148:6,12;149:4,10,19,
23;150:3;151:9,11,13;
152:4,9;153:3,13;
157:2,25;158:9;160:2,
4,9,14,19;161:6;
163:10,15,17,20,23; 164:1,7;167:13,14,15,
20,22;168:21;169:19;
170:4,6,8,14,21,23;
171:15,18,22;172:11,
19,22;173:3;175:24;
176:10;177:14,17,19, 24;178:2,7,9,22;180:1;
182:11,24;183:1;
184:8;185:10;186:24;
190:2;194:10;195:22,
23,24;197:10,24;198:1,
8;199:3,12,15,17,25; 200:4,10,11,21,24;
201:1;202:11,16
Rosenfeld's (1)
117:9
rotate (1) 38:14
38:14 roughly (1)
37:22
rounds (3)

row (3) 86:9,12,18 rule (8) 16:18,20;71:3; 153:14;156:12;159:3; 166:8,13 rulemaking (1) 157:1 rules (1) 8:2 ruling (2) 16:25;46:18 running (2) 99:3;137:17 rural (9) 69:15;70:12,22,24; 71:12,17;152:6,15; 153:1 Russell (1) 41:11 S S- (1) 124:18 S-2863 (1) 4:5 safety (26) 33:10;41:22;53:3; 70:6;109:5;129:5,7; 185:1,7,12,14;187:1,8, 11,19,23;196:1,3,14, 18;197:18,22;198:9, 22;199:4,13 same (13) 51:1;54:13;88:13; 98:25;104:22;106:4; 115:3;127:3,3;156:12; 182:1;189:19;198:21 Sammick (1) 79:4 Sammit (1) 77:1 sample (1) 149:19 samples (7)

145:21;146:8,10; 147:17,19;149:20;

144:8,10,18;145:3;

150:9 sampling (5)

154:23 sand (1) 79:18 Sarah (1) 160:7 satisfaction (1) 79:10 satisfied (1) 14:19 satisfies (1)

20:12

saw (4)	secondhand (1)	15;125:16,16;126:11,	show (8)	situation (10)
13:3;33:7;100:11;	114:4	14,20;127:8,17;128:5,	15:9;137:16;139:24;	43:24;60:22;88:23;
190:18	secondly (1)	11,11,16;129:4;	146:14,16;177:6;	89:2;91:1,3;92:17;
saying (33)	104:20	138:11;144:19;167:24;	179:19;193:17	106:9,10;193:18
14:18;19:25;29:8;	secret (1) 92:9	168:3;175:10,12	showed (1)	<b>six (10)</b> 42:7;145:11;146:1;
64:8;73:2;84:24;97:1; 98:9;105:3,24;128:21,	92:9 Section (4)	<b>separate (2)</b> 58:18;134:18	156:4 showing (1)	42:7;145:11;146:1; 156:16,17,17;157:3;
22,23;129:13;130:7;	4:6;147:6,9,10	September (20)	151:14	164:12;167:3;198:24
132:10,12;133:20;	sections (6)	4:15,17;6:9,11,20;	shown (2)	sixth (1)
134:2;135:17;146:8;	47:25;150:15,18,23;	11:22;15:1;73:1;94:12;	177:1;184:2	157:7
148:25;151:18;152:20;	155:19,20	95:22;96:2;103:11,13,	shows (1)	skim (2)
153:15;171:7;176:3;	sector (1)	22;104:2,7;105:15;	138:19	115:16,18
184:1,6;191:9;194:3;	23:12	144:6;176:11,18	shut (1)	skin (1)
195:16;198:18	seeing (2)	series (2)	142:11	198:20
scan (1)	24:13;33:4	96:14;154:18	side (4)	skip (1)
114:24	seeks (1)	services (2)	12:13;139:1;153:9;	84:15
scenario (1)	19:15	33:4;94:6	168:22	skipped (1)
91:8	seem (4)	serving (1)	sides (3)	102:21
scent (1)	73:20;94:2;108:20;	111:18	12:8;190:10,15	slightly (2)
145:7	191:14	session (2)	signed (1)	95:21;182:5
scents (1)	seemed (1)	4:16;10:12	95:14	small (4)
145:6	39:21	set (14)	significance (4)	12:22;13:18;23:8;
schedule (1)	seems (4)	41:19;53:16;71:3,4;	50:2;51:15;56:14;	28:18
17:16	89:21;131:16;	78:21;81:23;128:5;	121:16	smoke (1)
scheduled (2)	132:23;171:3	142:17;163:8;168:10,	significant (3)	114:4
6:16,19	segment (1)	13;181:1;191:12;	56:19;121:14;165:14	smoking $(1)$
school (15)	28:18	192:10 sets (4)	<b>Silver (1)</b> 4:9	114:4 society (1)
25:3,8;38:10;39:25; 50:9;51:1,13;53:21,22,	<b>segue (1)</b> 195:19	59:9;71:2;167:24;	4:9 SILVERMAN (41)	106:3
25;68:3;92:24;97:16;	segueing (1)	181:18	5:10,10,12;12:16,18,	sold (1)
108:13;143:3	125:15	setting (1)	21;13:2,5,7,9,11,15;	64:7
schools (7)	selected (3)	80:15	64:15,20,21;65:9,21;	solve (1)
25:7;50:6,23;62:7;	47:25;75:5;88:4	settings (1)	110:17;141:8,24;	86:21
92:24,25;93:1	selection (1)	47:22	142:1,3;148:5,7,11,15,	Somebody (5)
science (1)	75:7	settling (1)	18;151:25;160:1;	19:4;83:8;87:7;
84:4	sell (2)	77:11	166:15;167:9;168:20;	148:9;171:16
scientific (13)	62:16;63:6	seven (5)	191:2,5;193:14,24;	somehow (2)
44:9;46:21;49:3;	selling (1)	42:7;52:7,11;91:16,	194:2;195:6,17;	21:4;160:14
68:6;74:21;77:18;	75:21	17	198:25;203:21	someone (2)
79:21;82:16;97:19;	seminar (1)	several (6)	Silverman's (1)	110:1;163:5
100:23;170:13;201:16,	31:17	38:19;95:23;127:14;	13:17	someplace (1)
19	seminars (3)	183:3;187:8,9	similar (8)	142:4
scientists (2)	31:6,6,10	shaking (1)	44:13;51:5;88:13;	sometime (1)
73:21;135:24 sclerosis (1)	Senate (1) 108:12	141:13 shape (1)	92:17;103:17;144:9, 18;199:13	10:8 sometimes (3)
36:6	send (3)	12:1	simply (1)	31:6;84:12;155:13
scope (7)	18:13;73:2,3	share (2)	11:24	somewhat (1)
42:14,18;67:8,17;	sense (12)	23:25;190:8	single (2)	192:19
89:8;136:24;177:3	16:18;77:18;83:11;	SHEARD (2)	107:9;196:24	somewhere (1)
scripted (1)	101:9,10;105:13,16;	5:22,22	sit (1)	171:20
73:17	117:8;118:23;125:21;	sheet (3)	77:4	soon (1)
se (2)	161:16;186:20	166:6;167:20;170:16	site (11)	192:18
62:24;153:17	sensitive (5)	shop (1)	4:9;45:19;62:5;	sorry (41)
second (21)	53:1;81:14,18;	95:19	64:10;97:20,23;98:18;	22:14;27:12;34:13;
4:18;45:5;50:5;	129:17;162:9	short (8)	125:5;147:20;150:9;	38:2;39:3;44:12;47:11;
62:13;71:3;73:12;	sensitivity (1)	12:23;48:23;90:11;	191:24	49:4;59:8;64:11;72:5;
90:12;99:18;124:14;	82:9	157:6,6,7;163:4,7	sited (1)	81:5,16,25;83:24;
130:23;131:3;133:3,4,	sent (7)	shorter (1)	98:10	85:19;87:9;89:12;94:3;
4,19;137:2;161:18;	16:11;18:6;73:1;	162:25	sites (2)	99:15;103:12;104:11;
168:3;180:18;183:8;	77:6;94:9;95:12;	shorthand (1)	146:9,10	112:1;113:5,10;115:9;
190:13	188:22	170:12 short torm (4)	sitting (4)	120:11;121:22;122:6;
secondary (1)	sentence (23)	short-term (4)	38:15,16;137:21;	123:8;130:8;144:15;
64:3	109:8,13,20;124:14,	161:2,5,20;162:23	159:19	145:16;147:7;155:23;

163:3;167:18;168:12; 170:24:175:25:185:4 sort (3) 88:2,3;95:25 sorts (1) 37:23 sought (1) 120:15 sounds (3) 107:12:121:3.3 source (2) 107:9;108:1 sources (3) 76:15;179:16;180:7 **SOX (2)** 157:6;187:12 **sp** (1) 119:25 space (1) 6:19 span (1) 98:21 speak (11) 14:12;20:9;57:23; 86:11;87:1,7;111:7; 128:3;135:3;155:23; 180:22 speaker (1) 57:23 speaking (3) 8:25;117:20;201:2 speaks (2) 126:16:131:18 special (12) 4:5;17:23;19:16; 29:9,16;35:9;48:7; 56:18;97:20;124:18; 141:18:142:21 specialization (1) 29:24 **Specializations (1)** 28:6 specialties (4) 27:11,15;28:25;40:4 specialty (4) 27:19,21;29:4;30:4 specific (9) 77:22;85:8;93:1; 106:9,10;120:23; 121:17;146:10;174:24 specifically (13) 8:4;20:10;31:19; 34:21;42:8;45:17; 51:14;53:20;55:22; 111:2;113:8;135:9; 175:2 speculate (2) 199:8,8 speculating (2) 88:7:199:6 speed (1) 47:20 spelled (1)

53:10 Spencer (1) 107:18 spend (1) 162:6 spent (4) 25:10;31:1;181:16; 199:22 spirit (1) 12:3 spoke (1) 32:21 spread (1) 10:23 Spring (1) 4:9 squarely (1) 20:5 squeezing (1) 17:6 ST (10) 106:14,16;157:15. 17;159:7;169:13; 188:23;189:2,2,7 stachybotrys (1) 108:11 staff (22) 9:19;17:21,22;18:2, 6,19,25;19:3,6,12,18, 24;20:7,16;21:18;22:1, 6;66:20;73:5;112:6; 152:16:194:20 stand (4) 49:1;57:21;159:18; 195:2 standard (56) 43:9:69:15,15:76:23, 25;77:15;78:21;80:5; 103:3,5,9;104:15,19; 105:5.6.14:106:2; 108:23;156:3;157:8, 12:158:4.5.15:161:4.5. 19;163:8;167:25; 168:11,14;178:11; 181:1;182:17,21; 183:18;184:22,24; 185:20;187:11;188:13; 189:25;190:1,1;193:5; 196:16;197:3,18,21,21, 23;198:13;201:23,23; 202:3,5 Standards (91) 48:23;50:1,2;51:3,3, 17,18,19,23;52:13,17, 24;53:16,21;58:21,25, 25;59:2,6,7,10,18,23; 61:22;69:19;70:2,3,12, 16;71:7;76:16,22; 80:16;81:22,22,23,23; 103:19;109:1;146:4; 154:3,5,15,24;155:4, 17;156:19,19;164:1; 165:18;169:7;179:3,4;

185:21,23,24;186:9,10, 16.23:188:1.5.10.18: 190:4,6,7,17,20;191:7, 9,13,15,18,19,25; 192:2,6,8,11,19; 193:16,17,19,23; 194:18,19,24;195:1,15; 196:2 standing (1) 193:16 standpoint (1) 65:15 start (4) 10:15;26:4;142:4; 163:5 started (2) 100:13;120:11 starting (3) 38:17;133:4;175:18 state (11) 6:22;8:2,15;10:20; 22:16;59:1;61:18; 93:20;104:13;120:14; 131:16 stated (5) 15:13;78:20;81:21; 108:22;109:1 statement (7) 27:8;80:9;96:13; 128:20;131:18;133:9; 138:15 statements (2) 138:2.4 state-of-the (1) 124:16 state-of-the-art (5) 36:23;64:3;124:15; 125:4.17 States (5) 23:13:25:20:59:1; 82:4;91:19 stating (2) 7:22;61:16 station (64) 4:8;41:21,24;48:5, 14;49:9,19;50:6,21; 51:5;54:2,5,7;56:7,9, 10;57:4;58:16;59:9; 61:8;62:5;63:7,11; 64:7,24;65:4;67:25; 68:2;69:12,18;71:20; 75:20;81:19;84:19; 88:25;91:1;93:10,15; 106:23,25;107:1,2; 111:9;112:21;113:6,9, 10,11,20;121:24; 124:24;136:5;139:5, 22;140:12;141:5; 142:7,8,12;144:9,18; 146:12;151:17;189:24 stations (3) 122:5,7;125:18 statistics (1)

174:8 statute (4) 52:14:53:9,10; 190:20 stav (1) 192:25 staying (1) 193:7 step (2) 22:15:58:14 Stephen (4) 41:9;51:13;53:20; 68:3 Sterling (12) 51:5;140:5;144:9,18, 20;145:22;146:10,11; 147:12,17,19;150:9 stick (1) 125:22 still (16) 9:9,25;15:1;23:8; 38:12,13;39:15;69:2; 77:4;86:16;97:16; 128:8;136:1;142:8,9; 199:6 stipulate (1) 79:19 stipulated (1) 78:6 **Stop** (7) 5:10,16:33:3:78:8: 141:24:191:8:200:20 stopped (3) 33:2;143:23;152:7 stopping (1) 202:17 stops (1) 73:23 storage (1) 64:2 store (1) 112:20 stores (1) 113:19 strange (1) 68:13 strata (1) 179:5 Street (4) 22:19;23:10;111:16, 16 stricter (2) 59:2:106:2 strike (1) 176:6strongly (1) 79:20 stuck (1) 58:9 students (5) 37:22;38:14;39:10; 50:6,22 studied (1)

95:24 studies (6) 48:3;129:21;130:10; 132:2:133:13:201:12 study (5) 69:9;97:19;132:12; 139:24;147:12 stuff (4) 66:14;79:7;114:1; 122:9 sub-category (1) 29:9 subject (2) 4:8:12:23 subjected (1) 50:20 submission (7) 41:7;42:10;55:5; 104:11,12,13;194:13 submissions (2) 11:7;99:20 submit (1) 10:2 submitted (9) 11:21;14:18;21:1; 26:14;54:20;55:4;77:2; 100:5;101:19 subparts (1) 6:9 subsequent (1) 99:10 subset (3) 53:8:75:2:82:13 subspecialty (1) 28:7 sub-specialty (1) 30:4 substance (8) 43:16,19;58:10; 89:16:94:1:96:23; 104:1;129:12 substances (1) 127:22 substantive (3) 75:7;173:18,23 substantively (1) 104:24 suddenly (1) 159:12 suffer (1) 162:25 sufficient (2) 32:17;42:1 sufficiently (2) 12:9;193:4 suggest (5) 134:1,3;162:1,12; 194:17 suggested (1) 67:8 suggesting (1) 81:12 suggestion (1)

171:3 supply (1) suitcase (2) 92:5;145:1 supplying sulfur (11) 136:12;145:10,12; support (2 149:11,13;157:6; 164:22;198:22,25; supporting 199:1.1 Sullivan (67) supposed ( 6:19:14:9:15:7.16; 16:1,19;17:20;18:18; 20:5;21:17;44:7;51:4; sure (47) 55:2,12;61:13;68:18; 71:21;85:9,10,12,18, 20,23;87:11,21; 102:23;110:1;111:6; 117:2;127:13;128:1, 10,12,13,19,20,24; 144:21;146:18,18; 150:12;153:2,14; 171:8,25;172:5;173:4, 7:174:14;175:22; 176:15,19;180:16,22; 181:8,14,20,21,25; surface (1) 183:5;184:9,13,18; 191:3;194:11;196:11; 202:21 surprised Sullivan's (36) 20:15;21:8;40:15; surroundin 41:19;42:14;44:2;51:9; 54:16:55:20:56:2:61:6, surviving ( 7.16.21:62:1:73:5: 97:8;102:12;108:20; susceptible 114:9,11,23;118:21; 128:8;146:19;149:20; sustain (2) 176:21;178:13,15; 179:10,16,20,24;181:6; Sustained 193:1:194:4 summaries (2) swimming 153:22;182:9 summarized (2) sworn (1) 100:7:146:15 symptoms summarizes (1) 132:20 syndrome summary (9) 6:8,25;8:2;16:17; 138:25;178:3;179:21; system (5) 180:2;182:7 sun (1) 60:4 systematic sunlight (2) systems (2) 198:19.19 supplement (5) 21:15;32:4;55:4,14; 172:24 supplemental (5) 19:8;21:5;73:6; table (5) 74:23;102:23 supplements (1) 54:23 tables (3) supplied (5) 18:19,21;19:12; tailpipe (1)

<b>HOLESALE CORI O</b>	AHON
	tailminag (2)
<b>upply (1)</b>	tailpipes (2)
189:6	122:12;131:17
upplying (1)	talk (9)
159:17	47:18;57:11,15;
upport (2)	62:13;139:12,13,15;
19:17;20:10	150:1;157:3
pporting (2)	talked (2)
11:20;177:20	136:1;138:14
pposed (7)	talking (32)
14:17;80:5;89:15;	6:24;37:2;57:9,13;
115:5,7;164:15;192:1	63:15,16,17;64:6;
ıre (47)	67:14;80:14;81:16;
7:20;12:1,12;16:20,	121:2,4,25;126:21;
24;17:16;18:13;20:4;	132:23;133:1,18;
26:3;27:22;29:1;49:12,	134:2;137:5,8;138:4;
13;50:16,18;55:25,25,	139:12;140:7,7;
25;60:23,24,24,25;	150:16;177:23;189:13;
62:25;63:4,4,4;71:2;	191:11,12;194:18;
77:24;78:16;84:13;	201:8
85:15;88:7;92:8;94:19;	talks (3)
95:9,12;106:12;128:2;	20:2;133:17;168:1
134:7;138:15;149:6;	tank (1)
154:17;164:10;168:18;	64:2
189:12;200:6,25	taught (2)
urface (1)	37:22;39:9
24:3	teach (1)
rprised (1)	38:13
110:10	teaches (1)
rrounding (2)	97:16
62:5;151:16	team (1)
rviving (1)	44:1
199:23	Technical (9)
sceptible (1)	18:25;19:3,6,12,23;
162:20	21:18;73:5;102:20;
ıstain (2)	112:6
24:15;67:16	technically (2)
ustained (2)	139:3;158:19
46:18;47:4	technology (6)
vimming (2)	65:3;76:6,7,10;
50:8;68:2	138:7,9
vorn (1)	telling (1)
22:22	100:22
vmptoms (4)	temperature (1)
185:3,5,8,9	9:20
vndrome (1)	temporary (1)
92:21	81:10
vstem (5)	Ten (3)
36:5;60:7,12;66:14;	159:15;200:1,5
123:4	tend (1)
	75:18
v <b>stematic (1)</b> 98:22	
	tendered (1)
vstems (2)	21:21
36:5;136:11	tennis (1)
Т	50:25
Т	term (4)
	24:4;66:15;80:22;
ble (5)	186:21
157:13;163:22;	termed (3)
165:23;172:16;180:2	27:10,12,14
bles (3)	terminal (1)
153:18,21;172:12	83:8
ilpipe (1)	terminated (1)
122:9	36:11

terminology (1) 27:25 terms (20) 15:18;20:2;37:9; 56:14;66:20;67:18; 70:17;89:24;93:13,25; 95:18;126:19;127:10, 18:144:2;148:9,9; 155:17;164:1;193:21 testified (17) 24:21;25:16;46:20; 47:19:49:25:52:24; 69:8;93:23;94:1;106:9; 107:8,25;111:25; 130:6;150:11;181:22; 196:15 testify (20) 37:25;38:4;41:9,11, 13,18;42:17,21;45:17; 64:23;67:9;71:4;79:15; 90:13:97:1:107:9: 117:18;137:22;139:2; 189:11 testifying (12) 6:18;26:1;32:17; 46:12;51:14;89:24; 117:10,13;124:18; 137:22,24;177:4 testimonial (1) 91:4 testimonies (1) 106:7 testimony (47) 11:5;40:14,14;42:14, 19;43:16;52:16;53:21; 64:22,22;65:1,8,13,19; 66:25;67:2,11,19; 69:14;72:18;80:25; 89:8,15,19,23;90:7,25; 93:19:101:24:105:3; 110:14;135:16;138:6, 11,24;141:8;147:1; 154:1;155:18;179:15; 195:7,10;196:1,5,19; 197:17;200:13 thanks (1) 87:8 theme (1) 75:18 thereafter (1) 140:13 therefore (2) 82:5;124:8 third (7) 25:11;99:18;126:12, 14;144:7,19;176:5 third-(1) 181:22 third-hand (2) 175:3;181:23 Thomas (1) 41:14 thorough (1)

108:5 though (9) 11:14:46:14:49:12; 59:7:92:10:140:10: 153:22;155:4;168:19 thought (18) 10:11;21:19;35:2; 49:11:61:25:120:24; 121:18;129:11;135:6; 138:12,13;148:24; 157:16;192:3;193:10, 14,21;194:9 thousands (1) 28:22 three (27) 10:21;23:8;31:18; 37:5,16,16,18;42:6; 54:23;88:16;119:25; 141:6;146:5,5;151:14; 161:15;163:24;164:6, 12;165:1;167:2; 184:23;187:21;197:13, 13.14:200:7 threshold (2) 198:19.20 thrilled (2) 15:14;86:22 throughout (1) 44:24 throw (1) 102:8 Thursday (1) 17:12 Thus (1) 125:4**Tim (8)** 90:20;106:13; 157:13;188:21;189:1, 1.2.9 time-consuming (1) 99:4 timely (1) 10:14 times (9) 24:24;25:22;26:9; 80:19;187:9;188:3; 193:15;200:1,5 time-weighted (2) 158:7;159:13 timing (2) 15:16,17 tiny (2) 140:7,14 title (6) 130:18;147:6,9,11; 151:11,12 titles (1) 129:20 today (16) 4:16;5:24;6:17;9:18; 10:8,19;21:23;73:4; 117:11,13;129:18; 143:3;187:9;200:14;

21:17,22

	WHOLESALE CORI O		1	
203:17.20	33:4	138:20;143:25;201:6	United (3)	6:13;66:16;80:22;
together (1)	traveling (1)	turned (1)	23:13;82:4;91:19	111:15;133:13;151:15;
0				
80:18	34:6	108:10	units (1)	175:17;181:25;182:2,
togetherness (1)	treadmill (1)	Twenty-two (1)	174:7	3;184:9;187:8;196:14
86:24	23:9	165:4	University (7)	users (1)
told (11)	treatable (1)	two (45)	25:9,12,13,15;31:4;	62:7
14:1;69:6;77:5;79:4;	81:8	6:25;7:3,5;15:15;	38:10;39:25	uses (3)
86:4;88:11;103:21;	treated (16)	18:1;25:10;30:16;	unleaded (1)	56:10,19;111:14
110:8,9;111:2;135:22	32:23,25;33:17,18,	31:21;32:22;33:7,22,	64:7	using (8)
tomorrow (4)	20,24;34:21;35:5,16,	25;36:16,17,19;37:2,	unless (6)	11:21;75:22;168:25;
17:5,13,15;142:7	22;36:2,3,6,13,16;	11,15,18,19;42:6,8;	15:20;114:14;	169:23;176:20;181:13,
toned (1)	79:21	44:7;45:7,9;54:23;	152:13;168:16;191:7;	18;184:24
174:4	treating (2)	76:21;87:5;93:2;98:18;	194:14	usually (3)
took (12)	34:2;40:7	115:2,4,11;116:24;	unlikely (2)	20:1;92:20;129:22
79:4,4;105:4,16;	treatment (2)	117:14,17;126:22;	117:18,19	
128:8,24;135:16;	33:11,19	129:22;158:5;164:13,	unreasonable (1)	V
143:2,2,7;191:17;	Treatments (1)	14;166:17;167:2;	112:19	
197:14	36:22	181:18;203:5	up (45)	vacation (1)
top (4)	trial (1)	type (2)	9:11;22:15;25:2;	34:10
21:11;106:16;	26:1	60:15;134:22	34:15;47:20;50:10;	vaccinations (1)
165:25;167:24	trick (1)	types (2)	57:23;64:11;68:16;	34:6
topic (1)	168:19	53:17;135:18	70:7;74:10;76:22;77:3,	vaguely (2)
31:7	tricky (1)	typically (6)	4,11;79:1;83:22;86:7,	175:3;181:23
topics (2)	74:1	31:16;35:24;57:6;	13;87:7;90:17,19;	valid (1)
31:4,20	tried (1)	60:14;186:1;201:6	106:4;109:9,20;	36:25
<b>Topographic</b> (1)	89:10	typo (1)	111:21;114:1;132:13;	valuing (1)
151:14	trip (1)	178:3	138:19;144:2;150:25;	150:1
total (4)	129:24	170.5	151:1,20;155:23;	vapor (4)
		U		
176:21;178:25;	trouble (3)	U	156:4;163:16;169:16;	64:3;121:25;122:4,
179:10;180:6	57:24;86:14;171:1		177:14;183:21;191:21;	11
totality (1)	truck (7)	UCLA (4)	194:8,12;195:21;	variability (1)
97:11	75:14,15,15;137:17;	25:4,5,7,8	197:15;201:13	82:9
totally (2)	138:19,19;139:3	ultimately (1)	update (1)	variety (3)
19:19;52:19	trucks (14)	80:3	166:6	33:5;40:8;52:3
toxicologist (1)	54:9;63:17;64:9,13,	ultra-low (1)	updated (17)	various (16)
97:15	22,23;65:2,3,10,24;	136:12	16:10;17:19;18:2,5,	6:4;11:8;31:7;35:2;
toxicology (1)	75:21;137:11,15;138:5	umbrella (1)	17;20:20;21:17;52:14;	36:7;40:23;82:10;84:3;
52:4		45:22		
	true (11)		104:12;159:3;165:18,	98:4,6;102:23;113:19;
track (3)	45:16;65:23;66:8;	unanimously (1)	25;173:4;179:21;	119:12;140:11;141:19;
64:11;141:23;142:22	67:1;98:25;111:22;	7:3	188:12,15;192:9	155:8
tract (1)	135:1,2;155:16;	Unbuild (1)	updating (1)	vast (1)
121:20	190:22,24	142:14	11:24	137:12
traditional (1)	trust (1)	unchanged (2)	upon (1)	vehicle (2)
36:11	139:20	103:9;180:24	100:5	63:14;98:4
train (1)	truth (1)	under (13)	upper (5)	vehicles (7)
106:23	42:17	18:20;45:21;60:4;	127:11,23,25,25;	63:10,12,16;64:10;
		· · · · ·		
training $(2)$	try (17)	69:8;71:1,4;82:11;	128:22	65:25;66:3;133:6
67:23;106:21	12:10;55:23;61:1;	101:7;146:3;169:25;	upshot (1)	Veirs (1)
transcript (2)	73:21,25;74:4,6;84:11;	179:16;191:25;196:20	77:7	4:9
7:19;60:3	86:7,11;87:1;91:10;	underground (1)	up-to-date (1)	versa (1)
transcripts (3)	125:22,22;142:22;	64:2	39:22	183:19
138:18;187:5;196:8	153:7,11	underlying (2)	upwards (1)	VERSAR (3)
transfer (1)	trying (23)	165:11;182:1	30:9	85:22;87:20;88:10
10:5	13:11;19:4;63:21;	understood (9)	urban (10)	version (4)
transient (1)	71:19;75:13,14;76:5;	15:15;32:9,19;33:16,	14:17;70:22,24;	10:3;95:21;104:3;
81:10	78:16;79:14;89:21;	16;39:11;74:16;	71:17;152:5,14,18;	143:6
translate (1)	90:5;96:21;98:21;	139:19;154:2	153:1;176:20;180:25	versions (2)
136:3	99:21;136:5;170:4;	unfair (2)	use (11)	84:3;137:6
Transportation (1)	175:4;177:18;191:13;	114:13;116:13	24:4;65:18;71:12;	versus (4)
	192:24;193:10,17;	unique (4)	111:12;112:2;113:1,	37:19;137:6;152:6,
108:10			, , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , _ ,
			18:136:12:151.15	14
trap (1)	196:18	88:24;91:2,8,8	18;136:12;151:15; 186:21:199:23	14 Vice (3)
			18;136:12;151:15; 186:21;199:23 <b>used (13)</b>	14 Vice (3) 8:4;97:13;183:19

remun of cosice	WHOLESALE CORPOR	KATION		
vicinity (1)	9:18	112:8	115:6,14;116:22;	48:6;49:10,21;50:19;
111:9	warning (1)	Whereupon (1)	117:4;120:7,19;	62:3;68:1;70:4;188:11;
View (5)	83:22	204:1	121:11,14;122:14;	189:23;190:4,25;
5:19,22;9:6;18:3;	warranted (1)	whichever (1)	123:14;124:5;125:11;	191:24;192:1,12,15;
32:18	35:25	81:23	127:13;128:1,16;	193:3
violated (1)	Washington (10)	white (5)	129:1;131:7,10,23;	working (2)
193:19	22:19;23:15,16;	58:17;79:17;203:11,	132:1,9;134:12,14;	104:20;131:10
violation (1)	25:13;31:4;38:10;	14,14	135:3,21;136:8,19;	workplace (4)
12:3	39:24;44:24;45:1;	whole (7)	137:1;138:17;139:6,9,	24:16;188:11;191:7,
Virginia (8)	108:14	18:3;138:15;150:12;	14,20;140:5,15,21;	8
5:22;51:5;85:22;	waste (2)	165:23;178:5;191:18;	141:3;143:21;144:15;	work-related (1)
140:6;144:9,19;	140:15;171:13	192:10	146:21;147:4;148:22;	24:1
147:12,20	water (2)	Wholesale (1)	149:1,3,9,22,24;	works (1)
virtually (2)	24:3,3	4:4	150:19,24;151:2,5,7,	171:16
58:9;96:12	watershed (2)	wide (12)	10,12,14,22;152:1,11,	World (6)
visiting (1)	66:4;136:9	53:2,3;70:6;109:4;	16,23;153:4;156:25;	59:11,19;81:23;82:1;
63:16	way (34)	129:5,7;185:1,2,7;	157:16,18,21;158:1;	135:24;139:23
visitors (9)	19:23;20:1,11;33:13;	195:25;196:14,17	159:9;160:22,25;	<b>world's (1)</b> 79:1
41:23;45:19;49:10,	36:24;49:7;54:13;	widely (1) 104:19	163:21,24;164:3;	
21;50:19;62:3;68:1,2; 70:4	58:15;61:1,4;63:22; 83:18;86:20;93:9;94:6,	wife (1)	165:4,9,16,21,23; 166:2,8,20,22,24;	<b>worldwide (3)</b> 24:23,24;155:16
visits (2)	6;98:22;107:24;112:7;	35:8	169:11,16;170:9,22,24;	worry (1)
161:24;168:5	123:22;125:14;137:23;	Willard (1)	172:17,21,23;173:1;	73:24
vitae (2)	142:18,19;148:20,22;	41:12	175:13,23;176:4;	worse (1)
38:8;42:5	163:8;165:11;169:15;	wish (3)	177:16,18,25;178:5,8;	59:20
VOC (4)	170:12,13,19;177:9;	6:22;43:18;59:2	182:6;183:3,17,23,25;	write (1)
61:22,23;62:2;202:8	182:5	wishes (2)	184:6;185:9;188:19,	4:22
<b>VOC's (8)</b>	ways (2)	5:24;73:14	21;189:9,12,14,16,18;	writing (1)
119:11;145:19;	27:18;127:14	Withdrawn (1)	190:11,20;191:1,17;	100:24
147:14;150:4,5,11;	wearing (1)	126:9	195:2;198:3,5;199:1,	written (5)
202:7,8	87:8	within (12)	10,22;200:1;202:23,	7:14;11:7;16:24;
voice (1)	website (2)	10:18;11:19;20:5;	25;203:2,6,8,11,24	139:20;183:24
86:7	160:25;166:10	36:5;67:8;150:6;	witnesses (6)	wrong (5)
voir (7)	Wednesday (2)	152:12,14;159:11;	6:1,16;10:17,22;	20:21;30:8;83:12;
26:23;39:21;40:19;	16:21;17:14	176:23;182:16;183:13	41:8;42:7	92:10;99:16
89:11,13;93:20;143:18	week (3)	without (9)	witness's (5)	wrote (3)
<b>volatile (1)</b> 60:19	14:14;31:1;39:16	32:23;56:22,25;	37:10;43:5;65:15; 93:18;125:12	100:19;102:6;105:3
<b>volunteer (1)</b>	weigh (1) 7:12	129:14;139:12;162:15; 183:10;184:1;193:2	,	X
188:22	welfare (4)	witness (236)	<b>woman (2)</b> 24:15;38:18	Λ
<b>VOQ (1)</b>	41:22;49:20;52:1;	6:20;22:10,22;25:16,	wonder (1)	x-ray (1)
61:25	97:7	23,25;26:5,8;27:16;	130:17	23:9
voted (2)	well- (1)	31:1;34:2,5,9;35:7,24;	wondered (1)	
7:2,10	11:12	38:13;39:2,5,11,14;	189:23	Y
vulnerable (8)	well-characterized (2)	40:22;41:3,6;45:4;	wondering (1)	
53:4,8,13;82:13,15,	119:18,21	47:5,7;50:9,14,24;	117:10	year (20)
24;83:1;162:19	well-founded (2)	54:13;55:23;56:21,25;	Word (2)	25:9,11;26:9;47:19;
	65:14;137:25	57:12,17,21;61:16;	10:3;95:17	52:15;86:3;98:21;
$\mathbf{W}$	Westfield (2)	62:9;63:24;64:1,16;	words (2)	100:14;108:11;132:3;
	4:11;125:8	65:14;69:5,13,21;70:6;	16:10;197:14	133:9;136:9,9;146:7;
wait (4)	What's (18)	71:16,25;72:9,13;	work (17)	150:16;156:6;157:10,
91:22,25;161:15;	23:14,16;48:17;	76:24;77:11;79:24;	22:18;23:11;24:15,	24;162:22;178:14
169:4	58:19;64:19;77:20;	80:25;81:2;82:7;83:3,	21;26:11;34:10;52:22;	years (44)
waiting $(1)$	79:13;91:10;103:5;	7;84:7;86:11;87:1,3,6,	67:23;73:22;85:23;	25:10;26:9;30:16;
194:7	106:23;140:7;144:19;	17,23;90:8,11,16;91:7,	112:20,20;154:14;	31:21;32:22;33:7,22,
waived (1)	165:21;183:22;189:1;	16;92:2,6,9;93:6,14,14;	155:7;169:24;195:7,9	25;36:12,16,17,19,19,
15:4 wonts (2)	198:19,20;200:9 whatsoever (2)	94:23;96:18,22;97:1; 98:13,16;99:16;100:8,	<b>worked (4)</b> 44:18;87:20;89:20;	22;37:2,5,15,19,23;
wants (2) 177:8,9	45:9;46:1	13;101:6,11;102:7;	154:19	39:10,18;44:14;52:14; 66:8;80:20;85:21;86:3;
warehouse (4)	43.9,40.1 Wheaton (5)	104:2,9;105:7,10,25;	worker (1)	87:15,17;104:20;
64:23;113:7,25;	4:10,11;124:17;	104.2,9,105.7,10,25, 106:18,107:1,14;	194:18	127:20;129:12;139:11;
179:9	140:1,6	108:3,5,7,9;111:18,21;	workers (19)	146:5;156:22;161:15;
warm (1)	whereas (1)	113:6,15;114:18;	34:14;41:23;45:19;	164:6,12;165:1;
······································		,,,	,,,,,,,	100,12,100.11,

175:19;184:23;186:2; 199:22;200:7	<b>10-day (2)</b> 10:18;11:19	<b>17 (1)</b> 4:14	66:6 2007 (4)	151:2 271 (1)
Yep (2)	10.10,11.19 10th (6)	17e (1)	66:5,6,9;136:9	6:13
178:17;185:17	11:22;95:22;96:2;	42:5	2010 (7)	272 (3)
1/8.1/,185.1/				
Z	103:22;104:2,7	17h (2)	64:13,14;147:12;	9:18,21,23
L	<b>11 (1)</b> 77:8	26:15;38:8	158:21,22,23;161:4	273 (2)
····· (2)		<b>188 (8)</b> 55.12 14.70.0 0.	2011 (4)	13:9,20
ero (3)	11:00 (1)	55:13,14;70:9,9;	37:3;54:21;160:12,	274 (1)
63:24;168:24,25	72:15	169:23;170:10,17,22	12	16:1
one (2)	11160 (1)	19 (9)	2012 (51)	275 (4)
79:18;80:4	4:9	4:14;94:14;99:9,22;	15:7,8;54:22;64:13;	146:25;147:2;
oned (2)	113 (1)	100:7,24;102:5;105:4;	69:8;71:22;94:14;99:9,	160:15,16
4:11;125:8	147:4	117:2	22;100:7,24;101:22;	276 (5)
Coning (7)	1140 (1)	190 (1)	102:5,12,24;103:3;	160:12;167:16;
4:6;18:20;19:14;	22:19	182:17	105:4,14,17;117:2;	168:23;170:17;203:3
20:2,9;101:18;192:16	12 (18)	1963 (1)	128:12;132:17;146:13,	277 (18)
TA (1)	77:1,8,11;102:5;	53:19	20,24;153:16;155:22;	165:12,19;176:22;
126:8	103:6;104:24;108:21,	1964 (1)	156:13;160:17;165:18,	177:16,17;178:8,14;
ylene (1)	23;109:4;156:3;157:8,	25:6	22;166:7,12;173:19,	182:15,20;183:13,25
150:2	9,10,11;164:16;197:14,	1970's (1)	20;174:15;176:15,21;	184:1,2,11,19;185:20
130.2	19;202:13	192:10	178:14,18;179:21;	21;203:4
0	19,202.15 12/14 (1)	<b>192.10</b> <b>1980 (1)</b>	178.14,18,179.21, 180:19,20,20,24;181:6,	<b>21</b> ,205.4 <b>2863 (1)</b>
U	105:11	23:20	7,9,14;182:2,3	124:19
(1)			<b>2013 (29)</b>	<b>29th (1)</b>
(1)	12/14/12 (1)	<b>1995</b> (1)		<b>29th (1)</b> 99:19
7:2	155:24	38:11	4:13,15;6:9,11;	,,,
0.15 (1)	12-07 (3)	<b>1996</b> (1)	54:24,25;55:3;69:9,25;	<b>2B</b> (1)
158:2	101:18;126:4,5	162:20	71:23;73:6;94:13;	131:13
075 (2)	12th (1)	19th (8)	99:20;103:12,14;	2-page (2)
164:4;200:2	150:12	22:19;23:10;95:13;	105:15;144:6;173:5,	99:11;109:11
	13 (6)	96:1;109:7,15;124:12;	15,20;174:15;175:7,7;	2-sided (1)
1	177:25;178:3;182:8,	127:1	178:16;179:7,20,24;	114:22
	13;183:19;184:4	1-hour (21)	181:14,21	
l (4)	13-12 (1)	158:6,15;159:13;	20th (4)	3
4:14;23:20;131:11;	4:5	164:23,25;167:24;	6:20;202:19,23;	
165:13	13th (2)	168:11,14;176:21;	203:17	3-(1)
- (2)	4:3;14:3	178:12,14,18;179:2,4;	22 (5)	146:6
180:3;182:20	14 (8)	180:25;181:1;182:17;	52:2,6,11,12;200:20	3,000 (1)
.88 (6)	77:9;129:20;155:22;	183:12;184:10;187:11;	23 (1)	28:13
170:1,20,21,24,25;	156:12;165:18,22;	202:13	4:14	3:00 (1)
172:18	166:6,12	1-year (1)	24 (2)	167:6
/10,000 (1)	141 (1)	180:21	103:21;127:20	30 (4)
57:5	180:11		24-hour (1)	4:15;26:9;36:12;
:45 (2)	15 (18)	2	103:9	85:21
117:16;118:1	52:10,11;66:8;74:23;	-	25 (6)	300 (3)
.0 (15)	76:10;77:1,9;104:24;	2 (5)	72:15;86:3;87:15,17;	33:8,9,13
	129:19;130:14,16;			
4:10;6:9,11;10:16;		4:15;134:14;165:13,	167:5;199:22	<b>31 (1)</b> 4:15
11:23;14:14;36:19;				
	156:3;157:11;163:8;	15;180:2	255a (1)	
66:8;94:12;103:11,13;	197:15,19;198:11;	2-(1)	179:24	33 (2)
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13	<b>2- (1)</b> 108:10	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b>	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b>	<b>2-</b> (1) 108:10 <b>2.1</b> (1)	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b>
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b>	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23	<b>2-</b> (1) 108:10 <b>2.1</b> (1) 147:10	179:24 26 (1) 4:13 262b (1)	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b>	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1)	179:24 26 (1) 4:13 262b (1) 184:5	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b>
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b>	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17;	<b>2-</b> (1) 108:10 <b>2.1</b> (1) 147:10 <b>2.5</b> (1) 48:19	179:24 26 (1) 4:13 262b (1) 184:5 267 (1)	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1)	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b>
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b>	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b>	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b>	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b> 58:8	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1)	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b> 6:8	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2 <b>3-hour (1)</b>
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b>	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b>	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1; 158:7,10;167:25;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b> 58:8	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16 20 (3)	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b> 6:8	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2 <b>3-hour (1)</b>
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1; 158:7,10;167:25; 168:11,14;178:12;	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b> 58:8 <b>16 (8)</b>	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16 20 (3) 4:17;129:13;175:19	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b> 6:8 <b>269 (1)</b>	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2 <b>3-hour (1)</b> 184:9
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1; 158:7,10;167:25; 168:11,14;178:12; 184:22,24;188:4; 189:20	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a (3)</b> 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b (4)</b> 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th (1)</b> 58:8 <b>16 (8)</b> 4:8;15:1;51:10;55:3;	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16 20 (3) 4:17;129:13;175:19 2000 (7) 132:3,13,23;133:2,6,	179:24 26 (1) 4:13 262b (1) 184:5 267 (1) 6:5 268 (1) 6:8 269 (1) 6:10	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2 <b>3-hour (1)</b> 184:9 <b>3-month (1)</b> 158:1
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1; 158:7,10;167:25; 168:11,14;178:12; 184:22,24;188:4; 189:20 <b>00-fold (1)</b>	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a</b> (3) 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b</b> (4) 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th</b> (1) 58:8 <b>16</b> (8) 4:8;15:1;51:10;55:3; 68:20;69:25;73:6; 179:24	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16 20 (3) 4:17;129:13;175:19 2000 (7) 132:3,13,23;133:2,6, 9,15	179:24 26 (1) 4:13 262b (1) 184:5 267 (1) 6:5 268 (1) 6:8 269 (1) 6:10 269a (4) 6:11;103:14,15,17	<b>33</b> (2) 173:1;178:20 <b>35</b> (1) 103:9 <b>3a</b> (1) 41:8 <b>3-day</b> (1) 45:2 <b>3-hour</b> (1) 184:9 <b>3-month</b> (1) 158:1 <b>3-year</b> (15)
66:8;94:12;103:11,13; 129:12,13;144:6; 198:11 <b>0.8 (1)</b> 57:3 <b>00 (18)</b> 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25;103:1; 158:7,10;167:25; 168:11,14;178:12; 184:22,24;188:4; 189:20	197:15,19;198:11; 202:13 <b>15a</b> (3) 97:8;102:13;114:23 <b>15b</b> (4) 94:17;96:1;103:17; 124:12 <b>15th</b> (1) 58:8 <b>16</b> (8) 4:8;15:1;51:10;55:3; 68:20;69:25;73:6;	2- (1) 108:10 2.1 (1) 147:10 2.5 (1) 48:19 2:45 (1) 117:16 20 (3) 4:17;129:13;175:19 2000 (7) 132:3,13,23;133:2,6,	179:24 <b>26 (1)</b> 4:13 <b>262b (1)</b> 184:5 <b>267 (1)</b> 6:5 <b>268 (1)</b> 6:8 <b>269 (1)</b> 6:10 <b>269a (4)</b>	<b>33 (2)</b> 173:1;178:20 <b>35 (1)</b> 103:9 <b>3a (1)</b> 41:8 <b>3-day (1)</b> 45:2 <b>3-hour (1)</b> 184:9 <b>3-month (1)</b> 158:1

184:10,16;187:22         4         4 (3)         4:14;7:2,10         4,000 (1)         28:15         4:30 (1)         10:8         4:35 (1)         204:1         4:45 (2)         10:9;117:19         40 (3)         37:23;39:18;139:11         49 (1)         174:7         5         5 (1)         199:10         5,000 (2)         189:19,20         50 (9)         168:24,25;169:24;         170:1,16,17;188:3;         189:21,21         53 (2)         158:6;162:21         59-G-2.06 (1)         4:6         5th (3)         38:18;176:11,18         6         6         6 (5)         4:14;177:25;178:2;         182:8,10	8         8 (2)         4:15;179:20         8/13/13 (1)         14:10         8/26 (1)         16:4         80 (7)         47:7,9;74:17,19,24;         75:2;97:25         83 (2)         178:14,19         8-hour (4)         157:23;164:4,6,11         9         9 (3)         4:15;157:21,23         9:30 (1)         4:19         90 (4)         102:19,24;180:16,18         95 (4)         127:11,22,25;128:22         98 (3)         180:3,4,16         98th (4)         158:19;164:25;         165:3;184:17         99th (3)         16(2)
$\begin{array}{r} 4 (3) \\ 4:14;7:2,10 \\ 4,000 (1) \\ 28:15 \\ 4:30 (1) \\ 10:8 \\ 4:35 (1) \\ 204:1 \\ 4:45 (2) \\ 10:9;117:19 \\ 40 (3) \\ 37:23;39:18;139:11 \\ 49 (1) \\ 174:7 \\ \hline 5 \\ 5 (1) \\ 199:10 \\ 5,000 (2) \\ 189:19,20 \\ 50 (9) \\ 168:24,25;169:24; \\ 170:1,16,17;188:3; \\ 189:21,21 \\ 53 (2) \\ 158:6;162:21 \\ 59-G-2.06 (1) \\ 4:6 \\ 5th (3) \\ 38:18;176:11,18 \\ \hline 6 \\ \hline 6 (5) \\ 4:14;177:25;178:2; \\ \end{array}$	8 (2) 4:15;179:20 8/13/13 (1) 14:10 8/26 (1) 16:4 80 (7) 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25 83 (2) 178:14,19 8-hour (4) 157:23;164:4,6,11 9 9 (3) 4:15;157:21,23 9:30 (1) 4:19 90 (4) 102:19,24;180:16,18 95 (4) 127:11,22,25;128:22 98 (3) 180:3,4,16 98th (4) 158:19;164:25; 165:3;184:17 99th (3)
$\begin{array}{r} 4:14;7:2,10\\ \textbf{4},000 (1)\\ 28:15\\ \textbf{4};30 (1)\\ 10:8\\ \textbf{4};35 (1)\\ 204:1\\ \textbf{4};45 (2)\\ 10:9;117:19\\ \textbf{40} (3)\\ 37:23;39:18;139:11\\ \textbf{49} (1)\\ 174:7\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 5,000 (2)\\ 189:19,20\\ \hline \\ 5,000 (2)\\ 189:19,20\\ \hline \\ 50 (9)\\ 168:24,25;169:24;\\ 170:1,16,17;188:3;\\ 189:21,21\\ \hline \\ 53 (2)\\ 158:6;162:21\\ \hline \\ 59-G-2.06 (1)\\ 4:6\\ \hline \\ 5th (3)\\ 38:18;176:11,18\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 6\\ \hline \\ \hline \\ 5 (5)\\ 4:14;177:25;178:2;\\ \hline \end{array}$	4:15;179:20 8/13/13 (1) 14:10 8/26 (1) 16:4 80 (7) 47:7,9;74:17,19,24; 75:2;97:25 83 (2) 178:14,19 8-hour (4) 157:23;164:4,6,11 9 9 9 (3) 4:15;157:21,23 9:30 (1) 4:19 90 (4) 102:19,24;180:16,18 95 (4) 127:11,22,25;128:22 98 (3) 180:3,4,16 98th (4) 158:19;164:25; 165:3;184:17 99th (3)
189:19,20 <b>50 (9)</b> 168:24,25;169:24; 170:1,16,17;188:3; 189:21,21 <b>53 (2)</b> 158:6;162:21 <b>59-G-2.06 (1)</b> 4:6 <b>51h (3)</b> 38:18;176:11,18 <b>6</b> <b>5 (5)</b> 4:14;177:25;178:2;	102:19,24;180:16,18 95 (4) 127:11,22,25;128:22 98 (3) 180:3,4,16 98th (4) 158:19;164:25; 165:3;184:17 99th (3)
<b>6 (5)</b> 4:14;177:25;178:2;	164:24,25;165:3 9th (1)
4:14;177:25;178:2;	99:8
<b>60 (5)</b> 90:21,21;97:12; 106:13;155:1 <b>664 (2)</b> 130:23;131:1 <b>6th (1)</b> 73:1	
7	_
<b>7 (1)</b> 182:10 <b>70 (2)</b> 127:20;129:12 <b>75 (6)</b> 114:11;117:2;118:4, 21;164:23;200:6 <b>76 (4)</b> 114:11;117:2;118:4, 21	