OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMINIS	TRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR MONTGOMERY C	COUNTY
×× : :	
PETITION OF COSTCO WHOLESALE : CORPORATION :	
: xx	<u> </u>

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on May 12, 2014, commencing at 9:38 a.m., at the Office of Zoning and Administrative Hearings, 100 Maryland Avenue, 2nd Floor Council Hearing Room, Rockville, Maryland 20850 before:

Martin L. Grossman

Hearing Examiner

	ge 2	Page
APPEARANCES	1	PROCEEDINGS
	2	MR. GROSSMAN: This is the 33rd day of a public
	3	hearing in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Boar
For the Applicant:		of Appeals No. S-2863, OZAH No. 13-12, petition for a
For the Approant.		5 special exception pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section
Patricia Harris, Esq.		5 59-G-2.06, to allow petitioner to construct and operate an
		automobile filling station which would include 16 pumps.
Mike Goecke, Esq.		The subject site is located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silve
Longh Farly & Prover Chartered		Spring, Maryland. That's Lot N, 631 Wheaton Plaza, Parce
Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered		0 10, also known as Westfield Wheaton Mall, and is zoned C-
3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460	11	
	12	2 next session will be on May 20, 2014, here in the second
Bethesda, Maryland 20814		B floor hearing room of the COB at 9:30 a.m. This hearing
		Le conducted on behalf of the Board of Appeals. My name
		5 Martin Grossman. I'm the Hearing Examiner, which means
For Kensington Heights Civic Association:		5 will take evidence, as I have been doing, and write a repo
		and recommendation to the Board of Appeals, which will mal
Michele Rosenfeld, Esq.		the decision in this case. Will the parties identify
		• themselves, please, for the record?
The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld, LLC	20	
11913 Ambleside Drive		L Costco.
	22	
Potomac, Maryland 20854	23	
		f of Costco.
	25	
Pag	ge 3	Page
CONTENTS		
	1	L Costco.
Rebuttal		
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr	coss	
	coss	MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little better today.
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147	ross	MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little better today.
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200	ross	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200		<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200	224	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry	224 (	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry EXHIBITS Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv	224 (	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS	224 ( 224 ( 224 ( 34 1)	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Later and the second morning.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the	224 ( 224 ( 224 ( 34 1)	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES	224 ( 224 ( 224 ( 34 1)	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. La</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers	ross 2 224 6 .ved 2 34 10 12 97 12 14	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. La</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> </ul>
Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky	ross 2 224 6 .ved 2 34 10 12 97 12 14	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. La</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153</pre>	ross 2 224 6 224 6 34 10 12 97 12 104 19	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153</pre>	coss 2 224 6 224 6 34 10 34 12 97 13 104 15	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area</pre>	ross 2 224 ( 224 ( 34 1) 34 1) 12 97 13 143 1( 143 1)	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality designations for 2010,</pre>	coss     2       224     6       224     6       34     10       12     97       104     12       143     16       152     18	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Late</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with</pre>	coss     2       224     6       224     6       34     10       12     97       104     12       143     16       152     18	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> <li>MR. HLINKA: Dennis Hlinka, Sullivan</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality designations for 2010, primary NO2, NAAQS 571 February 17, 2012 Federal Register,</pre>	coss       2         224       6         224       6         34       10         34       12         97       13         104       15         143       16         152       18         20       20	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View</li> <li>MR. HLINKA: Dennis Hlinka, Sullivan</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality designations for 2010, primary NO2, NAAQS 571 February 17, 2012 Federal Register, EPA final rule on measuring NO2</pre>	ross 2 224 ( 224 ( 34 10 13 97 13 143 15 152 18 160 23	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. La</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View MR. HLINKA: Dennis Hlinka, Sullivan</li> <li>Environmental.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning. Okay, we have couple of preliminary matters. First of all, since our</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality designations for 2010, primary NO2, NAAQS 571 February 17, 2012 Federal Register, EPA final rule on measuring NO2 572 Display of bias of federal</pre>	coss       2         224       6         224       6         34       10         34       10         104       12         143       17         152       18         20       20         160       22	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lat</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View MR. HLINKA: Dennis Hlinka, Sullivan</li> <li>Environmental.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning. Okay, we have couple of preliminary matters. First of all, since our</li> </ul>
<pre>Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recr David Sullivan By Ms. Rosenfeld 8 By Mr. Silverman 147 By Mr. Goecke 200 By Ms. Cordry E X H I B I T S Exhibit No. Marked/Receiv 567 Modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2 NAAUS by CAPCOA 568 EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers 569 Atmospheric Turbulence, Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, pages 150-153 230-A Site plan with red circle delineating 40-meter area 570 Fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality designations for 2010, primary NO2, NAAQS 571 February 17, 2012 Federal Register, EPA final rule on measuring NO2</pre>	coss       2         224       6         224       6         34       10         34       12         97       13         104       15         143       16         152       18         160       22         214       23	<ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, you look a little</li> <li>better today.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: A little bit. Thank you.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for the opposition</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.</li> <li>Michele Rosenfeld with Kensington Heights.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Lar</li> <li>Silverman, Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abig</li> <li>Adelman for the Stop Costco Gas Coalition.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.</li> <li>MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View MR. HLINKA: Dennis Hlinka, Sullivan</li> <li>Environmental.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning. Okay, we have</li> <li>couple of preliminary matters. First of all, since our</li> <li>session on May 8th, the parties were too exhausted to file</li> </ul>

	Page 6		Page 8
1	we, I said on today I would provide exhibits. They asked if	1	time. All right, you may proceed, Ms. Rosenfeld, with your
	there were any more exhibits coming in, to try to have them		cross-examination.
	in by today, so I filed it this morning at 7:30, so it's not	3	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, thank you.
	necessarily for today. It's going forward.	4	REBUTTAL CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed)
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I haven't seen that yet.	5	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6	MS. CORDRY: And I	6	Q Mr. Sullivan, between your January 2013 and your
7	MR. GROSSMAN: If they don't come in by the day	7	August 2013 reports, as I understand it you made changes to
8		8	your modeling for several reasons. One was because you
9	MS. CORDRY: Right, right.	9	changed the, the changed standard for PM2.5, is that
10	MR. GROSSMAN: obviously they don't get on	10	correct?
11	MS. CORDRY: And I gave them copies of it and I	11	A Between January
12	have printed out a copy I can give you the next time I come	12	Q January of 2013 and August of 2013.
	up for, an hour or whatever.	13	A There's been a lot of reports. And the standard,
14	MR. GROSSMAN: You couldn't let me get away with	14	
15	my little fantasy, could you, Ms. Cordry?	15	standard, and I made changes to them all because of the
16	MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, see, it's a	16	issue with the NO2 conversion. And the third reason I made
17	very small little snag. Very small.	17	changes, among others, was the fact that prior in the case,
18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Thank you. All right,	18	the focus was on the neighborhood school and so forth, and
19	then we'll see if we have time today to get to the	19	during the time between January and August the focus from my
20	applicant's objections. I've had all of the particular	20	perspective was now on the gas queue and loading dock, and I
21	exhibits tagged that are objected to, so hopefully we can	21	made changes to respond to those situations.
22	get to them easily.	22	Q And what has changed between August and, between
23	MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, did you receive my	23	your August report and your February report of 2014, to
24	electronic version of that, that I e-mailed to you?	24	cause you to be less conservative in your modeling?
25	MR. GROSSMAN: Gee, when did you e-mail that?	25	A We, a couple things. One is the, not necessarily
	Page 7		Page 9
1	Page 7 MR. GOECKE: Friday.	1	-
1		1	Page 9 less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.
	MR. GOECKE: Friday.		less conservative, but the background change over time, and
2	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time?	2	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.
2 3 4	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday.	2 3	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned
2 3 4	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd	2 3 4	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.
2 3 4 5	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check	2 3 4 5	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so	2 3 4 5 6	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here	2 3 4 5 6 7	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed. Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed. Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact. And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr. Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed. Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GOECKE: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other preliminary matters? Seeing none, we have Mr. Sullivan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> <li>A I don't know. He did make that request, and the record speaks for itself. And I can't reconstruct what I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other preliminary matters? Seeing none, we have Mr. Sullivan resuming his cross-examination today on his rebuttal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> <li>A I don't know. He did make that request, and the record speaks for itself. And I can't reconstruct what I might have done, you know, I don't know.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other preliminary matters? Seeing none, we have Mr. Sullivan resuming his cross-examination today on his rebuttal. You're still under oath, Mr. Sullivan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> <li>A I don't know. He did make that request, and the record speaks for itself. And I can't reconstruct what I might have done, you know, I don't know.</li> </ul>
22 34 56 77 88 99 100 111 122 133 144 155 166 177 188 199 200 211 222 23	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GROSSMAN: and if it came after 7:00 o'clock on Friday, I was gone. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other preliminary matters? Seeing none, we have Mr. Sullivan resuming his cross-examination today on his rebuttal. You're still under oath, Mr. Sullivan. (Witness previously sworn.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> <li>A I don't know. He did make that request, and the record speaks for itself. And I can't reconstruct what I might have done, you know, I don't know.</li> <li>Q If the only reason was that the background numbers had changed over time, would you have changed your August</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GOECKE: Friday. MR. GROSSMAN: What time? MS. CORDRY: Actually I think it was Saturday. MR. GOECKE: I've lost track of the days. I'd have to double check. MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't see it. I didn't check MR. GOECKE: It might have been, it may have been over the weekend, so MR. GROSSMAN: my e-mail this morning here MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was Saturday morning. MS. CORDRY: It was Saturday morning. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Cordry says it was Saturday morning, so I haven't seen that yet. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see. Any other preliminary matters? Seeing none, we have Mr. Sullivan resuming his cross-examination today on his rebuttal. You're still under oath, Mr. Sullivan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>less conservative, but the background change over time, and we accounted for that fact.</li> <li>And the second major reason is, as I mentioned previously, the December, I believe it was, hearing, Dr.</li> <li>Cole mentioned OLM method. And if you're going less than 100 percent conversion, in his judgment we should use the OLM method. We gave that some consideration and decided, well, okay, we'll model NO2 OLM and the other options that are provided by EPA guidance documents for doing, you know, less conservative more accurate treatments of NO2 for our purposes, and we did so. So that those are the main reasons, the main issues that changed.</li> <li>Q And there's been a lot of discussion back and forth as to whether or not Dr. Cole actually suggested that you make those changes so that you apply the OLM. Assuming for the sake of argument that he didn't actually make that suggestion, absent that request, would you still have relied on the August report that you submitted previously?</li> <li>A I don't know. He did make that request, and the record speaks for itself. And I can't reconstruct what I might have done, you know, I don't know.</li> <li>Q If the only reason was that the background numbers had changed over time, would you have changed your August</li> </ul>

	Page 10		Page 12
1	MR. GOECKE: Objection, speculation.	1	been included in the definition of the neighborhood?
2	MS. ROSENFELD: He's an expert.	2	A My definition, I mean I don't, my definition, when
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I know, but usually	3	I meant to say neighborhood, was the portion beyond the ring
4	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm asking	4	road, with the emphasis being to the south. That's how I
5	MR. GROSSMAN: you can ask an expert a	5	interpreted the neighborhood.
6	hypothetical on facts that are	6	Q I'm sorry
7	MS. ROSENFELD: I can also ask him, I'm not asking	7	A I'm not sure about the official designation of
8	him to speculate as to what others might have concluded.	8	the, for the permit or anything else.
9	I'm asking what his	9	Q I'm sorry, did you say south of the ring road?
10	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I'm going to let you	10	A What I said was the, I see the neighborhood as
11	ask this question, because I don't think it's that big a	11	being beyond the ring road, and the focus that we had was
12	deal. But you can ask an expert to give, to respond to	12	really in the southern portion, which is closest to the most
13	hypotheticals based on evidence either in the record or that	13	gas stations.
14	you propose, but this is something a little bit different.	14	Q So in your initial modeling then you really didn't
15	But go ahead and pose that question if you know.	15	model for emissions levels within the mall parcel, did you?
16	THE WITNESS: I don't know what I would have done.	16	A You say did not?
17	I mean I've responded to the circumstances. If the	17	Q Did not.
18	circumstances were different, I may have reacted	18	A That is not correct.
19	differently. I'm not going to guess.	19	Q You included modeling within the mall parcel in
20	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	20	your December, in your November 2012 report?
21	Q In your opinion, is your February report less	21	A That's correct.
22	conservative than your August report?	22	Q And could you just remind me where?
23	A To clarify, it is still extremely conservative,	23	A Look at any of the plots. The plots show, they
24	but less conservative than assuming 100 percent of all the	24	clearly had to model, look at the model files. It shows all
25	NO, NOX, is NO2. That's what you're asking about. For the	25	the receptors we modeled. We had 8,100 receptors, evenly
	Page 11		Page 13
1		1	
1 2	Page 11 other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking	1	
	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking		spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.
2 3	other pollutants, some aren't that much different.	2	spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex. Q But in the figures that you contained in the text
2 3	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal	2 3	spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex. Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you
2 3 4	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report?	2 3 4	spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex. Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?
2 3 4 5	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li><li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text</li><li>and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you</li><li>show those levels in the mall parcel?</li><li>A They all showed those levels.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text</li> <li>and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you</li> <li>show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made,	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the locations that were discussed the most earlier in the case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> <li>A We did not, because based upon my interpretation</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the locations that were discussed the most earlier in the case. Q And earlier in the case, was the neighborhood	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> <li>A We did not, because based upon my interpretation of previous modeling, and move it down here, it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the locations that were discussed the most earlier in the case. Q And earlier in the case, was the neighborhood included in the applicant's definition of the neighborhood	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> <li>A We did not, because based upon my interpretation of previous modeling, and move it down here, it was unnecessary to do all these analyses using 8,100 receptors,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the locations that were discussed the most earlier in the case. Q And earlier in the case, was the neighborhood included in the applicant's definition of the neighborhood for purposes of the special exception application?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> <li>A We did not, because based upon my interpretation of previous modeling, and move it down here, it was unnecessary to do all these analyses using 8,100 receptors, when we know from past modeling that the concentrations out</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other pollutants, some aren't that much different. Q And so is it your belief that Dr. Cole was asking you to take a less conservative approach in your rebuttal report? A I mean Dr. Cole's comments speak for themselves. He, on the record we've gone through exactly what he said. My interpretation of that, those statements that he made, was that he didn't agree it was appropriate, in his judgment, to use anything about 100 percent, unless we were to use a method like OLM. In order to try to get closer to the same page, I concluded let's try to meet him halfway, and then let's do it, and so we did. Q You also explained that part of the reason for your shift in focus was that there had been a change in focus from the neighborhood to the mall. In your mind does the neighborhood mean the school, the pool, and the homes in the immediate vicinity of the mall parcel? A In my mind those are the closest locations among the neighborhood type receptors to the mall, and the locations that were discussed the most earlier in the case. Q And earlier in the case, was the neighborhood included in the applicant's definition of the neighborhood	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>spaced grid, that included the entire mall complex.</li> <li>Q But in the figures that you contained in the text and in any isopleths that you might have prepared, did you show those levels in the mall parcel?</li> <li>A They all showed those levels.</li> <li>Q And you also showed them for the adjoining roadway network, is that correct?</li> <li>A We did. I mean 8,100 receptors covered the entire mall plus beyond to the, you know, the different roadways.</li> <li>Q And do you show the concentration levels on the road network in your February 2014 report?</li> <li>A We, well, the road network, we show the levels along the southern mall area. The ring road is one of the road networks you're referring to. We do. The focus in the February report was on the mall area and the closest area to the mall, where there was concern there could be potential violations. And that's what we focused on.</li> <li>Q But did you show any of the perimeter major roadways, University, Veirs Mill, Georgia Avenue?</li> <li>A We did not, because based upon my interpretation of previous modeling, and move it down here, it was unnecessary to do all these analyses using 8,100 receptors,</li> </ul>

	Page 14		Page 16
1	those major road networks? It showed exceedances, didn't	1	A No, this has come up previously in testimony. The
2	it?	2	issue is dealing with the mall itself, one thing Dr. Cole
3	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, I missed the last part	3	and I agreed upon was that the mall surfaces are all urban.
4	of that question. Didn't your original report show	4	Q Correct.
5	violations, what was the rest of that sentence?	5	A And we also agreed that if we're going to go out
6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	6	to the larger domain, we're going to follow EPA's Auer
7	Q Exceedances along the major roadway network.	7	method, A-U-E-R, land use method, up to three kilometers.
8	A Exceedances of what?	8	And that clearly is going to be rural. So I didn't see any
9	Q Of the NO2 standards.	9	reason to go against the EPA guidance. And you certainly
10	A Well, I don't recall if it's an isopleth might be	10	don't look at one road, you know, you don't look at
11	up to there, but recall that in the August report we're	11	University. If you're going that far out, you're going to
12	doing OLM modeling, and at an intersection we know that the	12	use EPA guidance, and we did. And we showed those earlier.
13	ratio of NO2 to NOX from the moving vehicles is under five	13	And any, my objective interpretation of our earlier modeling
14	to 10 percent. And that if a vehicle would idle about five	14	results out past the ring road, especially with due
15	minutes at a light, we're talking maybe on the order of 15	15	consideration of the actual ratios of NO2 to NOX, this gas
16	percent. So if, you know, the modeling previously was 100	16	station gives insignificant contributions, and there's no
17	percent, so if you take that into account, it was clear that	17	basis to interpret, if modeling was done, to assume there's
18	those concentrations would be far below the standard.	18	going to be violations.
19	MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan, you said you did the	19	Q So it's your testimony that beyond the mall
20	OLM in the	20	parcel, and in particular that queue, you were looking at
21	MR. GROSSMAN: Whoa, whoa.	21	the surrounding area as rural and not as urban.
22	MR. GOECKE: I just want to correct for the record	22	MR. GROSSMAN: Which queue?
23	that I think he misspoke in terms of which report he did the	23	MS. ROSENFELD: The queue, the gas station queue.
24	OLM.	24	MR. GROSSMAN: So beyond, you're saying if you go
25	MR. GROSSMAN: You can bring that up on redirect.	25	beyond the queue.
	Page 15		Page 17
	-	-	
1	MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: This is cross-examination.	1	MS. ROSENFELD: Right.
2	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	THE WITNESS: That's not correct. If you go
3	Q So that's your opinion, but you don't have that	3	beyond the queue on the mall, the mall is being treated as urban, as it should. And we showed that in the August
5	information set out in your report, do you?	5	report. And you're looking at the larger scale. It goes
6	A Well, I mean if you, it's my opinion, but also if	6	much further out. We're relying upon rural, consistent with
7	you look at the references and the report I just did in		the EPA guidance.
8	February, it's very clear that if you're going beyond 100	8	MR. GOERKE: Mr. Grossman, I'd like to object. I
9	percent NO2, that there would be no possibility, in my	9	think this is beyond the scope of what we crossed in
10	judgment, that the standard would be hopposibility, in my	10	rebuttal. She had an opportunity before to talk about the
11	beyond the mall, or on the mall, for that matter.	11	urban versus rural, and we did talk about that at great
12	Q And under the stage one that you reflect in your	12	length, and comparing his early reports, which we'd already
13	February report, you show the adjoining rate of growth	13	done before he testified on rebuttal.
		14	MR. GROSSMAN: I think it is somewhat beyond the
114	networks?		-
14 15	A We do not.	15	scope, but I'm going to give her some leeway in cross-
15	A We do not.	15 16	scope, but I'm going to give her some leeway in cross- examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat
15 16	<ul><li>A We do not.</li><li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your</li></ul>	15 16 17	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat
15	<ul><li>A We do not.</li><li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li></ul>	16 17	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue
15 16 17 18	<ul><li>A We do not.</li><li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li><li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that</li></ul>	16	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I
15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already,
15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do that because I don't believe that's correct. I don't</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19 20	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already, he's already gone over what he
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do that because I don't believe that's correct. I don't believe it's correct to use urban dispersion coefficients</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19 20 21	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already, he's already gone over what he MS. ROSENFELD: I'm trying to understand,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do that because I don't believe that's correct. I don't believe it's correct to use urban dispersion coefficients throughout that larger grid that we did before.</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already, he's already gone over what he MS. ROSENFELD: I'm trying to understand, because I, what, I think what he's saying and what I'm
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do that because I don't believe that's correct. I don't believe it's correct to use urban dispersion coefficients throughout that larger grid that we did before.</li> <li>Q You don't believe that urban dispersion</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already, he's already gone over what he MS. ROSENFELD: I'm trying to understand, because I, what, I think what he's saying and what I'm hearing may not be the same thing. Maybe this will make it
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A We do not.</li> <li>Q And had we asked that you include that in your updated report?</li> <li>A My recollection is I was asked to include that based upon urban dispersion coefficients. And I didn't do that because I don't believe that's correct. I don't believe it's correct to use urban dispersion coefficients throughout that larger grid that we did before.</li> </ul>	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	examination. On the other hand, it is becoming somewhat repetitive on the same issue MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I MR. GROSSMAN: so if we can, we've already, he's already gone over what he MS. ROSENFELD: I'm trying to understand, because I, what, I think what he's saying and what I'm

	Page 18		Page 20
1	right there.	1	much urban do I have? And if that goes above 50 percent,
2	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	you're going to call it urban. But in every case it's a
3	Q Okay. Taking a look at Exhibit 230, which is the	3	mixed bag. So University Boulevard would have obviously
4	overall illustrative plan dated 7/31/13, if I show you	4	asphalt. And the mall parking lot of course is asphalt.
5	what's inside the special exception boundary itself, you	5	And the school has parking lots. So you do your best
6	qualify that as urban, correct?	6	approximation of those things. So you're when asking each
7	A I qualify everything inside the ring road as	7	one, what would this be, well, that's how you do it.
8	urban, as did Dr. Cole.	8	Q Well, I think my question is a little more
9	Q Okay, so everything inside the ring road is urban.	9	specific than that. You certainly have covered the Auer
10	What happens when you get beyond the ring road and into the	10	method. And if you just are looking at the gross three-
11	forest buffer? Is that urban or is that rural?	11	kilometer area, I think you testified that that overall area
12	A This kind of land use would qualify as rural land	12	is rural. But then you looked at it on more of a micro-
13	use.	13	scale, applying to this parcel.
14	Q Okay.	14	My question is in your modeling, did you assume
15	A And it would be, I mean you're asking very	15	that the area south of the ring road is rural?
16	specifically, if you're applying to the, again, to the	16	A In the modeling that was done this time?
17	larger grid, it's what the three-kilometer circle says.	17	Q Yes.
18	Q Right.	18	A We're using urban dispersion, because our focus in
19	A Because you have many, you have mix and match of	19	here is inside the ring road. This is, it's very slight
20	land uses out to that distance.	20	coverage over in here.
21	Q I recall the three-kilometer circle. I'm just	21	MR. GROSSMAN: Over in here being?
22	trying to ask specifically on Exhibit 230 what you consider	22	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, to the south, where the
23	urban and rural, so that way we don't have this discussion	23	neighborhood is. But this, these runs were based on urban
24	again.	24	conditions.
25	A Well, no, this is	25	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2.5		2.5	BT MO. ROOLNI LEB.
	Page 19		Page 21
1	Q So beyond the ring road to the south you're saying	1	Q So in your current February 2014 report, you
2	is rural.	2	treated the area south of the ring road as urban, is that
3	A Well, you do the Auer method.	3	correct?
4	Q Correct.	4	A That's correct.
5	A The A-U-E-R method. This would be the area, I'm	5	Q And did you treat the area east of the ring road
6	pointing to the south and the residential zone, much of this	6	on
7	is wooded, by the way, would be designated as a rural land	7	MR. GROSSMAN: You mean west of
8	use. That's one of the inputs for determining the overall	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	dispersion, coefficient of diffusion for a larger scale.	9	Q west of the ring road, toward the pool, as
10	Q And for the purposes of the school, that would be	10	urban or rural?
11	rural as well?	11	A We treated, as the run done in August of this year
12	A I would say yes.	12	was an urban run, everything would be treated as urban.
13	Q And the pool area?	13	Q And what about in your February 2014 report?
		13 14	<ul><li>Q And what about in your February 2014 report?</li><li>A August, 2014.</li></ul>
13	Q And the pool area?		
13 14	<ul><li>Q And the pool area?</li><li>A The same answer.</li><li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you</li></ul>	14	A August, 2014.
13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> </ul>	14 15	A August, 2014. MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.
13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean</li> </ul>	14 15 16	<ul> <li>August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the Auer method, because I think then we'll be on the same page.</li> <li>Q Yep.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And for the area southeast, over the pool area,</li> <li>over the school area, did you treat that as urban or rural</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the Auer method, because I think then we'll be on the same page.</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And for the area southeast, over the pool area,</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the Auer method, because I think then we'll be on the same page.</li> <li>Q Yep.</li> <li>A You look at how much asphalt, how many driveways, how much forested area. And each one of those categories</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And for the area southeast, over the pool area,</li> <li>over the school area, did you treat that as urban or rural</li> <li>in your current February report?</li> <li>A The same answer to all those. We have very</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the Auer method, because I think then we'll be on the same page.</li> <li>Q Yep.</li> <li>A You look at how much asphalt, how many driveways, how much forested area. And each one of those categories has a designation, urban or rural. And you categorize the</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And for the area southeast, over the pool area,</li> <li>over the school area, did you treat that as urban or rural</li> <li>in your current February report?</li> <li>A The same answer to all those. We have very</li> <li>limited coverage shown, might not be ours, but beyond the</li> </ul>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q And the pool area?</li> <li>A The same answer.</li> <li>Q And then when you come up beyond the ring road and you're headed northwest toward University Boulevard, do you consider north of the ring road to be rural?</li> <li>A In all these answers, it depends. I mean basically when you do the Auer, I'm going to explain the Auer method, because I think then we'll be on the same page.</li> <li>Q Yep.</li> <li>A You look at how much asphalt, how many driveways, how much forested area. And each one of those categories</li> </ul>	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A August, 2014.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You said, he said August.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Sorry. February 2014.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q You treated as urban.</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>Q And for the area southeast, over the pool area,</li> <li>over the school area, did you treat that as urban or rural</li> <li>in your current February report?</li> <li>A The same answer to all those. We have very</li> </ul>

	Page 22		Page 24
1	concerns in there based upon the modeling we've done so far.	1	quadrant of the mall.
2	And I was trying to address the issues in the mall which was	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record's clear, which
3	where the concern was with the gas queue and the loading	3	exhibit number are you looking at now?
4	dock. So that was the focus of those runs.	4	MS. ROSENFELD: Hold on. Two-fifty-five.
5	Q And then going toward the north, University	5	MR. GROSSMAN: Fifty-five?
6	Boulevard, Veirs Mill Road, and down toward Georgia Avenue,	6	MS. ROSENFELD: Two-fifty-five.
7	did you include those areas in your February 2014 report?	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Two-fifty-five. All right.
8	Did you do any modeling analysis in those locations?	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	A Yeah, we modeled the southern ring road. Again,	9	Q I'm looking at figures 9 and 10 on page 34, 24.
10	the focus was on the area near the gas station itself, the	10	Do you have it?
11	loading dock, and gas queue.	11	A I have it in front of me, yes.
12	Q So when is the last time that you modeled the	12	Q Okay. Is figure 10, is figure 9 the figure that
13	northern ring road perimeter of the mall parcel?	13	you carried over as your tier one analysis?
14	A I would project that would be in August 2013.	14	A Stage one?
15	Q And in August 2013 did you use urban or rural	15	Q Your stage one analysis in your February 2014
16	dispersion coefficients?	16	report?
17	A I'm trying to recall. I know we did include urban	17	A With the exception of the background I used, yes.
18	coefficients. We did some testing. But that was mostly in	18	I used a background of 90, which would be the up-to-date
19	the southern area. We really modeled the entire area rural	19	background. This one showed a 98, which was the earlier
20	back in 2012, as I recall it was, all the isopleth maps were	20	background.
21	done rural. But back then we showed you the results of the	21	Q My page 24 shows a background of 90.
22	key receptors, both urban and rural.	22	A Well, this is the, we've discussed this a few
23	Q And then again for the areas north of the ring	23	times on the record. The 168 shown there is based upon a 98
24	road, do you consider them under the Auer method to be urban	24	background. It really should be 160.
25	or rural?	25	Q Okay.
	Page 23		Page 25
1	A I don't have a map to make that judgment right	1	A And version in February shows the 160 in there.
2	now. I'll say the same answer again. We treated, we had	2	Q I keep getting confused, because it says urban
3	two different types of runs. One was for the area focused	3	dispersion plus 90 background. So looking down at figure
4	on the loading dock, the view of the area right near where	4	10, which was your rural dispersion, if you carried that out
5	the gas station is going to be located, we did general run	5	to the roadways, do the roadways exceed the max standard?
6	that did the entire domain including all the roads you're	6	A What road?
7	talking about. We used rural for all of the large scale and	7	Q Urban, under the rural coefficients?
8	urban for the close-in to the mall.	8	A You're referring to the ring road?
9	Q And so the close-in urban would have been in	9	Q No, the University and Veirs Mill.
10	February 2014 and the larger more rural would have been back	10	A No, it would not.
11	in December 2012?	11	Q And how do you reach that conclusion?
12	A It was, and the 2012 reports clearly had urban and	12	A Well, if you, again, this run is assuming that all
13	rural, shown in the tables for the school, the pool, and the	13	NOX is NO2. And I you look at the ring, right just south of
14	homes. And the actual isopleth maps done in 2012 were based	14	the ring road, you'll see like a 170 shown there. And by
15	on rural conditions.	15	the time you get to the closest house, you're down to about
16	Q Thank you.	16	a 150 microgram cubic meter.
17	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you, Mr. Grossman.	17	Q That's not my question.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly.	18	A Well, I'm answering your question. That the
19	MS. ROSENFELD: That helps.	19	gradient is such that if you went to any other major
20	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	20	roadway, your concentrations would be approaching
21	Q And Mr. Sullivan, do you have your August 2013	21	background.
22	report in front of you?	22	Q But going back to Exhibit 230, I'm not asking as
23	A I do.	23	you go south, as you continue to go south. I'm asking as
24	Q Okay, if you'd turn to page 24, figure 10, where	24	you move up toward University Boulevard, toward the
o -			
25	you ran overall dispersion in the lower quadrant, southwest	25	northwest and up northeast toward Veirs Mill Road.

	Page 26		Page 28
1	A I'm saying looking at the gradients, we've seen	1	you'd put a monitor there. Based on looking at, you know,
2	this plot, and if you apply those gradings to the north, the	2	nationwide data, you would not expect to see an NO2
3	northwest and northeast, your concentrations by the time you	3	violation.
4	got to the locations at University or for Veirs Mill, you're	4	Q And if we could go to your January 2013 report on
5	going to be approaching background levels, clearly not	5	page 35.
6	anywhere near a standard.	6	MR. GOERKE: Again, Mr. Grossman, this is outside
7	Q So is it your testimony that the background levels	7	the scope.
8	along these major roadways are the same as the ambient air	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's hear the question
9	everywhere?	9	first.
10	A No, I'm not saying that. You know, if you go near	10	MS. ROSENFELD: This is my last question.
11	one of the intersection points, of course that will affect	11	MS. ROSENFELD: If you would look at the isopleth
12	it. What I'm saying is if you look at figure 10, you can	12	on that page, and look at the roadway grid work and the
13	see that, for example right very close to the special	13	levels, the concentration levels.
14	exception area, we're showing, the last isopleth we show is	14	MR. GROSSMAN: That was the January 2013 report,
15	a 150. I can't, it's surely considered to the northwest,	15	and the exhibit number?
16	not a very long distance from the special exception area as	16	MS. CORDRY: Fifty-six A, 56-A.
17	you get down to 150. By the time you get up into the other	17	MR. GOERKE: Okay. And what page?
18	areas, it'd be, you'd be substantially lower than that.	18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thirty-five.
19	My point is if you're meeting the standard right	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Do you have
20	near the source in question, you're going to meet the	20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't have a copy of it.
21	standards much further away.	21	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy that you want to
22	Q And the roadways themselves aren't sources?	22	show the witness?
23	A I'm not saying they're not sources. The	23	MS. ROSENFELD: I don't have a court copy. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24 25	contribution from the gas station Q I'm not asking	24 25	Q Assuming for the moment that it shows numbers as
25		23	A Assuming for the moment that it shows numbers as
	Page 27		
	Faye 27		Page 29
1		1	
1	A operations is very small.	1	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road
	<ul><li>A operations is very small.</li><li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background</li></ul>		high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what?
2	A operations is very small.	2	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road
2 3	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you</li> </ul>	2 3	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> </ul>	2 3 4	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was</li> <li>before there was, we realized there was a conversion error,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct? A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2.</li> <li>And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct? A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2.</li> <li>And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> <li>Q No, I understand that. I'm just trying to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you subtract from that 175 and you get what, 85? And you divide</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 operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> <li>Q No, I understand that. I'm just trying to understand where you started.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you subtract from that 175 and you get what, 85? And you divide that by a factor of five or six, and you're down to 15 or</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 operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> <li>Q No, I understand that. I'm just trying to understand where you started.</li> <li>A Well, if I artificially kept the numbers high by</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>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you subtract from that 175 and you get what, 85? And you divide that by a factor of five or six, and you're down to 15 or so.</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 operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> <li>Q No, I understand that. I'm just trying to understand where you started.</li> <li>A Well, if I artificially kept the numbers high by assuming 100 percent conversion right at an intersection,</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>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you subtract from that 175 and you get what, 85? And you divide that by a factor of five or six, and you're down to 15 or so.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: But I'm not</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 operations is very small.</li> <li>Q I'm just asking what's the overall background concentration. What is the overall concentration when you get to Veirs Mill and University?</li> <li>A Well, we showed examples in the 2012 reports based on complete, assuming 100 percent NO2. You could take a look at those figures and divide by a factor of four or five after you subtract background, and get a pretty good idea of what the levels would look like.</li> <li>Q And why would you divide by four or five?</li> <li>A Because it's not 100 percent NO2. The free-flowing portion is in the order of five to 10 percent NO2. And stopping at an intersection for only five minutes, your ratio would be in the order of 15 percent NO2, such that you actually should divide by a factor of five or six.</li> <li>Q But assuming you stay with the 100 percent conversion ratio, you're not reducing it by that</li> <li>A I'm not staying with the 100 percent conversion ratio.</li> <li>Q No, I understand that. I'm just trying to understand where you started.</li> <li>A Well, if I artificially kept the numbers high by</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>high as 175 over Veirs Mill Road MR. GROSSMAN: One-seventy-five of what? MS. CORDRY: Micrograms of NO2. MS. ROSENFELD: Of NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Of NO2. In your January 2013 report, that was before there was, we realized there was a conversion error, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. Oh, before the background error? That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. So if that 175 had been corrected for the background error, would those numbers be above the NAAQS? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule it. This is her last question, she said. THE WITNESS: Mathematically you could show that it's higher. But my point I just made was if your background is 90, and your number was 175, you know, you subtract from that 175 and you get what, 85? And you divide that by a factor of five or six, and you're down to 15 or so.</li> </ul>

	Page 30		Page 32
1	done with extremely conservative assumptions, and then try	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Twenty-nine of which report?
2	to mathematically show there's an issue when, as shown in	2	MS. ROSENFELD: Of his February
3	more recent reports, you can't do that. It's extremely	3	MR. GROSSMAN: 2014 report?
4	conservative, and it would not give you a number that could	4	MS. ROSENFELD: February 2014 report.
5	be reproduced by measurement.	5	THE WITNESS: I don't have a copy with me, but
6	MS. ROSENFELD: And all I'm asking is what the	6	again I'd like to ask Mr. Grossman, do you have a copy of
7	number would be	7	that report?
8	MR. GROSSMAN: I think you, he's already answered	8	MR. GROSSMAN: This is your rebuttal report she's
9	that many times.	9	referring to
10	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	10	THE WITNESS: Correct.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand the distinction you're	11	MR. GROSSMAN: 66.
12	making, and the one he's making. You don't have to do it	12	THE WITNESS: The CAPCOA 2011 is a reference
13	again.	13	relating to modeling NO2. And I believe it's available
14	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	14	here. It's certainly a widely available document.
15	Q All right. Mr. Sullivan, just from a global point	15	MR. GROSSMAN: What page are you on, Ms.
16	of view, looking at the, in particular the stage two and the	16	Rosenfeld?
17	stage three analysis that you did in your February 2014	17	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, it's referenced on page 29 of
18	report, assuming for the moment that this analysis were	18	the rebuttal report.
19	going to go through an EPA review, what would the level of	19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20	expertise and background and experience of the EPA reviewer	20	MR. GOECKE: Are you asking if he has a copy of
21	or regional office reviewer have in looking at that report?	21	his report, or the CAPCOA document?
22	MR. GOECKE: Objection. Calls for speculation.	22	MS. ROSENFELD: Of the CAPCOA document.
23	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think he answered that based	23	MR. GOECKE: You don't have copies of that?
24	on his knowledge of reviews of models before, so I'll	24	MS. ROSENFELD: I brought a copy for the record.
25	overrule that.	25	I asked you last time if you would plan, if you would plan
	Page 31		Page 33
1	Page 31 THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of	1	
1 2	-	1 2	
	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of		to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his
2	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then	2	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report.
2 3	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have	2 3	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think
2 3 4	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for
2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional	2 3 4 5	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time. Q I'd like to refer you for a moment to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brown, if you'd just hold on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brown, if you'd just hold on one second. Just disconnect it, unless it's blocking, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time. Q I'd like to refer you for a moment to the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brown, if you'd just hold on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time. Q I'd like to refer you for a moment to the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association guidance document that you referenced on page 29 of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brown, if you'd just hold on one second. Just disconnect it, unless it's blocking, if it's blocking the path. I can't see down the path from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: The regional offices, well, first of all it'd go to the State to review. The EPA would then oversee what the State did. And at both levels they have competent meteorologists and air quality specialists who can interpret the issues that end here. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So they would have education and professional training specific to the types of analysis that you produced in your rebuttal? A Well, each one has different degrees and different training. My point is they, from my experience in working with regional meteorologists, for example, in the various regions, including Todd Ellsworth in region three, regional meteorologist, these are experienced meteorologists that have done modeling for a long time, and they have the ability to read technical reports, and including issues they haven't dealt with specifically before, and make informed judgments. So I'd say yes, EPA is technically competent to review issues like this, and do all the time. Q I'd like to refer you for a moment to the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association guidance document that you referenced on page 29 of your report. Do you have a copy of that with you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to bring copies of all of the reference materials in his report. THE WITNESS: I have most of them. I don't think I have CAPCOA. But if you have a question, if I could have a look at your copy, I'll try to, be happy to answer it. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I do have a copy for the record, and then I have my copy that perhaps Mr. Sullivan and I can share. THE WITNESS: All right. MR. GROSSMAN: Please watch out for the wires. MS. ROSENFELD: You know what? I'm going to go that way. MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, why do we need to have that set up when we're not using it, is my question. When we use it, you can have it set up, but I'm afraid of having those wires stretched across the room. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, okay. THE WITNESS: Which part does your question pertain to? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brown, if you'd just hold on one second. Just disconnect it, unless it's blocking, if it's blocking the path. I can't see down the path from here, but. And then if you need to use it, we can reconnect

	Page 34		Page 36
1	Do you have page 7?	1	Q And do they have the right to full discovery of
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Is this being marked as an exhibit?	2	Q And do they have the right to full discovery of what your modeling analysis includes?
3	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	∠ 3	A They would certainly have the modeling files, the
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so this will be	4	protocol, the modeling results, output files, input files,
	MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I can run a copy of this	-4 5	whatever they wanted.
5	one.	6	Q And do they have the authority to make you
6	MR. GROSSMAN: This, oh, I thought	7	provider further information, or run the model in different
	MS. ROSENFELD: You have an entire copy. I have		-
8		8	ways?
9	an entire copy. Mr. Sullivan has	9	A Well, they certainly have the authority to approve
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let him use my copy once	10	or disapprove the modeling. If they specify it should be
11	we mark it as an exhibit, if you want, if that'll help.	11	
12	MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I can share mine.	12	presume that you would not get your permit.
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so this'll be Exhibit 567.	13	Q Or they could ask that you use different inputs in
14	And that is modeling compliance of the federal one-hour NO2	14	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
15	NAAUS by CAPCOA, which stands for California Air Pollution	15	A Certainly.
16	Control Officers Association, and that's Exhibit 567.	16	Q And that process in fact is very different from
17	(Hearing Exhibit No. 567 was	17	the situation here, is that correct?
18	marked for identification.)	18	A Yes, because this matter did not require an agency
19	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, so what page?	19	such as MDE or EPA to have a permit, air quality permit, so
20	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, I'm going to start, I'm now	20	there's no review conducted.
21	on page 7.	21	Q So in this case the hearing examiner or the Board
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	of Appeals have to determine if your modeling analysis is
23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	23	reasonable, based on what you've provided, is that correct?
24	Q And on page 7, under section 3.3, there's a	24	MR. GOECKE: Objection. Calls for a legal
25	section that's titled selecting the appropriate tier	25	conclusion. And this also goes again beyond the scope of
	Page 35		Dago 27
	Page 35		Page 37
1	Page 35 approach. Do you see that section?	1	rebuttal, and we've been through this before.
1 2	approach. Do you see that section? A I do.	1 2	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I
	approach. Do you see that section? A I do. Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are		rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area.
2	<ul><li>approach. Do you see that section?</li><li>A I do.</li><li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the</li></ul>	2	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have
2 3	<ul><li>approach. Do you see that section?</li><li>A I do.</li><li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li></ul>	2 3	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath?
2 3 4	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses?
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are</li> <li>several options available to demonstrate compliance with the</li> <li>one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by</li> <li>all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have an idea as to what policy</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on. MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have an idea as to what policy judgments they would want to make with respect to how</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on. MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the record to be clear as to the distinctions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have to make with respect to how conservative they would be in allowing use of those</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rebuttal, and we've been through this before. MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area. When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath? THE WITNESS: They do not. MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses? THE WITNESS: No, sir. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross- examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on. MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the record to be clear as to the distinctions. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have to make with respect to how conservative they would be in allowing use of those alternative options?</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>rebuttal, and we've been through this before.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area.</li> <li>When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: They do not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross-examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the record to be clear as to the distinctions.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q I do have one other question about the EPA</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>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have an idea as to what policy judgments they would be in allowing use of those alternative options?</li> <li>A Well, they would make whatever judgments they</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>rebuttal, and we've been through this before.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area.</li> <li>When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: They do not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross-examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the record to be clear as to the distinctions. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q I do have one other question about the EPA process. Are outside parties allowed to come in 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	<ul> <li>approach. Do you see that section?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And under it it notes that, quote, there are several options available to demonstrate compliance with the one-hour NOX standard.</li> <li>A NO2 standard is what it says.</li> <li>Q NO2 standard. Not all options may be allowed by all agency, is that correct?</li> <li>A You're reading exactly what it says.</li> <li>Q Okay. And so in fact under ordinary circumstances if an applicant has to obtain a permit, the regulatory agency would have the expertise to know what questions to ask and what additional data might be required in order to authorize use of the, some of those options, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, to clarify, if your permit was required, then the State, with EPA oversight, would have reviewed the modeling protocol and would approve all options, including whatever decisions are made on NO2 modeling.</li> <li>Q And they would have to make with respect to how conservative they would be in allowing use of those alternative options?</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>rebuttal, and we've been through this before.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I agree. I sustain that. And I guess I'd ask this question, since you're into this area.</li> <li>When you, going through a permit process, do they have cross-examination of you under oath?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: They do not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do they have witnesses come in to testify under oath, expert witnesses?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, sir.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: All right. See, yes, the process is different, but each process has its own methodology of achieving some approximation of truth. So you are stuck with the process that is here. That is, you have a hearing examiner listening to evidence, and you have cross-examination of what he's presented. You have your own expert witness on these points. And so that gives you that level of security. And when it's done by the EPA or the State, they have a different process. We have the process we have here. So I think you can move on.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just want the record to be clear as to the distinctions.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q I do have one other question about the EPA</li> </ul>

	Page 38		Page 40
1	A I think it depends. I haven't seen that on	1	methodology for stage two and stage three.
2	typical permits I've helped obtain. I won't say it never	2	MR. GROSSMAN: But it seems to me you're going
3	happens. On a large controversial air quality project, that	3	back to step one, rather than anything that came up in the
4	certainly could happen. The answer is I don't, I haven't	4	rebuttal testimony. Can you point me to the part of the
5	seen one. I won't say they won't do that.	5	rebuttal testimony that this touches on, or that this is
6	Q From an overall perspective I'd like to walk	6	responsive to? You're already cross-examined him, and he's
7	through the process that you go, that you went through in	7	been cross-examined at great length previously. So this
8	order to come up with your stage two and stage three	8	rebuttal cross-examination should be addressed to things
9	analysis.	9	that were raised during rebuttal, rebuttal direct.
10	A Ms. Rosenfeld, did you finish with the CAPCOA	10	MS. ROSENFELD: And one of the questions is how
11	document?	11	did he come up, how did he derive his OLM analysis in stage
12	Q I'll have more questions about it later	12	two and in stage three, and
13	A All right. I'll leave it here.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, so this is restricted to
14	Q so you can hold onto it, or I can take it back	14	the OLM analysis.
15	for that.	15	MS. ROSENFELD: This is, as I said, this is
16	The initial step is to pick the model that you	16	MR. GROSSMAN: That's, I don't think you said
17	use, correct?	17	that.
18	A Well, that's one of the initial steps, yes.	18	MS. ROSENFELD: this is for his stage two,
19	Q And in this case the choice really was between	19	which is his ozone limiting method
20	MOVES and MOBILE6?	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21	A You're talking about emission models now.	21	MS. ROSENFELD: and stage three, which he
22	Q Yes.	22	identified as something other than was already levelled.
23	A I thought you were going to those are, those	23	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Go ahead.
24	certainly are two choices.	24	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
25	Q Okay. And you picked MOBILE6?	25	Q You say the modeling does not include the
	Page 39		Page 41
1		1	-
1	A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the	1	locations where vehicles will be operated?
			locations where vehicles will be operated?
2	A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the	2	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're
2 3	A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.	2 3	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those
2 3 4	<ul><li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li><li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model,</li></ul>	2 3 4	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li><li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li><li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li><li>A We do.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	locations where vehicles will be operated? A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified. MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices. THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</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 Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which report?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</li> <li>Q Did you model fast food emissions, or any other</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 Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which report?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His February 2014 report.</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>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</li> <li>Q Did you model fast food emissions, or any other localized source of emissions in stage two or stage three?</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 Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which report?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His February 2014 report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</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>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</li> <li>Q Did you model fast food emissions, or any other localized source of emissions in stage two or stage three?</li> <li>A Localized source of emissions. Well, we modeled</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 Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His February 2014 report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: And my questions are going into</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>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</li> <li>Q Did you model fast food emissions, or any other localized source of emissions in stage two or stage three?</li> <li>A Localized source of emissions. Well, we modeled back in</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 Well, at the time of this project in 2012, the original report, that was the recommended, that was the model of choice.</li> <li>Q And then you select your inputs into the model, correct?</li> <li>A We do.</li> <li>Q And that includes the number of vehicles?</li> <li>A That's correct. Among other things.</li> <li>Q And the locations where they'll be operated?</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: How is this within the scope of the rebuttal direct?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's a</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I've given you a lot of leeway, but really, we can't</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's in order</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: go over the entire cross-examination of this witness's original direct here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His report is presented as an alternative methodology, and my questions</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which report?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: His February 2014 report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</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>locations where vehicles will be operated?</li> <li>A You're asking about running MOBILE6 is what you're asking for? That comes up with emission rates, and those are then applied to the locations. But to clarify, the MOVES and MOBILE6 treatment, the roadway counts and so forth, are not changed. That was not modified.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words your February 2014 rebuttal report didn't modify the MOBILE6 versus MOVES choices.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct, but the only exception being we did factor some things up, as I stated. But the gas queue, we increased the PM2.5 emissions by a factor of 10, to address the fact that MOVES is higher. And we described, you know, why we did not scale up the loading dock, for various reasons. But the actual running of MOBILE6 was not repeated for the February 2014 report. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Did you make any modifications to your Mobil 6 runs?</li> <li>A We did not.</li> <li>Q Did you model fast food emissions, or any other localized source of emissions in stage two or stage three?</li> <li>A Localized source of emissions. Well, we modeled the ones that, we modeled the ones that we modeled back in</li> </ul>

	Page 42		Page 44
1	the parking lots, the garage, ring road, all the gas station	1	Q And did you make that adjustment on the mall
2	sources and the loading dock sources.	2	parcel for PM2.5?
3	Q But you didn't model all of the parking lots in	3	A Did I make an adjustment? I was referring, the
4	the mall?	4	example I gave was for the closest home. There was an
5	A We modeled the southern, well, the parking lot	5	annual standard, and the closest home, the annual standard
6	that was in close proximity to Target and Costco, and the	6	was what I was talking about.
7	parking garage to the east.	7	Q And do you remember if you made that adjustment
8	Q And in your 2014 report did you update your	8	for PM2.5 in the mall parcel?
9	traffic congestion levels in light of evidence and testimony	9	A Again, I described it for the closest home only.
10	in this case that there would be more traffic and congestion	10	Q And then in your prior report did you make a
11	on the mall parcel than originally shown?	11	similar adjustment for NOX or NO2, based your selection of
12	A I think we addressed that at the last hearing. My	12	models?
13	answer hasn't changed. I mean we modeled, we modeled, did	13	A Same answer. I mean as I said, we did not, the
14	our modeling. We considered the queues, as we did before,	14	modeling was not changed for the MOBILE6. I discussed an
15	at stop signs, intersections, the various points you asked. We had queues there. We didn't change it. It's the same.	15 16	interpretation. In terms of NO2, to clarify the record, I did
16 17	Q And prior to the rebuttal report did you make any	17	agree with Dr. Cole that on a fleet basis that NO2 was
18	adjustments for NOX in light of your selection of MOBILE6?	18	higher with MOVES than it was with MOBILE6.
19	A Did we make any changes? This is going back to	19	What didn't come out in the record last year, they
20	the 2012 report.	20	looked at that closer, that a lot of those, the factor of
21	MR. GOECKE: Again I would object.	21	two is because in fact there's a 20- or 30-fold difference
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Would you repeat that question,	22	between MOVES and MOBILE6 that's in diesel emissions. And
23	because I didn't	23	if you look at the gas station queue, that gas station queue
24	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	24	is gasoline vehicles. And for the gasoline vehicles, MOVES
25	Q Did you, prior to the rebuttal report, did you	25	is in fact lower by about 20 percent, 20 to 30 percent in
	Page 43		Page 45
	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in	1	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale
2	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor	2	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match
2 3	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?	2 3	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.
2 3 4	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony	2 3 4	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled
2 3 4 5	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.	2 3 4 5	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?
2 3 4 5 6	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going	2 3 4 5 6	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up? A As I've answered
2 3 4 5 6 7	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this	2 3 4 5	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up? A As I've answered Q The NO2.
2 3 4 5 6	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going	2 3 4 5 6 7	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up? A As I've answered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up? A As I've answered Q The NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES. Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up? A As I've answered Q The NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct? A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013?</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013?</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just <ul> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES. And I said well, if we were to take that into account that the highest impacts for the closest home would go from .005</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references that confirmed very clearly that MOBILE6 had higher, 20 to</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>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES. And I said well, if we were to take that into account that the highest impacts for the closest home would go from .005 micrograms per cubic meter to about .05. And so while I</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 literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references that confirmed very clearly that MOBILE6 had higher, 20 to 30 percent higher emissions for gasoline vehicles than did</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>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES. And I said well, if we were to take that into account that the highest impacts for the closest home would go from .005 micrograms per cubic meter to about .05. And so while I didn't specifically model it that way, I certainly</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>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references that confirmed very clearly that MOBILE6 had higher, 20 to 30 percent higher emissions for gasoline vehicles than did MOVES. So to be consistent, I scaled. One went up for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES. And I said well, if we were to take that into account that the highest impacts for the closest home would go from .005 micrograms per cubic meter to about .05. And so while I didn't specifically model it that way, I certainly acknowledged the point and put it in mathematical terms.</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>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references that confirmed very clearly that MOBILE6 had higher, 20 to 30 percent higher emissions for gasoline vehicles than did MOVES. So to be consistent, I scaled. One went up for PM2.5, and NO2 went down a little bit.</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>make any adjustments for the fact that you used MOBILE6, in the context of NO2? I believe you had an adjustment factor of 10 for PM2.5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, this is going back to do with my testimony last year.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I'm going to overrule the objection. But let's not go too far in this again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're talking about prior to</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's very simple. I'm trying to compare what he did before with what he's doing.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, and that's why I'm allowing it.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But what I said last summer, frankly, is that I simply modeled using MOBILE6. I acknowledged that I agree with Dr. Cole that on the gas, the gas queue, particulate emissions were higher with MOVES. And I said well, if we were to take that into account that the highest impacts for the closest home would go from .005 micrograms per cubic meter to about .05. And so while I didn't specifically model it that way, I certainly</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>the literature, than MOBILE6. So there was no need to scale up those sources, there was a need to scale down to match MOVES.</li> <li>Q So in your August 2014 report had you scaled anything up?</li> <li>A As I've answered</li> <li>Q The NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In the August 2013? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the August 2013 report did you scale up NO2?</li> <li>A Other than the fact that the testimony that I just gave, that I did the math on the stand, the modeling was not based on scale-up. The modeling was direct.</li> <li>Q And did you correct, your testimony correctly that in the rebuttal report in fact you have scaled down for NO2?</li> <li>A I scaled down for NO2 one hour, that's correct, by 20 percent.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Because of the distinction between the fleet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct. I had multiple references that confirmed very clearly that MOBILE6 had higher, 20 to 30 percent higher emissions for gasoline vehicles than did MOVES. So to be consistent, I scaled. One went up for</li> </ul>

	Page 46		Page 48
1	Q And then after you've gone through those input	1	had the addition of in his report to me is not particularly
2	steps, you need to select a dispersion model, correct?	2	relevant. The point is that he's asked were there other
3	A I didn't, I already, that selection had already	3	things he relied on, and he said yes, there's this other
4	been made. I mean we're using AERMOD for this project.	4	report that I relied on. He doesn't have to list
5	Q Okay. And then beyond that though it's the urban	5	everything, every basis for his knowledge in his report,
6	versus rural, correct?	6	does he?
7	A We're using the same treatment as August. It's	7	MS. CORDRY: I understand, but it does make it
8	urban for that set of receptors.	8	much more difficult to cross-examine when someone comes up
9	Q In your rebuttal report you, do I understand	9	with new references.
10	correctly that you conclude that the rural dispersion	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, except that you have every
11	characteristics to the south of the mall parcel would be	11	opportunity to look at his report, have your expert analyze
12	overtaken by the urban dispersion, and you do that based on	12	it, pull out every report that could possibly pertain to it,
13	a formula from a report called Panofsky, or a Panofsky	13	and cross-examine on it. He doesn't have to know, there's
14	article that you reference?	14	no requirement anywhere that everybody list every piece of
15	A That's one reference. There's others that show	15	information that they have studied in their lifetime that
16	very similar things.	16	causes them to reach a certain conclusion.
17	Q Can you tell me what in addition to the Panofsky	17	MS. ROSENFELD: If I could just remind the witness
18	article you referenced are other sources?	18	of my question.
19	A There are other sources. I didn't reference them	19	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
20	all, but if you look at, I mean I have references, Raynor,	20	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
21	R-A-Y-N-O-R, 1979, would be an example, where they, where he	21	Q Do you reference any other sources in your
22	showed in there approximately a one-to-three to one-to-four	22	rebuttal report, other than the Panofsky article, as the
23	front ratio. It means for every four feet you go, you're	23	basis for the transition between the rural dispersion
24	going to, the point where it's equilibriating would be one	24	characteristics south of the mall parcel, and the more urban
25	meter, one foot above the ground. So if you, it's one-to-	25	on the mall parcel?
	Page 47		Page 49
1	four slope that that's about what I showed here.	1	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example,
2	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?	2	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the
2 3	<ul><li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li><li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li><li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li></ul>	2 3	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.
2 3 4	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if	2 3 4	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I did not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed. MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: I did not. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>four slope that that's about what I showed here.</li> <li>Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct?</li> <li>A No, but you asked me other references.</li> <li>Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on?</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Right.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can say in answer to a question as to are there, he mentions one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A Atmospheric Turbulence.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can say in answer to a question as to are there, he mentions one source, on report he relied on. He's asked a question are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A Atmospheric Turbulence.</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	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can say in answer to a question as to are there, he mentions one source, on report he relied on. He's asked a question are there other things you relied on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A I used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A Atmospheric Turbulence.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A By Panofsky and Dutton. I believe it's been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can say in answer to a question as to are there, he mentions one source, on report he relied on. MS. ROSENFELD: But that was	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 used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A Atmospheric Turbulence.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A By Panofsky and Dutton. I believe it's been referenced in previous reports I've had, I've done. It was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	four slope that that's about what I showed here. Q But that's not referenced in your report, correct? A No, but you asked me other references. Q No, no, no, no, no. I asked you if MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him on what other things he relied on, and I think he's MS. ROSENFELD: No, I asked him if there were other, I asked him if there were other references in his report. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't remember you saying in his report, but it doesn't really matter. He can answer that question. Were there other references in the report that you relied on? MS. CORDRY: Well, but those are ones we haven't been provided then. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MS. CORDRY: So he can, I mean he can bring up as many references as he does, but now we're sitting here MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's okay. I mean he can say in answer to a question as to are there, he mentions one source, on report he relied on. He's asked a question are there other things you relied on.	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 used the Panofsky 1984 reference as an example, and like I said, these levels are very consistent with the literature, other things I've reviewed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But she's asking you are there other, did you list any other references in your report? THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I did not.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And the Panofsky formula is not part of any standard EPA guidance, is it?</li> <li>A Panofsky, I don't recall seeing that in the EPA guidance, but it's in a peer-reviewed book.</li> <li>Q And what book is that? Do you know?</li> <li>A I gave the reference. Panofsky and Dutton, 1984, published I believe in, apparently I don't have it on the list. Panofsky and Dutton, is it Atmospheric Turbulence?</li> <li>My applications, I believe</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A Atmospheric Turbulence.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A By Panofsky and Dutton. I believe it's been</li> </ul>

	Page 50		Page 52
1	And I believe it was mentioned earlier, in previous reports.	1	Q When you finally do get to this, the tier three
2	Q Is this a source that you got from the Library of	2	analysis, it's not a one-step calculation, is it?
3	Congress?	3	A One-step, what is a one-step calculation?
4	A I've had that text for a long time.	4	Q Well, first you have to come up with a ratio for
5	Q You evaluate a number of pollutants in the	5	the initial combustion, the primary NO2, or what I'll call
6	rebuttal report, including PM2.5 and CO, is that correct?	6	the tailpipe NO2, is that correct?
7	A That's correct.	7	A They call it in-stack ratio. It's an input to
8	Q And with those two pollutants you just are	8	AERMOD.
9	measuring them directly. You're just looking at specific	9	Q And you describe at page 29 the study you rely on
10	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not understanding that	10	to come up with that 25 percent ratio, is that, that 25
11	question.	11	percent stack number, correct?
12	MS. ROSENFELD: You're looking at direct numbers,	12	A We're referring to CAPCOA as a basis for coming up
13	pulled from monitors.	13	with a conservative in-stack ratio for all NO2 combustion
14	MR. GROSSMAN: When you say he's looking at, do	14	sources.
15	you mean his rebuttal report?	15	Q And that's what you talk about in the first couple
16	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	16	of sentences of the full paragraph on page 29, is that
17	Q Yes, in the rebuttal report. Your concentration	17	correct?
18	levels?	18	A We mention CAPCOA, among other things, and we
19	A I'm directly modeling without conversion	19	describe more specific references that provide more specific
20	Q Right.	20	information.
21	A is that what you mean? CO and PM2.5.	21	MR. GROSSMAN: Once again, you're referring to
22	Q And with respect to NO2, you're not measuring that	22	Exhibit 466 now, the rebuttal report, page 29.
23	directly, but you need to evaluate a mix of compounds, is	23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24	that correct?	24	Q And you said you were applying that 25 percent
25	A You mean modeling it directly?	25	ratio to cars in the queue and for 40 meters beyond the
	Page 51		Page 53
_	Page 51	_	Page 53
1	Q Mm-hmm.	1	receptors in the queue, is that correct?
2	<ul><li>Q Mm-hmm.</li><li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to</li></ul>	2	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in-
2 3	<ul><li>Q Mm-hmm.</li><li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li></ul>	2 3	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios.
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone? Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone? Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone? Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues? A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone? Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues? A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	receptors in the queue, is that correct? A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the in- stack ratios. Q Mm-hmm. A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number. And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone? Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues? A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent. Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> <li>A I think tier two would show higher, but if we were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring road.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> <li>A I think tier two would show higher, but if we were to run that, my expectation would be less than the standard.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring road.</li> <li>Q And in the parking lot?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> <li>A I think tier two would show higher, but if we were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring road.</li> <li>Q And in the parking lot?</li> <li>A Cars driving, all NOX emissions in this case from</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>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> <li>A I think tier two would show higher, but if we were to run that, my expectation would be less than the standard. It would be closer, but I think it would be less than the</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>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring road.</li> <li>Q And in the parking lot?</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>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A What we're modeling, NOX is being converted to NO2.</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</li> <li>A The modeling emission rates are for NOX, and that's been the model through OLM or OLM group. It's modeling the NO2 fraction.</li> <li>Q In this case you're deriving your ultimate concentrations through a combination of NOX and ozone, correct?</li> <li>A The ozone is certainly input to the model, but then uses that as an input to estimate NO2 levels.</li> <li>Q We've discussed that the EPA has a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. And you went straight from tier one to tier three, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Would it be reasonable to conclude that the tier two method would show considerably higher results than what you've calculated with tier three?</li> <li>A I think tier two would show higher, but if we were to run that, my expectation would be less than the standard. It would be closer, but I think it would be less than the standard.</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>receptors in the queue, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, just to clarify, we're talking about the instack ratios.</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A We're using 25 percent, you know, as our number.</li> <li>And as I indicate in here, in most cases that's highly conservative. But if you're asking me now what about, you're going beyond the in-stack ratios. You're asking about the 40-meter zone?</li> <li>Q No, I'm trying to understand what geographical area you applied the 25 percent tailpipe ratio for. Is it just for the cars that are in the queues?</li> <li>A It's called an in-stack ratio. It's cars in the queue. It would also be for trucks at the loading dock. We can certainly put them at 25 percent, even though CAPCOA shows that heavy-duty diesels are at 11 percent.</li> <li>Q So it doesn't apply, you're not applying that to the cars in the ring road?</li> <li>A We're applying 25 percent to the cars in the ring road.</li> <li>Q And in the parking lot?</li> <li>A Cars driving, all NOX emissions in this case from motor vehicles, we're using 25 percent conservatively.</li> </ul>

	Page 54		Page 56
1	ratio was for the queue and for the loading dock. Does it	1	method, so the model is internally computing how much of
2	also include the cars in the southern ring road	2	that NO versus NO2 each hour, based on how much ozone is
3	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir, it does. MR. GROSSMAN: and the parking lot?	3 4	present in the air. MR. GROSSMAN: And just for clarity of the record
5	THE WITNESS: It includes the parking lot, the	5	now, we're not talking about tier two, we're talking about
6	parking garage, travel in the ring road, University.	6	on your, in your rebuttal report you used the term stage
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	7	one, stage two, and stage three. We're talking about stage
8	THE WITNESS: That ratio is used for everything,	8	two from the rebuttal report.
9	free-flow and queues.	9	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	10	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11	THE WITNESS: It could be, you know, to simplify	11	Q And in stage two, you've identified this area that
12	the analysis and make it conservative.	12	is 40 meters outside beyond the queue area, right?
13	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	13	A Correct.
14	Q And is it all parking lots?	14	Q And I'm just going to call that the tailpipe box,
15	A We didn't model the northern parking lots, because	15	unless you've got a better, just so we know what we're
16	they're too far away to be significant.	16	talking about
17	Q So basically it's whatever motor vehicle sources	17	A Okay.
18	you've been modeling throughout.	18	Q an easy way to refer to that
19 20	A To clarify, if you refer to the November 2012 report, it has pictures showing exactly what the model,	19 20	<ul> <li>A Tailpipe box, all right.</li> <li>Q 40 meter area. Are you assuming that there is</li> </ul>
20	which part of the, which loading, parking lot, which garage	20	any hour by hour conversion occurring within the tailpipe
22	and so forth. That hasn't changed.	22	box under stage two?
23	Q Okay. And so all of those sources from your	23	A Certainly. There is conversion occurring from
24		24	sources other than the gas queue and the loading dock. All
25	ratio.	25	other sources are assumed, their impacts are assumed to be
	Page 55		Page 57
1	A For NO2, correct.	1	converting by the OLM method.
2	<ul><li>A For NO2, correct.</li><li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li></ul>	2	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also
2 3	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> </ul>	2 3	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> </ul>	2 3 4	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct.
2 3 4 5	A For NO2, correct. Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that 25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of the NOX, is that correct?	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use</li> <li>to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining 75 units, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO to NO2. If there's less than 10 available, then it'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use</li> <li>to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining</li> <li>75 units, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO to NO2. If there's less than 10 available, then it'll convert what it can. And that's a procedure that's done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining 75 units, correct?</li> <li>A Which, you're referring to stage two or stage three?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO to NO2. If there's less than 10 available, then it'll convert what it can. And that's a procedure that's done internal to model. We don't do that. The model is doing
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 For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining 75 units, correct?</li> <li>A Which, you're referring to stage two or stage three?</li> <li>Q Well, we need to go through both, so let's start</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	converting by the OLM method. Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct? A Correct. Q That's just being modeled directly by the program. A Correct. For all sources. MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that? THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it. And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO to NO2. If there's less than 10 available, then it'll convert what it can. And that's a procedure that's done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A For NO2, correct.</li> <li>Q For NO2, okay. Okay, so then in addition to that</li> <li>25 percent in-stack tailpipe ratio, you also have another</li> <li>formula that you use to model the remaining 75 percent of</li> <li>the NOX, is that correct?</li> <li>A I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Well, let's assume that there's 100 units of NOX</li> <li>that comes out of a tailpipe.</li> <li>A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q You're assuming that 25 percent of that is</li> <li>immediately, comes out of the tailpipe as NO2, correct?</li> <li>A It starts, that fraction starts as NO2. It is</li> <li>NO2.</li> <li>Q Starts as NO2.</li> <li>A And stays there.</li> <li>Q Okay. So then that leaves you 75 units of NOX.</li> <li>A Yeah, and it's basically NO.</li> <li>Q NO. Then you have a separate formula that you use to model what happens with that remaining, those remaining 75 units, correct?</li> <li>A Which, you're referring to stage two or stage three?</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>converting by the OLM method.</li> <li>Q And then so that, and that OLM method is also applied outside of the tailpipe box, correct?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q That's just being modeled directly by the program.</li> <li>A Correct. For all sources.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What about the other 75 percent of the emissions coming out of the tailpipe box? Are they also analyzed by this method, or what do you do with that?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The model itself internally does it.</li> <li>And we've done the, a very conservative way of using, there's two options to do this. One's called OLM. The other's called OLM group. When you use OLM it considers ozone separately for all the sources. It doesn't consider overlapping issues, which are significant here. So that if you use the OLM method, at each source it independently sees how much ozone is there this hour, and if there's 10 micrograms of ozone, it'll convert 10 micrograms of NO2, if there are 10 micrograms of NO rather, it'll convert the NO to NO2. If there's less than 10 available, then it'll convert what it can. And that's a procedure that's done internal to model. We don't do that. The model is doing that.</li> </ul>

	Page 58		Page 60
1	the last, near the bottom of the first full paragraph, you	1	peak modeling for this gas queue. A lot more potential for
2	talk about how the ratio of NO2 to NOX is much less than 100	2	conversion, and a lot more mixing going on than we had
3	percent. Is that something that is addressed directly in	3	mixing going on in ours. A lot more potential, probably 10,
4	the model, or is that a formula that you have come up with?	4	20 times more potential for mixing of the ozone with the
5	A You're referring to the page that says even then	5	plumes, that they were converting in, you know, after going
6	the ratio of NO2 to NOX is much less than 100 percent?	6	10, or two or three kilometers, they're converting 10 or 15
7	Q Mm-hmm.	7	percent of the NO2 to, the NO to NO2. Tiny, tiny fraction.
8	A Well, that's what that particular reference, those	8	My point was I used Janssen '86 as an example to
9	references show. Atmospheric Agency, 2007, Janssen 1986.	9	say what has to be more than 40, I'll conservatively set it
10	And I probably gave four or five others in this document	10	at 40, it's probably more like a couple of kilometers. But
11	that show the same thing.	11	to have it tractable I'll use 40 as my basis. But these
12	Q And if I were to take a look at appendix B of your	12	references show it's much, much more than that.
13	rebuttal report, it starts on page 27, I think on the bottom	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Use 40 what?
14	of 27 you refer to that same Janssen, you also refer to a	14	THE WITNESS: Meters, so there was I set the zone
15	Janssen report, is that correct?	15	where if you have your gas queue, we know it's not, it's not
16	A I do.	16	converting inside the source itself, and so we set the gas
17	Q Summary of Janssen, and then I think there's some perhaps additional references further on. Here's my	17	queue up at 40 meters around that gas queue loading dock zone. We say well, based upon the literature, clearly
18 19	question. When you're looking at the conversion factor for	18 19	there's probably zero conversion, and certainly not, no
20	the conversion of, the hour by hour pairing, and the	20	significant conversion happening that fast. Six kilometers,
21	conversion of NO to NO2, you have to use a certain formula	21	I used the formula in Janssen '86 to show that, you know, at
22	in order to figure how fast that's going to happen, is that	22	40 meters you would still be at six percent. And in the
23	correct?	23	range for a power plant, initial in-stack ratio is five to
24	A The, are you talking about AERMOD?	24	10 percent. So it had not simply converted all at that
25	Q No	25	distance. I used that as a very conservative benchmark. It
	Page 59		Page 61
1	Page 59 A Are you talking about these references?	1	
1 2	<ul><li>A Are you talking about these references?</li><li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li></ul>	1 2	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.
	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2</li> </ul>	2 3	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this
2 3 4 5	A Are you talking about these references? Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page 7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using	2 3 4 5	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and
2 3 4 5 6	A Are you talking about these references? Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page 7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about	2 3 4 5 6	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter
2 3 4 5 6 7	A Are you talking about these references? Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page 7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.	2 3 4 5 6 7	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A Are you talking about these references? Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page 7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over. A That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A Are you talking about these references? Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page 7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over. A That's correct. Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing.</li> <li>Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing.</li> <li>Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, and much of the testing has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well represented in the literature. I'm showing, and I can</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things. Janssen '86, Janssen '88, let's see what else. Shu, S-H-U,
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 you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, and much of the testing has been done for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well represented in the literature. I'm showing, and I can certainly show with the projector, examples of this from</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things. Janssen '86, Janssen '88, let's see what else. Shu, S-H-U, 1978. Peters and Carmichael, 1977. These are all showing
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 you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, and much of the testing has been done for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well represented in the literature. I'm showing, and I can certainly show with the projector, examples of this from three or four reports, that the amount of time required to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things. Janssen '86, Janssen '88, let's see what else. Shu, S-H-U, 1978. Peters and Carmichael, 1977. These are all showing very similar things. But the common pattern is it takes
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 Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, and much of the testing has been done for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well represented in the literature. I'm showing, and I can certainly show with the projector, examples of this from three or four reports, that the amount of time required to convert NO to NO2 in a power plant pump, where they had a</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>could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q So you used the Janssen report and this</li> <li>Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct?</li> <li>A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing.</li> <li>Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things. Janssen '86, Janssen '88, let's see what else. Shu, S-H-U, 1978. Peters and Carmichael, 1977. These are all showing very similar things. But the common pattern is it takes kilometers at a time for that conversion to take place. 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	<ul> <li>A Are you talking about these references?</li> <li>Q I'm talking about your discussion here on page</li> <li>7, where you talk about, you assume a starting ratio of NO2 to NOX at a source, and then you have a conversion of the remaining fraction of NO to NO2 on a one-to-one basis, using ozone concentrations. I assume there you're talking about that sort of remaining 75 units that we have left over.</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. How did you come up with the conversion that you used for that remaining 75 units?</li> <li>A We don't. The conversion in stage two is based on the AERMOD dispersion model, but the OLM treatment and the model is doing that internally.</li> <li>Q Then could you explain to me why there's this discussion here of the Atmospheric Agency report and the Janssen report? If AERMOD makes those conversions automatically, why do you have these source references?</li> <li>A Well, because of the fact that the OLM method was developed for stacked sources, and much of the testing has been done for stacked sources, our plant's certainly well represented in the literature. I'm showing, and I can certainly show with the projector, examples of this from three or four reports, that the amount of time required to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could have been 100, 200, 300 meters. I used 40 meters to very conservatively address it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So you used the Janssen report and this Environmental Agency report, Atmospheric Agency report, and maybe some others, to extrapolate that 40 meter perimeter that you drew, is that correct? A I used Janssen. Janssen had a formula that I could extrapolate it back to 40 meters. Q Okay. A Plus interpretation of not just the ones listed here, but I've identified others where they had studies that have been done. It's on my data disk on your references. I had a number of them that I can describe to you, that said the same, show the same thing. Let me tell you what those are. Carmichael and Peters, 1981, would be an example. And I can show you these on a screen if you'd like. Another example, let me get my list out. But if you look on that data disk, there's quite a number of them that would show you similar kind of things. Janssen '86, Janssen '88, let's see what else. Shu, S-H-U, 1978. Peters and Carmichael, 1977. These are all showing very similar things. But the common pattern is it takes

	Page 62		Page 64
1	and creates maximum impacts at ground level. It has to mix	1	percent for the idling cars in the queue, but we're using 25
2	down to the ground first. It has two or three more	2	as a benchmark number. That's what it is. But inside the
3	kilometers to mix, and it does.	3	zone from the source itself, going out 40 meters
4	Q And that brings me back to a question I asked	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
5	earlier, because maybe I misunderstood. In your stage two	5	THE WITNESS: the zone around that, we're
6	analysis, did you assume that any of that mixing was	6	saying in there that for the loading dock and gas queue
7	occurring within the tailpipe box? A Is your tailpipe box, you're referring to the,	7	only, we're restricting that to 25 percent because there's not enough time for mixing to the molecular level for sure
9	outside the gas queue itself, loading dock. Outside the	9	in that zone. But for every other source, including the
10	source, for the immediate zone around the source?	10	ring road that's right next to that, those receptors, we're
11	Q Right, that's	11	using OLM directly.
12	A I'm assuming no conversion takes place. Remember,	12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, then I misunderstood. I
13	I'm starting at 25 percent	13	thought I asked you whether or not that 25 percent
14	Q Right.	14	conversion applied to the cars in the parking lot and the
15	A level.	15	ones on the immediate vicinity in the ring road, within that
16	Q That's what I thought I asked.	16	40 meter thing. And you, I thought you said yes to that.
17 18	A And as I described in here, actually the rate is even lower than that. The in-stack rate is lower than that,	17 18	THE WITNESS: It does. The in-stack ratio coming out of the tailpipe is always at 25 percent in this
19	based upon Lenner and Lindquist's reference.	19	modeling, for all the sources between the parking lot and
20	Q Okay, so you're assuming the 25 percent direct	20	the parking garage. But we're referring to a zone here
21	tailpipe emission within the tailpipe box, which is the	21	around, it's a rectangle you could draw around the gas queue
22	queue plus the 40 meters.	22	going into that source.
23	MR. GROSSMAN: You mean by a 25, when you say 25	23	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but so how far out
24	percent direct tailpipe emission, you're saying he's	24	does that in-stack ratio go? If you're not talking about
25	assuming a 25 percent conversion to NO2	25	the full 40 meters for that, how far out are you taking that
	Page 63		Dana 65
	i age 00		Page 65
1	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.	1	in-stack ratio that you're applying?
1 2		1 2	-
	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio		in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	2 3 4	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO,
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been	2 3 4 5	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it.	2 3 4 5 6	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box.	2 3 4 5 6 7	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box.	2 3 4 5 6 7	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change. MS. ROSENFELD: And that's what's coming out of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we don't modify beyond the 25 percent. They stay at 25 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change. MS. ROSENFELD: And that's what's coming out of the tailpipe.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we don't modify beyond the 25 percent. They stay at 25 percent in that box.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change. MS. ROSENFELD: And that's what's coming out of the tailpipe. THE WITNESS: Correct. MS. ROSENFELD: That's what's just blowing out of the exhaust.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we don't modify beyond the 25 percent. They stay at 25 percent in that box.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But all the sources that contribute, including the ring road and the parking lots, what have you,</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: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change. MS. ROSENFELD: And that's what's coming out of the tailpipe. THE WITNESS: Correct. MS. ROSENFELD: That's what's just blowing out of the exhaust. THE WITNESS: Exactly. We think it's less, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we don't modify beyond the 25 percent. They stay at 25 percent in that box.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But all the sources that contribute, including the ring road and the parking lots, what have you, those are straight OLM.</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: That's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: in the tailpipe box. MS. ROSENFELD: The in-stack ratio MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: I think is what he's been calling it. MS. CORDRY: Well, actually not the tailpipe box. Coming out of the tailpipe. MR. GROSSMAN: No, well, he's, as I understood the earlier testimony, he's included within that box 25 percent conversion rate of everything within that box. And that box is defined out to the 40 meter line. That's my understanding. THE WITNESS: Let me clarify. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that THE WITNESS: It's a little different than that. I mean basically we're saying the in-stack ratio is 25 percent for all the sources. That doesn't change. MS. ROSENFELD: And that's what's coming out of the tailpipe. THE WITNESS: Correct. MS. ROSENFELD: That's what's just blowing out of the exhaust.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>in-stack ratio that you're applying? THE WITNESS: The in-stack ratio is applied throughout the modeling grid. That doesn't change. What changes is how much potential is there to convert the NO, the residual NO to NO2.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, but I'm not making my question clear. You've talked about this box that goes out 40 meters. You also talked about the in-stack ratio that you're applying being 25 percent. Then I thought I asked you, and maybe I didn't make that question clear, whether or not that 25 percent in-stack ratio conversion was applied to all emissions within that 40 meter box. And I thought you said yes to that, but now I'm hearing you say something different.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Within the box, within inside the box we have the gas queue and the loading dock. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Those are the only sources that we don't modify beyond the 25 percent. They stay at 25 percent in that box.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: But all the sources that contribute, including the ring road and the parking lots, what have you,</li> </ul>

	Page 66		Page 68
1	THE WITNESS: Inside the box, outside the box.	1	Q Of the queue and the loading dock.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2	A Correct.
3	MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, may we step outside the	3	Q And what about for emissions outside of the
4	box and take a brief break now?	4	tailpipe box that drift into the box? Is the treatment of
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Yeah, okay, we'll come back	5	that the same?
6	in five minutes.	6	A It is not.
7	(Whereupon, at 10:59 a.m., a brief recess was	7	Q How is that treated?
8	taken.)	8	A We assume very conservatively, based on all these
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, back on the record.	9	references I provide here, that they have 50 percent
10	MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. Mr. Grossman, I do	10	conversion of their emissions for, affecting the box and for
11	appreciate your patience. It's complicated, and I'm still	11	locations outside the box, it's 50 percent.
12	trying to understand some of the nuance here.	12	Q So emissions from, for example, the parking lot,
13	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	13	that disperse into the box, you assume a 50 percent
14	Q Going back to the, Mr. Sullivan, going back to the	14	conversion ratio, correct?
15	tailpipe box, I think I understood you to say that for the	15	A Correct.
16	emissions coming from the queue and the loading dock, it's	16	Q And for emissions that are generated by the queue
17	the flat 25 percent tailpipe in-stack emissions.	17	and the loading dock that disperse beyond the tailpipe box,
18 19	A That's correct. For all the receptors that are inside that location, that's either inside the source or 40	18 19	you're assuming a 50 percent conversion ratio for those as well?
20	meters happens to be one area source width away from the	20	A That's correct. Which like I say, we have tested
20	source, the gas queue source, for all those receptors, for	20	that. That's a very conservative approach, relative to the
22	all those receptors and just for the loading dock and the	22	approach using OLM outside the box. I mean using OLM
23	gas queue, we strictly use 25 percent. We do not modify OLM	23	outside the source. That has been tested.
24	at all, because there's nowhere near enough time to convert.	24	MR. GROSSMAN: So your stage three results should
25	So that's the assumption. All other sources affecting that	25	show higher concentrations of NO2 than your stage two
	Page 67		Page 69
1	Page 67 box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.	1	Page 69 results, because it's more conservative?
1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1 2	
	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.		results, because it's more conservative?
2	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that	2	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your
2 3	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you	2 3	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct?
2 3 4 5 6	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM	2 3 4 5 6	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.</li> <li>There's no difference.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that</li> <li>emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you</li> <li>apply the OLM</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q conversion factor to that.</li> <li>A Yes, we do.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two</li> <li>and your stage three</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q analysis? This is only stage two?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done differently.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done differently. Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done differently. Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in stage three?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done differently. Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in stage three? A Stage three is the gas queue and loading dock effects on the box. The tailpipe box, as you're referring to it, is the same.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference between stage two and stage three. Stage two is all based on old NO2 data, old, very old background data, 2006 to 2010, to match the meteorological data set we use throughout
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM. There's no difference. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you apply the OLM A Correct. Q conversion factor to that. A Yes, we do. Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two and your stage three A No. Q analysis? This is only stage two? A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two that is the way it is done. Stage three is done differently. Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in stage three? A Stage three is the gas queue and loading dock effects on the box. The tailpipe box, as you're referring to it, is the same. Q Yes, I thought the treatment inside the box.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference between stage two and stage three. Stage two is all based on old NO2 data, old, very old background data, 2006 to 2010, to match the meteorological data set we use throughout this project before. So you're having very high background
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.</li> <li>There's no difference.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that</li> <li>emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you</li> <li>apply the OLM</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q conversion factor to that.</li> <li>A Yes, we do.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two</li> <li>and your stage three</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q analysis? This is only stage two?</li> <li>A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two</li> <li>that is the way it is done. Stage three is done</li> <li>differently.</li> <li>Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in</li> <li>stage three?</li> <li>A Stage three is the gas queue and loading dock</li> <li>effects on the box. The tailpipe box, as you're referring</li> <li>to it, is the same.</li> <li>Q Yes, I thought the treatment inside the box.</li> <li>A Is the same. Stage two, stage three.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference between stage two and stage three. Stage two is all based on old NO2 data, old, very old background data, 2006 to 2010, to match the meteorological data set we use throughout this project before. So you're having very high background that's kind of balancing that, to some extent. So that'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>box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.</li> <li>There's no difference.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that</li> <li>emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you</li> <li>apply the OLM</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q conversion factor to that.</li> <li>A Yes, we do.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two</li> <li>and your stage three</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q analysis? This is only stage two?</li> <li>A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two</li> <li>that is the way it is done. Stage three is done</li> <li>differently.</li> <li>Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in stage three?</li> <li>A Stage three is the gas queue and loading dock</li> <li>effects on the box. The tailpipe box, as you're referring</li> <li>to it, is the same.</li> <li>Q Yes, I thought the treatment inside the box.</li> <li>A Is the same. Stage two, stage three.</li> <li>Q Okay. That was my question.</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	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference between stage two and stage three. Stage two is all based on old NO2 data, old, very old background data, 2006 to 2010, to match the meteorological data set we use throughout this project before. So you're having very high background that's kind of balancing that, to some extent. So that's what you were seeing. The fact that the background is so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>box, the ring road, all the rest, they're straight OLM.</li> <li>There's no difference.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Okay. So if there's a car in the parking lot that</li> <li>emits some NO2, some NO and it drifts into the box, you</li> <li>apply the OLM</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q conversion factor to that.</li> <li>A Yes, we do.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that's the case for both your stage two</li> <li>and your stage three</li> <li>A No.</li> <li>Q analysis? This is only stage two?</li> <li>A Stage, we're talking about stage, for stage two</li> <li>that is the way it is done. Stage three is done</li> <li>differently.</li> <li>Q Okay. Could you explain to me how it's handled in</li> <li>stage three?</li> <li>A Stage three is the gas queue and loading dock</li> <li>effects on the box. The tailpipe box, as you're referring</li> <li>to it, is the same.</li> <li>Q Yes, I thought the treatment inside the box.</li> <li>A Is the same. Stage two, stage three.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	results, because it's more conservative? THE WITNESS: Generally stage three is taking your lower maximums. It is somewhat lower. MS. ROSENFELD: Stage three is less conservative, correct? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I misunderstood. I don't, I thought you just said that stage three, where you're using that 50 percent assumption THE WITNESS: There's another factor MR. GROSSMAN: was more conservative than the OLM method, but stage two used the OLM method. So where you're more conservative, you would show a higher conversion to NO2, would you not? THE WITNESS: Your logic is correct. MR. GROSSMAN: But my answer is wrong. THE WITNESS: No, no, your answer is correct for the information at hand, but there's another difference between stage two and stage three. Stage two is all based on old NO2 data, old, very old background data, 2006 to 2010, to match the meteorological data set we use throughout this project before. So you're having very high background that's kind of balancing that, to some extent. So that's

	Page 70		Page 72
1	impacts.	1	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
2	So we couldn't run every gradation here, Mr.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3	Grossman, because we would have had so many runs it would	3	MS. ROSENFELD: So it assumes that 50 percent of
4	have been unwieldy. But we did show a stage two and stage	4	the NO gets converted.
5	three, as I just explained this, to show a range. And we	5	THE WITNESS: It assumes 50 percent of the NO will
6	also did a test, as I'd be happy to talk about, where we	6	convert.
7	applied OLM to all receptors outside the source region. You	7	MS. ROSENFELD: Got it. And is that, that's 50
8	know, if the tailpipe box is done by OLM, we have tested	8	percent of the 75 percent that was remaining, right?
9	that.	9	THE WITNESS: I want to clarify. It's 50 percent
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, okay, but so if I understand	10	of NOX.
11	you correctly, what you're saying is that in stage three you	11	MS. CORDRY: Original?
12	used a conversion ratio that was more conservative than the	12	THE WITNESS: Original, correct. Fifty percent,
13	OLM method would have shown, but you had a different	13	if the NOX was 100, if you had assumed it all NO2, it would
14	variable. You used a corrected background. Well, you	14	be 50.
15	didn't say corrected	15	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
16	THE WITNESS: More recent.	16	Q Okay, so of those original 100 units that I talked
17	MR. GROSSMAN: A more recent background level of	17	about, you're assuming that 50 percent of those original 100
18	NO2? THE WITNESS: Correct.	18	units get converted. A Correct.
19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: So and therefore the bottom line	19 20	Q So in that case you would have, so does that leave
20	result was a lower level of NO2 in stage three. Do I	20	you with a 75 percent conversion ratio, the 25 percent plus
22	understand you correctly now?	22	the 50?
23	THE WITNESS: You're correct.	23	A No, for stage three we're assuming for every
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	24	situation except the gas queue and loading dock inside the
25	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	25	box, we're assuming that half of the NOX is NO2, throughout
			,
	Page 71		Page 73
1	Q Now I'm confused. In stage two when you have the	1	the grid, no matter how close it to the source. It's always
2			<b>o</b> ,
	100 percent conversion under the OLM, you assume that all	2	at 50 percent NO2.
3	available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?	2 3	at 50 percent NO2. Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.
3 4	•		-
	available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?	3	Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.
4	available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct? A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100	3 4	<ul><li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li><li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li></ul>
4 5	available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct? A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.	3 4 5	Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all. A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime,
4 5 6	<ul><li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li><li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li><li>percent conversion on here.</li><li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's</li></ul>	3 4 5 6	Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all. A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.
4 5 6 7	<ul><li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li><li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li><li>percent conversion on here.</li><li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li></ul>	3 4 5 6 7	Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all. A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up
4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li> <li>percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50</li> <li>percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.</li> <li>You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li> <li>percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's</li> <li>available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50</li> <li>percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.</li> <li>You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li> <li>percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50</li> <li>percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.</li> <li>You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li> <li>percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50</li> <li>percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.</li> <li>You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100</li> <li>percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's</li> <li>available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50</li> <li>percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough</li> <li>ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there</li> <li>isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very</li> <li>short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that</li> </ul>	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms.</li> <li>You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage three.</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> <li>A I don't recall. The model doesn't print that out.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words the 50 percent does</li> </ul>	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> <li>A I don't recall. The model doesn't print that out.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words the 50 percent does not refer to the amount of ozone available. It refers to</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>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> <li>A I don't recall. The model doesn't print that out. It may be possible to write statements in it to do that, but the model output shows your concentration of NO2, not</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words the 50 percent does not refer to the amount of ozone available. It refers to the assumed conversion percentage of NO to NO2, is that</li> </ul>	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 Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> <li>A I don't recall. The model doesn't print that out. It may be possible to write statements in it to do that, but the model output shows your concentration of NO2, not conversion ratios. That's all internal calculations.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>available ozone is used to convert to NO2, is that correct?</li> <li>A You said 100 percent conversion. There's no 100 percent conversion on here.</li> <li>Q Not 100, but that 100 percent of the ozone that's available actually is used to convert to NO2, correct?</li> <li>A That's what AERMOD will do, yes.</li> <li>Q And in stage three you're assuming that only 50 percent of the available ozone actually is used to convert.</li> <li>A No, we're assuming that there's always enough ozone, and we're assuming there's enough time, which there isn't, to convert from 25 percent to 50 percent in a very short distance. Based on the references I've shown, that really is way too short.</li> <li>But to come up with a conservative bounding approach, we said let's do 50. We know it's an overstatement. It's probably more like 25 percent. But we'll show it conservatively that way, and we did, so we'd have two different ways we showed it, stage two and stage three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: In other words the 50 percent does not refer to the amount of ozone available. It refers to</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>Q Got it. So ozone doesn't factor into it at all.</li> <li>A No. This is beyond available, most ozone levels</li> <li>when we have peaks, which happen in the winter at nighttime, the average is around 10 ppb of ozone, like 20 micrograms. You've not going to convert very much with 20 micrograms, up to 20.</li> <li>Q And so that's why you said earlier that stage three is not the ozone limiting method.</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But you said ozone doesn't factor into it at all. I think what was testified is ozone does factor into it, but you've made assumptions that there's enough available ozone to make that conversion of 50 percent of the NOX to NO2, correct?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Correct.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And under stage two, what is the highest percentage of conversion that you found?</li> <li>A I don't recall. The model doesn't print that out. It may be possible to write statements in it to do that, but the model output shows your concentration of NO2, not</li> </ul>

	Page 74		Page 76
1	don't know.	1	NO2 and you have a fan that stirs it up, then you, it's tens
2	A During the, based upon our analysis and review of	2	of seconds, I agree with Dr. Cole on that point, inside the
3	when the maximum conditions occurred for creating NO2, they	3	chamber, but not inside the atmosphere.
4	occurred during time periods that had low ozone. Again,	4	MS. ROSENFELD: No.
5	that was typically in the early evening hours when the rush	5	MR. GROSSMAN: It's tens of seconds, or tenths of
6	hour peak occurred, and mostly during, almost all during the	6	seconds?
7	hours of November, December, and January, when ozone is at	7	THE WITNESS: I looked at some reports on that,
8	its minimums.	8	and if you had a 10 part per billion level, the study I
9	Q In terms of the time and distance that you	9	reviewed showed it would take about 40 seconds to convert
10	discussed for the conversion, assuming that there is NO and	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Forty, four-zero?
11	ozone, that there are those two molecules in proximity, the	11	THE WITNESS: which is 10, 40 seconds.
12	actual conversion process itself doesn't take very long,	12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13	right? The time is a factor of making sure they're in	13	THE WITNESS: But one meter per second, by
14	proximity to each other.	14	coincidence, is about 40 meters, is 40 meters. If you had
15	A More than in proximity to each other. They have	15	complete contact. But it takes a long time for molecular
16	to be, I'm going to read the quote that's, helpful to read	16	diffusion in the atmosphere to create intimate contact at
17	the quote that's in appendix B, how much molecular, we're	17	the molecular level. It's a long process.
	talking about molecular contacts, which is more than just	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Because if I recall Dr. Cole's
18 19	getting close proximity. This is the inherent assumption	19	testimony on that point, he said that the conversion upon
20	that is the basis for the ozone main method.	20	contact was almost instantaneous. That's my recollection.
20	MR. GROSSMAN: What page are you on, sir?	20	So you're saying it's actually not instantaneous.
22	THE WITNESS: On page 27, the PDF that I attached	22	THE WITNESS: There's a subtle difference. In a
22	in the middle of the page.	22	smog chamber it is, it's quick, but not instantaneous. But
24	MR. GROSSMAN: I see it.	24	in the atmosphere, and the literature really is clear on
25	THE WITNESS: It assumes that complete mixing of	25	this point, it takes a long time.
2.5		2.5	
	Page 75		Page 77
1	-	1	
1	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular	1	Page 77 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
	-		MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a	2	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm
2 3	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up
2 3 4	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm
2 3 4 5	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to
2 3 4 5 6	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go right over it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. THE WITNESS: You need to select a background
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go right over it. THE WITNESS: It's big. It stands out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. THE WITNESS: You need to select a background monitor for ozone and NO2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go right over it. THE WITNESS: It's big. It stands out. MS. CORDRY: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. THE WITNESS: You need to select a background monitor for ozone and NO2. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go right over it. THE WITNESS: It's big. It stands out. MS. CORDRY: Yes. THE WITNESS: It stands out. If you don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. THE WITNESS: You need to select a background monitor for ozone and NO2. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And then you also have to choose which time period
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	plume NO and ambient ozone down to the level of molecular contact has occurred by the time the plume reaches a ground level receptor of maximum NOX concentration. Or for a typical power plant, again that's probably two or three or more kilometers of travel prior to that occurring, much more travel time than we're talking about here, especially distance-wise. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What paragraph are you in? A I'm at the third paragraph, which is an obviously font. Q With the big text, okay. A The dark bolded one. MS. CORDRY: It was too hard to see because it's too big. THE WITNESS: It's clear on my copy. MS. ROSENFELD: It's clear on mine as well. MS. CORDRY: It's big, so you know, your eyes go right over it. THE WITNESS: It's big. It stands out. MS. CORDRY: Yes. THE WITNESS: It stands out. If you don't have molecular, the fusion of molecular contact, you don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q All right. First going to stage two, and I'm still working my way through the process of how you came up with your analysis. You have to make a selection as to which monitor or monitors you will use for the concentrations of the pollutants you're looking at, correct? A Well, which pollutants are you referring to? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors or receptors? MS. ROSENFELD: The EPA monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so for background. MS. ROSENFELD: Right now I'm moving on from receptors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're asking MS. ROSENFELD: Just for the moment. The background monitors. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. THE WITNESS: You need to select a background monitor for ozone and NO2. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And then you also have to choose which time period you evaluate, correct?

	Page 78		Page 80
1	Q Stage two was 2010 to 2012?	1	A My recollection is occasional, but I haven't, I
2	A Stage three was based upon 2010 to 2012.	2	would have to look at the data sets to tell you exactly how
3	Q And did you also have to select which hour or day	3	much fill there was. I don't remember.
4	or season data you're using?	4	Q And you're matching the ozone levels that you
5	A During the whole year? All the, every day for	5	derived from the monitors in Rockville and Beltsville with
6	the, within those time periods. Every hour, every day.	6	NO2 levels from a monitor in Arlington, is that correct?
7	Q And you did that in stage two and stage three	7	A You said derived.
8	both, correct?	8	Q You're matching?
9	A We do that, and for stage two it involves ozone	9	A Well, I inputted the data from, for ozone, as we
10	and NO2. For stage three it's ozone. I mean it's NO2.	10	just described. And I inputted the NO2 data from Arlington.
11	That's hour by hour.	11	l didn't modify it.
12	Q And particularly with respect to the stage two	12	Q But you're, so the data that you got for ozone you
13	with the ozone limiting method, the level of either	13	obtained from a monitor in Arlington, correct?
14	chemical, whether it's ozone or NO2, on any given day and	14	A No, it was NO2
15	any given hour would depend on factors such as the wind	15	Q I'm sorry, NO2.
16	direction and the wind speed with respect to that particular	16	A that was from Arlington. That's correct.
17	monitor, correct?	17	Q And do you agree that the Arlington monitor is
18	A Yes, it would.	18	about 15 miles or so south of the mall?
19	Q And in this case you obtained your ozone levels	19	A I don't have the distance exactly, but that's, it's, you know, that much or more. I don't disagree.
20	from a monitor in Rockville for part of the year and from Beltsville for part of the year, is that correct?	20 21	Q And the Rockville monitor is several miles to the
21 22	A You're referring to ozone?	21 22	northwest of the mall?
22	Q Yes.	22	A That's correct.
23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: When you say in this case, you're	23 24	Q And Beltsville is primarily east and a little
25	talking about which stage?	25	south of the mall.
	Page 79		Page 81
1	Page 79 MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two	1	Page 81 A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and
1 2		1 2	
	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two		A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and
2	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two.	2	A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated	2 3	A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct.	2 3 4	A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable. Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and</li> <li>Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall.</li> <li>Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years? A I don't have the full data set in front of me. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct. Table one modeling options is correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years? A I don't have the full data set in front of me. I wouldn't be surprised if it was missing some hours in each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit? MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct. Table one modeling options is correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years? A I don't have the full data set in front of me. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct. Table one modeling options is correct.</li> <li>Q Right. And it says within each of the three tiers</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: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years? A I don't have the full data set in front of me. I wouldn't be surprised if it was missing some hours in each year.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct. Table one modeling options is correct.</li> <li>Q Right. And it says within each of the three tiers described above, there are 11 options that may be applied to</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: It would be stage two MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: because they only evaluated that in stage two. THE WITNESS: We used Rockville and, Rockville and Beltsville is correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you have to use Beltsville because Rockville doesn't measure ozone for the full year? A When it was missing, my recollection is when it was missing records we filled it with Beltsville. Q Does Rockville monitor for the entire year? A Well, the objective, my recollection is they do. The objective is to monitor for the entire year, but sometimes monitors don't work right. Sometimes they malfunction or are missing data for whatever reason. Q And you monitored for ozone from 2006 to 2010. Was the monitor in Rockville missing data in all five of those years? A I don't have the full data set in front of me. I wouldn't be surprised if it was missing some hours in each year. Q So did you only need to fill in for occasional	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 That's, well, it's, there, Rockville and Beltsville are probably equal distance from Wheaton Mall. Beltsville to the east, I don't know the exact distance, but your number seems reasonable.</li> <li>Q I just said several miles. Do you have a better estimate than that?</li> <li>A No, I don't.</li> <li>Q If you could turn back to the CAPCOA guidance document, if you could look at appendix A on page 33. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Thirty-three, appendix A. I'm sorry, did we mark this as an exhibit? MR. GROSSMAN: We did. It's Exhibit 567. MS. ROSENFELD: Right. The first new one. MR. GROSSMAN: Correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In section 4.2 there's a description of the modeling options available within each tier, tier one, two, and three, is that correct?</li> <li>A Correct. Table one modeling options is correct.</li> <li>Q Right. And it says within each of the three tiers described above, there are 11 options that may be applied to assess a project's compliance with the NAAQS. Each</li> </ul>

	Page 82		Page 84
1	correct?	1	A We could have mathematically put that into the
2	A Correct.	2	model, but my point is in my judgment, looking at the trend
3	Q And table one under that section 4.2 lays out 11	3	line we have here, it would be inappropriate to go back
4	different modeling options, correct?	4	beyond the most recent three years, because it was a very
5	A Yes. Well, significant impact level analysis,	5	strong trend line dropping NO2 levels, background levels
6	yeah, one through, there are 11 sets.	6	substantially.
7	Q And number 11 is described as the paired sum five-	7	Q And if you had used the 2008 to 2012, would that
8	year average of the 98th percentile, correct?	8	have been a more conservative analysis than using the three
9	A That's what it says.	9	years?
10	Q And is that the approach that you took in your	10	A You'd probably get higher and less representative
11	stage two analysis?	11	estimates.
12	A Our approach is consistent with the Fox 2011 e-	12	Q And the 50 percent cap that you placed in the
13	mail. We did have five years of analysis, and we did a	13	stage three, is that reflected in any of those 11 options?
14	paired sum in stage two. So I'd say it's certainly somewhat	14	A This particular set of 11 options is generic
15	of, maybe exactly the same thing.	15	guidance. As I mentioned previously, we're modeling inside
16	Q And it's clear, option 11 has the double asterisk,	16	a gas queue, inside a loading dock, and it's a very atypical
17	if you look down below it says option 11 may be used with	17	application which would not be contained in this or any EPA
18	the approval of the reviewing agency, is that correct?	18	guidance document. Usually the guidance is general
19	A Correct.	19	guidance, and things like this are done on a site specific
20 21	Q And is that required for any of the other 11 options? Any of the remaining 10 options?	20 21	basis. Q Is the analysis in your rebuttal report under tier
22	A CAPCOA only shows that for the 11.	22	two and, stage two and stage three, less conservative than
23	Q Is your tier, is your stage one analysis, does	23	the analysis contained in your November 2012 report?
24	your stage one analysis fall within any of those 11 options?	24	A Is it less conservative than November 2012? Well
25	A We used the maximum background, 98th percentile	25	
			, G
	Page 83		Page 85
1	Page 83 background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the	1	Page 85 Q Yes.
1 2		1 2	
	background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the		Q Yes.
2	background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.	2	<ul><li>Q Yes.</li><li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li><li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less</li></ul>
2 3	<ul><li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li><li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li><li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li><li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that</li></ul>	2 3	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li><li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li><li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li><li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> <li>Q You could have, could you have used a five-year</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal report does not satisfy the fundamental requirements for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> <li>Q You could have, could you have used a five-year analysis, 2008 to 2013 five-year analysis?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal report does not satisfy the fundamental requirements for admissibility under Maryland law.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> <li>Q You could have, could you have used a five-year analysis, 2008 to 2013 five-year analysis?</li> <li>A 2013, the full, when we did this modeling the full year hour by hour data were not available. That's why we capped it at 2012. So the answer to your question is no, we</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal report does not satisfy the fundamental requirements for admissibility under Maryland law.</li> <li>And it's clear under Maryland law that courts and non-expert administrative agencies are not supposed to be the arbiters of developing or novel scientific approaches,</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>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> <li>Q You could have, could you have used a five-year analysis, 2008 to 2013 five-year analysis?</li> <li>A 2013, the full, when we did this modeling the full year hour by hour data were not available. That's why we capped it at 2012. So the answer to your question is no, we couldn't have done that.</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>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal report does not satisfy the fundamental requirements for admissibility under Maryland law.</li> <li>And it's clear under Maryland law that courts and non-expert administrative agencies are not supposed to be the arbiters of developing or novel scientific approaches, whether or not that science is good, bad, or unfounded. 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	<ul> <li>background value for all receptors, in conjunction with the directly modeled data.</li> <li>Q And that correlates with what number?</li> <li>A I have it best correlated with number six.</li> <li>Q Okay. And where does stage three fall on that table?</li> <li>A Stage three? Where does stage three fall on that table? Well, it's paired some 98th percentile. It's a three-year average, not a five-year average. We used the most recent three years.</li> <li>Q And generally speaking, is a three-year average less conservative than a five-year average?</li> <li>A Well, if you're going back in time five years with a trend like we had for NO2, yes. And if you went back five years, if you for example used 2006 to 2010, the concentrations back in 2006 for NO2 were much higher than they are today. So you would have a more conservative, a less representative background level.</li> <li>Q You could have, could you have used a five-year analysis, 2008 to 2013 five-year analysis?</li> <li>A 2013, the full, when we did this modeling the full year hour by hour data were not available. That's why we capped it at 2012. So the answer to your question is no, we</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>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Yes, it's more, it is more realistic.</li> <li>Q And is the analysis in your rebuttal report less conservative than the analysis contained in your August 16, 2013 report?</li> <li>A Yes, it is. That report was based on 100 percent conversion.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, for the record I just want to reiterate that we continue to oppose consideration of the stage two and stage three analysis of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. And these methodologies can only be, in addition to the fact that they should only be reviewed on a case by case basis by the appropriate governmental authority, if the applicant can't rely on the standard methods and defaults prescribed by EPA guidance, which Mr. Sullivan has conceded he has not done, those standard methods and defaults reflect generally accepted scientific methodologies. And as a result the rebuttal report does not satisfy the fundamental requirements for admissibility under Maryland law.</li> <li>And it's clear under Maryland law that courts and non-expert administrative agencies are not supposed to be the arbiters of developing or novel scientific approaches,</li> </ul>

	Page 86		Page 88
1	decisions based on judgments that are well within the	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was, but I don't think
2	mainstream of accepted scientific analysis. And the	2	that was directed, the question didn't come to health
3	discretion that's been conferred upon the EPA to allow for	3	effects per se, it came to analysis of how many minutes the
4	these non-preferred and non-default methodologies rests	4	person was exposed, and whether you should apply the one-
5	within their expertise.	5	hour standards, or a third of the one-hour standards if
6	And again I just would like to reiterate that we	6	there was 20 minutes in the queue. So it didn't directly,
7	ask that those two methodologies be stricken from the	7	he didn't directly opine on health effects.
8	record, and we ask that evidence and testimony be excluded,	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	and that we concluded with our cross-examination on his	9	Q Okay. Let me ask the question a little bit
10	report at this point, should you see fit to rule in our	10	differently. Mr. Sullivan, you have no opinion, you've
11	favor.	11	expressed no opinion in your rebuttal report as to potential
12	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, first of all, as	12	adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and
13	I think I said earlier, I want to hear also from Dr. Cole on	13	visitors within the mall parcel, as a result of the
14	these points before I rule on that area. That is, the	14	pollution concentrations that you show in your stage one
15	scientific acceptability of the methodology used by Mr.	15	analysis?
16	Sullivan in order to respond to your evidentiary point. So	16	A I'm just going to, I'm preparing the modeling, I
17	I'm not going to ask for a response now from the applicant,	17	mean I show the modeling, in each one I show what the
18	I mean until I hear from Dr. Cole in surrebuttal.	18	national standard is. I'm not qualified to go beyond the
19	MS. ROSENFELD: Sure. I was just making the	19	national standard. But point of comparison can be made.
20 21	record. MR. GROSSMAN: No, I understand, but I think it's	20 21	But I do want to clarify that the stage one figure shown here assumes 100 percent time in queue. It's in the
21	a little premature because I said I would, if you renewed	21 22	whole hour. We're not doing that factoring. The factoring
22	that objection I would act on it.	22	is respective, I mentioned that point, that they cannot be
24	MS. ROSENFELD: Mm-hmm.	24	there for the full hour. But that figure doesn't take that
25	MR. GROSSMAN: But I do want to hear from Dr. Cole	25	into account.
	Page 87		Page 89
1	Page 87 on the point, because we might as well consider all the	1	Page 89 Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed
1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1 2	, and the second s
	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.		Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the
2	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration
2 3	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in	2 3	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that
2 3 4 5 6	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse	2 3 4 5 6	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else. Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct? A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else. Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but projections regarding some health effects in his original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's for nearby areas, but there's also been testimony that in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but projections regarding some health effects in his original testimony. But I don't recall it coming up in the rebuttal testimony, so. MS. ROSENFELD: As I recall under his, under Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's for nearby areas, but there's also been testimony that in fact there are potential adverse health effects at those lower levels. So I guess I'm trying to establish whether or not you're expressing an opinion on health in your rebuttal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but projections regarding some health effects in his original testimony. But I don't recall it coming up in the rebuttal testimony, so. MS. ROSENFELD: As I recall under his, under Mr. Sullivan's stage one analysis, there was some discussion	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 Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's for nearby areas, but there's also been testimony that in fact there are potential adverse health effects at those lower levels. So I guess I'm trying to establish whether or not you're expressing an opinion on health in your rebuttal report with respect to your stage one analysis, your stage</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	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but projections regarding some health effects in his original testimony. But I don't recall it coming up in the rebuttal testimony, so. MS. ROSENFELD: As I recall under his, under Mr. Sullivan's stage one analysis, there was some discussion about whether or not exposures would be limited to 20	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 Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's for nearby areas, but there's also been testimony that in fact there are potential adverse health effects at those lower levels. So I guess I'm trying to establish whether or not you're expressing an opinion on health in your rebuttal report with respect to your stage one analysis, your stage two analysis, and your stage three analysis. What is 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	on the point, because we might as well consider all the expert evidence on the point before we make a ruling. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Sullivan, in light of the findings set out in your rebuttal report, in your opinion will there be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentrations that you show under your stage one analysis? MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope of his testimony. If I heard her correctly, she's asking for health effects. MR. GROSSMAN: I think so. I think that, aren't you in fact asking something beyond, certainly beyond what was covered in the rebuttal direct. He did touch on health effects in his original direct. And so and I think it might have been objected to at that point, but he was using statistical, as I recall, it's been a long time, but projections regarding some health effects in his original testimony. But I don't recall it coming up in the rebuttal testimony, so. MS. ROSENFELD: As I recall under his, under Mr. Sullivan's stage one analysis, there was some discussion	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 Okay. And in your rebuttal report you expressed no opinion as to whether there will be adverse health effects on the residents, workers, and visitors within the mall parcel as a result of the pollution concentration levels that you show on your stage two analysis, is that correct?</li> <li>A Well, not directly, but again, I show what the standard, and I show the stage one, two, and three, what the model maximums are. And in each case the model maximum, based upon conservative modeling, is less than the standard. So based upon what I can opine about, if it's less than the standard, according to EPA, there should not be health effects to the worker, people visiting, or anyone else.</li> <li>Q Well, I certainly don't think that the opposition concedes that point, so I guess my question is are you opining on health or are you not? Because there's been testimony in this case that not only do EPA standards presume protective measures lower than the maximum that's for nearby areas, but there's also been testimony that in fact there are potential adverse health effects at those lower levels. So I guess I'm trying to establish whether or not you're expressing an opinion on health in your rebuttal report with respect to your stage one analysis, your stage</li> </ul>

	Page 90		Page 92
1	MR. GOECKE: I would object to that. He's already	1	showing concentration in high impact areas that are, you
2	answered the question.	2	know, on the order of, for example in California in 2013,
3	MS. ROSENFELD: I don't think he has.	3	there's 103 monitors. The highest one in the entire state
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, I'm going to, but see I'm	4	of California of those 103 was 77 parts per billion, which
5	going to overrule that objection, because if he wants to	5	is 145 micrograms. And we think
6	clarify it, I'm going to give him the opportunity to clarify	6	Q And where are you reading that from?
7	that. So go ahead, answer.	7	A that at this location it's going to be 145
8	THE WITNESS: I made a statement, based on my	8	micrograms, even close to that? No.
9	professional judgment, considering the substantial duties of	9	Q And where are you reading that number? What was
10	conservatism in the modeling, and also considering measured	10	that number again?
11 12	data that's available throughout the country, that I, my opinion is that the maximum 98th percentile value on this,	11 12	A This, you can obtain this by going to EPA's air data and put in NO2 one hour. The year is 2013. And look
13	in this parcel, will be in the range of 75 to 100 micrograms	13	at all sites listed for 2013 at this point in time. There's
14	per cubic meter, less than half of EPA's standard.	14	103 of them, and 145 micrograms per cubic meter is the
15	MR. GROSSMAN: For?	15	highest of those sites, maybe the highest in the country.
16	THE WITNESS: For one-hour NO2. Thank you. So on	16	Q And was, is this information contained in your
17	that basis, and following EPA's lead that sets the standards	17	report?
18	for the country, my conclusion is that there will not be	18	A It is not. But it's publicly available
19	adverse health effects. I'm speaking as a meteorologist	19	information that can be confirmed very easily.
20	interpreting EPA's standards. I'm not a toxicologist. I'm	20	Q And was this number derived, the 145 micrograms,
21	not a medical doctor.	21	was that drawn from a near road monitor, an EPA near road
22	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	22	monitor?
23	Q And did I hear you say that it was your conclusion	23	A I looked at it this morning, 103 sites. Some of
24	that the results are less than half of the EPA max?	24	them could very well be. I don't know the answer to that
25	A That's correct. For NO2.	25	question. But this site is not a near road monitor site.
	Page 91		Page 93
-			
1	Q For NO2. At stage one again, your maximum was	1	We're talking about the Wheaton Mall ring road. They're
2	what number?	1 2	monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of
	what number? A The statement I just made to clarify	2 3	monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.
2 3 4	what number? A The statement I just made to clarify Q Figure one.	2 3 4	monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach. Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li><li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three,</li> <li>which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li><li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li><li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> <li>They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> <li>They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> <li>They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> <li>They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three,</li> <li>which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance</li> <li>conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're</li> <li>showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over</li> <li>that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I</li> <li>think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014.</li> <li>They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three,</li> <li>which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance</li> <li>conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're</li> <li>showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over</li> <li>that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I</li> <li>think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page</li> <li>13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page 13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number that you derived?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page 13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number that you derived?</li> <li>A The maximum model here is 121.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> <li>Q Well, you just said you don't know why they're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page 13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number that you derived?</li> <li>A The maximum model here is 121.</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half of the max?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> <li>Q Well, you just said you don't know why they're doing it, so</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>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three,</li> <li>which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance</li> <li>conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're</li> <li>showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over</li> <li>that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I</li> <li>think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page</li> <li>13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number</li> <li>that you derived?</li> <li>A The maximum model here is 121.</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half of the max?</li> <li>A Well, clearly that's a little bit more than half,</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>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> <li>Q Well, you just said you don't know why they're doing it, so</li> <li>A I said I'm not going to presume that they're doing</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page 13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number that you derived?</li> <li>A The maximum model here is 121.</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half of the max?</li> <li>A Well, clearly that's a little bit more than half, but my point, I'm making the point, as I mentioned before,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> <li>Q Well, you just said you don't know why they're doing it, so</li> <li>A I said I'm not going to presume that they're doing it because they're concerned there's a problem. The initial</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>what number?</li> <li>A The statement I just made to clarify</li> <li>Q Figure one.</li> <li>A was based upon stages, looking at stage three, which in my judgment is the most accurate circumstance conservatism. If you're looking at stage one, you're showing a maximum of one, approximately 160. And</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half?</li> <li>A Well, I</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't have to go over that.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: All right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it says what it says, and I think he's made very clear what his position is.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q If we could look at figure three, please, on page 13 of your rebuttal report. And what is the maximum number that you derived?</li> <li>A The maximum model here is 121.</li> <li>Q And is that more or less than half of the max?</li> <li>A Well, clearly that's a little bit more than half,</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>monitoring sites for major highways like I-710 in Port of Long Beach.</li> <li>Q And the EPA recently required near road monitors in fact, is that correct?</li> <li>A EPA is requiring the states to have some near road monitors starting in 2013. 2014, I'm sorry. January 2014. They're running a little bit late in some cases, but they're coming on line now.</li> <li>Q And in fact that's because the EPA thinks that perhaps emission levels have been underreported, isn't that correct?</li> <li>A From what I've seen so far, that doesn't look like that's the case.</li> <li>Q Is that why</li> <li>A I don't know why EPA, I assume EPA wants to know what the near road concentrations are. I'm not going to presume that there's going to be a problem, because the initial data doesn't suggest that at all.</li> <li>Q Well, you just said you don't know why they're doing it, so</li> <li>A I said I'm not going to presume that they're doing it because they're concerned there's a problem. Not relative</li> </ul>

<ul> <li>9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>9 the</li> <li>10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>11 Q And did you also use that in your stage three</li> <li>12 analysis, FORTRAN?</li> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>9 the</li> <li>10 MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference</li> <li>11 number 15.</li> <li>12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this</li> <li>13 United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?</li> <li>14 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or</li> <li>16 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.</li> <li>17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick</li> <li>18 look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only</li> <li>19 want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>20 MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>21 Written in FORTRAN.</li> </ul>		Page 94		Page 96
2       Q       Aff to your knowledge has the EPA required that         3       monitors be located in remoter rural non road locations?       A       Did you say page 17. Actually it's listed         3       A       Did you say page 17.       Actually, it's listed         3       A       Did you say page 17.         4       Well, they've had them in those locations for       5         6       They're not at, supplementing those current       6         7       monitors, are they?       6       This or page 17. Actually, it's listed         9       iphyways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you       6       The ap robably 100 times more emissions in one klometer         10       know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as 1-710,       16       Exhibit No. 466. It's the         11       THE wITNESS: The references.       MS. ROSENFELD:       17         12       A ord think you teshified that you used as oftware       18       18       report. And for simplicity IV's numbered them. That's the         12       C A we did use FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour diat,       18       17       Page 97         14       red quote.       7       NS. ROSENFELD:       18       19         12       O wo did use FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour diat,       24	1	the data I have seen	1	A I don't recall the document
<ul> <li>a monitors be located in remote rural non road locations?</li> <li>A Did you say page 17?</li> <li>C They're not at, supplementing those current</li> <li>G They're not at, supplementing those current</li> <li>a A They're additional monitors near major</li> <li>b highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you</li> <li>b highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you</li> <li>c hard to you say bage 17?</li> <li>M S. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, what I'll do is</li> <li>B marked as an exhibit. This is simply an excerpt from</li> <li>Exhibit No. 466. If's the</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>I that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>G A And I think you testified that you used a software</li> <li>G code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,</li> <li>I end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of</li> <li>I hat has probably 100 times more emissions in or complexitient.</li> <li>F end quote.</li> <li>P PoweFORT, refer to page 17. Do you have that document.</li> <li>I cont recall actually relying upon this</li> <li>C of you use that to add the specific data for your</li> <li>A I don't recall actually relying upon this</li> <li>C on the values.</li> <li>Page 95</li> <li>Page 97</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Was gort required nor soure any with your?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>T HE WTINESS: It's been along time since it's</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN programming two cross</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN programming two cr</li></ul>				
4       A       Well, they've had them in those locations for 5 years. That's not a new requirement.       4       C       It's in your iss of references, actually, and 5 it's called, let me see if 1 - oh, it's the second to last 6 reference.         7       They're not at, supplementing those current 7       monitors, are they?       8       They're adding some additional monitors near major 9 highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you 10 know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as I-710, 11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer 12 than this gas station operation would ever have.       1       THE WITNESS: The reference.         12 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer 13 du ny our rebuilt apeort, correct?       13       THE WITNESS: The reference.         14 modeling framework for the rebutal report, correct?       15       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       16       Q       If you look at number 15, it says United States         17       EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern 18 du quote.       16       Q. If you look at number 15, it says United States         18       ord quote       20       Nor use that to add the specific data for your       21       21       21       20       Nor on trecall it.         22       Q. You use that to add the specific data for your       23       24       23       24       23       24       24       24       14       14       14       14 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>				
<ul> <li>5 years. Tha's not a new requirement.</li> <li>G That's not a new requirement.</li> <li>G That's not a new requirement.</li> <li>M A They're additional monitors near major</li> <li>A They're additional monitors near major</li> <li>highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you</li> <li>that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer</li> <li>12 than this gas station operation would even have.</li> <li>13 and puot. For the receptors within the 40 meter radius of</li> <li>14 modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>C Q And I think you testified that you used a software</li> <li>13 report. And for simplicity I've numbered them. That's the</li> <li>14 modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?</li> <li>A Yes.</li> <li>15 d Q And U think you used MOBILE6 as the</li> <li>18 ransportation, refleased on August 2012. It says United States</li> <li>19 PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document</li> <li>20 You use that to add the specific data for your</li> <li>21 a ali you use that for add the specific data for your</li> <li>23 and yous ef FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,</li> <li>24 a ali you use that for add the specific data for your</li> <li>25 end quote.</li> <li>Page 95</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>24 A Fourthe stating about?</li> <li>25 With ROSSINFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment.</li> <li>26 That required us to have model outy to nor shoure your</li> <li>36 A FORTRAN to, coube that your stage three</li> <li>26 A FortRAN programming to screes the data and to come up with the Sth percentile values.</li> <li>37 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>38 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>39 A FORTRAN programming to strees the data and to come up with the Sth percentile values.</li> <li>31 A FORTRAN programming to strees the data and to come up with the Sth percentile values.<th></th><th></th><th>-</th><th></th></li></ul>			-	
e         Q         They're not at, supplementing those current         r reference.           7         MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, what I'll do is           9         highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you         9           10         know, 10 meters to 4 our you add such as I-N         10           11         that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         10         EMB No. 466. It's the           11         that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         11         THE WITNESS: The reference.           12         than this gas station operation would ever have.         13         report. And for simplicity I've numbered them. That's the           14         modeling framework for the rebuilt report, you used MOBILE6 as the         11         THE WITNESS: The reference.           15         A Yes.         16         Q And I think you testlifed that you used as a network for the rebuilt report, page 32 and 33, you         18         transportation, released on August 2012. It says           19         be gas queue?         1         A I don't recall actually relying upon this           20         You use that to add the specific data for you         24         A I just don't recall it.           23         analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you         24         A I don't recall actually relying upon it.     <				
7         MS. ROSENFELD: And Kr Grossman, what I'll do is 9 highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you 9 highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you 10 know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as I-710, 11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one klometer 12 than this gas station operation would ever have.         11         I'm going to hand out an excerpt. This doesn't have to be 9 marked as an exhibit. This is simply an excerpt from 12           13         Q in your rebuttal report, you used MOBILE6 as the 14 modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?         12         I'm going to hand out an excerpt. This doesn't have to be 9 marked as an exhibit. This is simply an excerpt from 14 with a fing tramework for the rebuttal report, correct?           15         A Yes.         12         I'm going to hand out an excerpt. This doesn't have to be 9 marked as an exhibit. This is simply an excerpt from 13           16         Q And think you testified that you used MOBILE6.         13         The receptors within the 40 meter radius of 19         14           17         Do you shave that do dift as specific data for your 24         24         A I don't recail actually relying upon this 22         2           2         MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter? 2         14         A True. I just don't recail relying upon it. 2         2         Q I don't recail relying upon it. 2         2         Q I don't recail relying upon it. 2         2         D oyu have a copy with you? 3         3         A forth.           2         MR. G				
8         A They're adding some additional monitors near major 9 highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you 10 know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as I-710, 11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer 12 than this gas station operation would ever have.         10         Exhibit No. 468. It's the 11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer 13 Q In your rebuttal report, you used MOBILE6 as the 14 modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct? 15 A Yes.         11         THE WITNESS: The reference.           16         Q And I think you testified that you used a software 17 code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 18 end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of 19 the gas queue?         15         BY MS. ROSENFELD: 10         11         12         13         13         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         14         15         15         15         16         Q         17         14         14         16         17         16         16         17         16         17         17         16         16         17         16         17         16         17         16         17         16         17         16         17         16         17         16         16         16         16         16         17         16         16         16         16			-	
9         highways to assess near road exposures, usually within, you         9         marked as an exhibit. This is simply an excerpt from           10         know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as I-710,         The Has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         11           11         that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         11         The WITNESS: The reference.           12         that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         11         The WITNESS: The reference from Mr. Sullivan's           15         A         Yes.         Yes.         Yes.           16         Q         And I think you testified that you used a software         12         EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern           16         Q         And uthink you testified that you used a software         12         EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern           17         to that is not really related to MOBLE6.         12         14         14 orth recall actually relying upon this           12         D         You use that add the specific data for your         21         A         1 Just don't recall relying upon it.           12         MS, ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a         moment.         1         A         True. I just don't recall relying upon it.           12         MR, GROSSMAN: Why does		-		
10       know, 10 meters to 40 meters of a busy road such as I-710, 11 that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer 11       10       Exhibit No. 466. If's the THE WITNESS: The reference.         13       Q       In your rebuttal report you used MOBILEG as the modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?       13       Papert. And for simplicity IVen numbered them. That's the only change to this document.         15       A       Yes.       10       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         16       Q       And I think you testified that you used a software code called FORTRAN to quote, add the hour by hour data analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you analysis, correct?       21       A       I don't recall recall recall relying upon this 22 document.         26       With worther the tailpipe box because it was summing to rouse in basis for all the receptors. Store those matrices, and then we basis for all the receptors. Store those matrices, and then these.       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         27       PAR MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment.       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         28       With the 38th percentile values.       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         29       Weid Vith Cost have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors. Store those matrices, and then we				
11       that has probably 100 times more emissions in one kilometer         12       than this gas station operation would ever have.         13       Q       Iny our rebuttle propy toy used MOBILEG as the         14       modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?         15       A       Yes.         16       Q       And I think you testified that you used a software         17       code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       TEPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern         18       end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of       PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document         20       A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs,       PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document         21       M. Korteal to MOBILEG as a reference.       10         22       Q. You use that to add the specific data for your       23         23       analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you       23       Q. No?         24       said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       14       I lost that is not really related to MOBILEG as         25       end quote.       Page 95       23       Q. No?         24       Sa KOSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in justa       3       That equiree dus to have model output on an hour by hour				
12       than this gas station operation would ever have.       13       Q       In your rebuttal report you used MOBILE6 as the         13       Q       In your rebuttal report you used MOBILE6 as the       14       only change to this document.         15       A       Yes.       15       A       Yes.         16       Q       And think you testified that you used a software       15       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       16       Q       If you look at number 15, it says United States         17       EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern       18       transportation, released on August 2012. It says         19       by tags queue?       11       analysis, correct?       10. you use that to Add the specific data for your         21       A       Idd the specific data for your       21       A       Idd the factor in your report, page 32 and 33, you         22       Q       You use that to Add the specific data for your       21       A       Idu transportation, released on August 2012. It says         24       said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       22       Q       Nor         23       analysis, correct?       In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you       21       A       I don't recall actually relying upon this         24       S din quote.       MR. GROSSMAN: Why do		-		
13       Q       In your rebuttal report you used MOBILE6 as the 14 modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?       13       report. And for simplicity I've numbered them. That's the 14         14       modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?       14       only change to this document.         15       A       Yes.       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       15         16       Q       And I think you testified that you used a software 17       16       Q       I you look at number 15, it says United States 17       17         16       M. did use FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 18       18       Transportation, released on August 2012. It says 19       PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document 10         20       A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs, 10       21       A       I don't recall actually relying upon this 10       22         21       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter? 2       21       A       I don't.       23       Q       No?         2       MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3       moment.       4       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?       3       A       I don't.         3       moment.       S       S       No inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       6       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Goro			12	
14       modeling framework for the rebuttal report, correct?       14       only change to this document.         15       A       Yes.       15       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         16       0       And I think you testified that you used a software       15       BY MS. ROSENFELD:         18       end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of       15       EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern         18       and quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of       16       PowePoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document         20       A You use that to add the specific data for your       23       analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you       24       3 id you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, seid you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, a moment.       25       Q       No?         2       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       2       A       Tue. I just don't recall relying upon it.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.       2       Q       Do you have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this         5       the tailpipe box because it was summing two rusa.       6       The WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in steps       4       MS. ROSENFELD: MS. Cossman, I apologize. I			13	
15       A       Yes.         16       Q       Ad I think you testified that you used a software         17       code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       18       EPA, MOVES Training for Non-Modelers, northeastern         18       end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of       19       the gas queue?       19         20       A       with egas queue?       19       DowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document         21       but that is not really related to MOBILE6.       21       A       I don't recall actually relying upon this         22       Q       You use that to add the specific data for your       23       Q       No?         24       said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       25       Q       I is cited as a reference.         Page 95         Page 95         Page 97         1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       3       A       I don't.         4       THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming to romes, and then       3       A       I don't.         5       That required us to have model ouptru on an hour by hour       A       A				
<ul> <li>17 code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 18 end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of 19 the gas queue?</li> <li>10 A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs, 21 but that is not really related to MOBILE6. 22 Q You use that to add the specific data for your 23 analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you 24 said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 25 end quote. Page 95 1 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter? 2 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3 moment. 4 THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage 5 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. 6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour 1 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then 8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up 9 with the 98th percentile values. 10 B YMS. ROSENFELD: 11 Q And did you also use that in your stage three 13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage 14 three. 15 Q In your 16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 17 years since I studied it in college? 17 years since I studied it in college? 18 D RYMS. ROSENFELD: 19 been wodified. It was modified a few times, but no, I dort. 20 MS. ROSENFELD: 21 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been andifies in to 22 MR. GROSSMAN: Has rofTRAN? 23 MR. GROSSMAN: What are we taiking about this 24 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been andified in the 50 25 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been andified in the 50 26 MR. GROSSMAN: Has rofTRAN been and the since it's 26 MR. GROSSMAN: Has ROTRAN been and the since it's 27 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been and the since it's 28 MR. ROSENFELD: No, I dort - 29 With the 98th percentile values. 29 WMS. ROSENFELD: 20 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been and the since it's 20 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been and the since it's 20 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been and the since it's 20 MR. GROSSMAN: Chay. Well, I tem take a quick 20 MR. GROSSMAN: Neage 17 or - 21 MR. GROSSMAN</li></ul>	15		15	
<ul> <li>17 code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 18 end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of 19 the gas queue?</li> <li>20 A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs, 21 but that is not really related to MOBILE6.</li> <li>22 Q You use that to add the specific data for your 23 analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you 24 said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 25 end quote.</li> <li>21 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>22 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3 moment.</li> <li>23 THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in steep 5 two inside the talipipe box because it was summing two runs. 6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then 8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up 9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>24 M. FORTRAN programming was not required for stage 4 three.</li> <li>25 Q In your 16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>24 MR. GROSSMAN: Has roort along time since it's 25 Deliver that, its been a long time since it's 26 Deliver that, its been a long time since it's 29 beliver that, its been a long time since it's 20 beliver that, its been a long time since it's 20 beliver that, its been a quite a while. The models were all 21 written in FORTRAN. 22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>34 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>35 W MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>34 M. ROSISMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 21 Witten in FORTRAN. 23 Q In your report you reference a document called 24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>35 W MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>36 MA Indox's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA bubication</li> <li>37 MR CROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark 38 M MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>38 M S. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>39 W MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>30 A In your repory you refe</li></ul>	16	Q And I think you testified that you used a software	16	Q If you look at number 15, it says United States
<ul> <li>18 end quote, for the receptors within the 40 meter radius of 19 the gas queue?</li> <li>18 transportation, released on August 2012. It says</li> <li>19 PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document with you?</li> <li>21 but that is not really related to MOBILE6.</li> <li>22 Q You use that to add the specific data for your</li> <li>23 analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you</li> <li>24 A I don't recall actually relying upon this</li> <li>25 end quote.</li> <li>26 Page 95</li> <li>27 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3 moment.</li> <li>28 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</li> <li>29 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour 7 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then 8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come 9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>20 MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>21 Q And did you also use that in your stage three 13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage 14 three.</li> <li>29 MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>30 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>31 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage 14 three.</li> <li>31 G In your 15 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>32 M MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>34 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been a long time since it's 19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>34 InterWITNESS: It's been a long time since it's 19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>34 InterWITNESS: It's been a long time since it's 19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>35 WMS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>36 M Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>36 M Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>34 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication<th>17</th><th>code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,</th><th>17</th><th></th></li></ul>	17	code called FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,	17	
<ul> <li>19 the gas queue?</li> <li>A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs.</li> <li>19 PowerPoint, refer to page 17. Do you have that document.</li> <li>20 with you?</li> <li>21 A I don't recall actually relying upon this</li> <li>22 document.</li> <li>23 analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you</li> <li>24 said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,</li> <li>25 end quote.</li> <li>26 Page 95</li> <li>27 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>28 MS. ROSENFELD: Wey and FORTRAN programming the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</li> <li>31 That WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up</li> <li>with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>20 And did you also use that in your stage three.</li> <li>21 Q. And did you also use that in your stage three.</li> <li>22 Q. In your</li> <li>24 MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>25 Q. In your</li> <li>26 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>27 Years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>28 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>39 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>30 A FORTRAN.</li> <li>31 A FORTRAN.</li> <li>32 Q In your</li> <li>33 M. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>34 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>35 been andified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>34 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>35 De In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>34 Written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>35 De In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>34 FORTRAN.</li> <li>35 De In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>34 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>	18		18	-
<ul> <li>A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs, 20 with you?</li> <li>but that is not really related to MOBILE6.</li> <li>Q You use that to add the specific data for your</li> <li>analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you</li> <li>said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 25 end quote.</li> <li>Page 95</li> <li>Page 95</li> <li>Page 97</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then</li> <li>use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN percentile values.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What are we taiking about? What is get three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What are we taiking about? What is get three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What are we taiking about? What is get three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay, so you're taiking about. So you only want page 17 or</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're taiking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>MG. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't and see what you're taiking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Ckay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li></ul>	19		19	· · · ·
<ul> <li>22 Q. You use that to add the specific data for your</li> <li>23 analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you</li> <li>24 said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,</li> <li>25 end quote.</li> <li>26 Page 95</li> <li>27 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>28 MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>3 moment.</li> <li>4 THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage</li> <li>5 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</li> <li>6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour</li> <li>7 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then</li> <li>9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>11 Q. And did you also use that in your stage three</li> <li>12 analysis, FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q. In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 Deleive that, it's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick</li> <li>13 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Deleive that, it's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't.</li> <li>10 In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the 24 file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>	20	A We did use FORTRAN programming to combine runs,	20	
<ul> <li>analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you 24 said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data, 25 end quote.</li> <li>Page 95</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?</li> <li>MR. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3 moment.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage 5 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</li> <li>That required us to have model output on an hour by hour 4 ato, 9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is 9 the</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Was not required for stage 14 three.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 the WiTNESS: It's been a long time since it's 18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's 18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's 19 been modified a few times, but no, I don't 4000 at and you're talking about. So you only 19 wart sage 17 or</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or</li> <li>MR. GROSSM</li></ul>	21	but that is not really related to MOBILE6.	21	A I don't recall actually relying upon this
24       said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,       25       A       I just don't recall it.         25       end quote.       26       Q       It is cited as a reference.         Page 95         1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         2       MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a       3       A       I don't.         3       moment.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       A       I don't.       4       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I         5       two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       5       don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this         6       that required us to have model output on an hour by hour       5       don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this         7       buse FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up       9       MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is         9       three.       10       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference         11       A F ORTRAN programming was not required for stage       13       United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?         14       three.       MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or       16	22	Q You use that to add the specific data for your	22	document.
25       end quote.       25       Q       It is cited as a reference.         Page 95       Page 95       Page 97         1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       4       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I         5       two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       6       That required us to have model output on an hour by hour         7       basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I         5       don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this       6         6       to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an       7         9       with the 98th percentile values.       9         10       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       8       MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is         13       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       11       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.         14       three.       12       MR. GROSSMAN: Nay, so you're talking about this         14       three.       10<	23	analysis, correct? In, on your report, page 32 and 33, you	23	Q No?
Page 95       Page 97         1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       2       MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a       3       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?       3       A       I don't.         4       THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage       5       Wo inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       6       That required us to have model output on an hour by hour       3       A       I don't.       4       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I       5         5       two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       6       To hat required us to have model output on an hour by hour       6       to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an         9       with the 98th percentile values.       7       exhibit, or should I have it marked first?       8       MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is         10       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       10       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference       11       11       Nmmbre 15.         13       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       14       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.       15       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this         14       three.       15       MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or       16       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	24	said you used FORTRAN to, quote, add the hour by hour data,	24	A I just don't recall it.
1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         2       MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a       3       A       I don't.         3       moment.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       3       A       I don't.         4       THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage       5       don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this         6       That required us to have model output on an hour by hour       7       basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then         8       use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up       9       with the 98th percentile values.       9         1       Q       And did you also use that in your stage three       10       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference         11       Q       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       11       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this         13       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       11       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.         14       three.       10       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.       12         14       three.       MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick	25	end quote.	25	Q It is cited as a reference.
1       MR. GROSSMAN: Why does that matter?       1       A       True. I just don't recall relying upon it.         2       MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a       3       A       I don't.         3       moment.       2       Q       Do you have a copy with you?         3       moment.       3       A       I don't.         4       THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage       5       don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this         6       That required us to have model output on an hour by hour       7       basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then         8       use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up       9       with the 98th percentile values.       9         1       Q       And did you also use that in your stage three       10       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference         11       Q       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       11       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this         13       A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       11       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.         14       three.       10       MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.       12         14       three.       MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick		Deve of		De 10 07
2MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a 3 moment.2QDo you have a copy with you?3AI don't.4THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage 5 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. 6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour 7 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then 8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up 9 with the 98th percentile values.4MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I 4 don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this 6 to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an 7 exhibit, or should I have it marked first?10BY MS. ROSENFELD:8MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is 9 the10BY MS. ROSENFELD:10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference11QAnd did you also use that in your stage three 1110MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference12analysis, FORTRAN10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference14three.10MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15QIn your15MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, Iet me take a quick18beleive that, it's been quite a while. The models were all uvitten in FORTRAN.18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all uvitten in FORTRAN. <th></th> <th>Page 95</th> <th></th> <th>Page 97</th>		Page 95		Page 97
3       moment.       3       A       I don't.         4       THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage       MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I         5       two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.       6       That required us to have model output on an hour by hour         7       basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then       8       use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up         9       with the 98th percentile values.       7       the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an         10       BY MS. ROSENFELD:       10       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference         11       Q       And did you also use that in your stage three       11       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about? What is         13       A       FORTRAN programming was not required for stage       14       MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference         14       three.       12       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this         14       THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's       15       MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or         16       MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50       16       MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.         17       years since I studied it in college?       17       MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, Ict me take a quick         <	-			
4THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage4MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I5two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.6That required us to have model output on an hour by hour7basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then6to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an8use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up9With the 98th percentile values.79with the 98th percentile values.9MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is10BY MS. ROSENFELD:10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference11Q And did you also use that in your stage three11number 15.12analysis, FORTRANmay sis, FORTRAN programming was not required for stage1314three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15Q In your16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19wat page 17 in, is that the idea?20Delieve that, it's been quite a while. The models were all10MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark21Q In your report you reference a document called24 <t< th=""><th>1</th><th>-</th><th>1</th><th></th></t<>	1	-	1	
<ul> <li>5 two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</li> <li>6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour</li> <li>7 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then</li> <li>8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up</li> <li>9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>11 Q And did you also use that in your stage three</li> <li>12 analysis, FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>19 beelieve that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>12 Written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>13 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>		-		Q Do you have a copy with you?
<ul> <li>6 That required us to have model output on an hour by hour</li> <li>7 basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then</li> <li>8 use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up</li> <li>9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>11 Q And did you also use that in your stage three</li> <li>12 analysis, FORTRAN?</li> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>	2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment.	2 3	<ul><li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li><li>A I don't.</li></ul>
7basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then7exhibit, or should I have it marked first?8use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up9With the 98th percentile values.99with the 98th percentile values.9the10BY MS. ROSENFELD:10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference11Q And did you also use that in your stage three11number 15.12analysis, FORTRAN?12MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this13A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15Q In your16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark21BY MS. ROSENFELD:22MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:23Q In your report you reference a document called23Q In your report you reference a document called2424	2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I</li> </ul>
8use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up 98MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is 99with the 98th percentile values.9the10BY MS. ROSENFELD:10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference11Q And did you also use that in your stage three11number 15.12analysis, FORTRAN?12MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about? What is13A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage13United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15Q In your15MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20MS. ROSENFELD:No, I've got other questions.2121written in FORTRAN.22MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:23Q In your report you reference a document called23Q In your report you reference a document called2424Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication2424Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24 <th>2 3 4 5</th> <th>MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.</th> <th>2 3 4 5</th> <th><ul> <li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I</li> <li>don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this</li> </ul></th>	2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs.	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I</li> <li>don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9 with the 98th percentile values.</li> <li>10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>11 Q And did you also use that in your stage three</li> <li>12 analysis, FORTRAN?</li> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an</li> </ul>
10BY MS. ROSENFELD:10MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference11QAnd did you also use that in your stage three11number 15.12analysis, FORTRAN?12MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this13AFORTRAN programming was not required for stage14three.14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15QIn your15MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20BY MS. ROSENFELD:20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21written in FORTRAN.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:22the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the23QIn your report you reference a document called2424Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Do you have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first?</li> </ul>
11QAnd did you also use that in your stage three11number 15.12analysis, FORTRAN?12MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this13AFORTRAN programming was not required for stage13United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15QIn your15MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark21BY MS. ROSENFELD:22the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is
12analysis, FORTRAN?12MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this13A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage13United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15Q In your15MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?16MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark21BY MS. ROSENFELD:22the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the23Q In your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the
<ul> <li>13 A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage</li> <li>14 three.</li> <li>15 Q In your</li> <li>16 MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50</li> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>13 United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?</li> <li>14 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.</li> <li>15 MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or</li> <li>16 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.</li> <li>17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick</li> <li>18 look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only</li> <li>19 want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>20 MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>22 the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the</li> <li>23 file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.</li> <li>24 And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 6 7 8 9	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference
14three.14MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.15QIn your15MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?16MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21written in FORTRAN.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15.
15QIn your15MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21written in FORTRAN.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark23QIn your report you reference a document called2324Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this
16MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 5016MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.17years since I studied it in college?17MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick18THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's18look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only19been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't19want page 17 in, is that the idea?20believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all20MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.21written in FORTRAN.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?
<ul> <li>17 years since I studied it in college?</li> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick</li> <li>18 look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only</li> <li>19 want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>20 MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
<ul> <li>18 THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's</li> <li>19 been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or
<ol> <li>been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't</li> <li>believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the</li> <li>file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.</li> <li>And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.
<ul> <li>20 believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all</li> <li>21 written in FORTRAN.</li> <li>22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>23 Q In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication</li> <li>20 MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark</li> <li>22 the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the</li> <li>23 G In your report you reference a document called</li> <li>24 And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick
21written in FORTRAN.21MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark22BY MS. ROSENFELD:22the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only
22BY MS. ROSENFELD:22the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea?
23QIn your report you reference a document called23file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.24Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication24And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.
24 Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication 24 And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all written in FORTRAN.	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 have a copy with you?</li> <li>A I don't.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I</li> <li>don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this</li> <li>United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick</li> <li>look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark</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: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all written in FORTRAN. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all written in FORTRAN. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your report you reference a document called	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568.
	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: Well, I'll get there in just a moment. THE WITNESS: We used FORTRAN programming in stage two inside the tailpipe box because it was summing two runs. That required us to have model output on an hour by hour basis for all the receptors, store those matrices, and then use FORTRAN programming to process the data and to come up with the 98th percentile values. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And did you also use that in your stage three analysis, FORTRAN? A FORTRAN programming was not required for stage three. Q In your MR. GROSSMAN: Has FORTRAN been modified in the 50 years since I studied it in college? THE WITNESS: It's been a long time since it's been modified. It was modified a few times, but no, I don't believe that, it's been quite a while. The models were all written in FORTRAN. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your report you reference a document called Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers, an EPA publication	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Do you have a copy with you? A I don't. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I don't have an extra copy. What I'd like to do is show this to the witness, and then we can have it introduced as an exhibit, or should I have it marked first? MR. GROSSMAN: What are we talking about? What is the MS. ROSENFELD: It's exhibit, it's reference number 15. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, so you're talking about this United States EPA MOVES Training for Non-Modelers? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Page 17 or MS. ROSENFELD: Page 17. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, let me take a quick look at it and see what you're talking about. So you only want page 17 in, is that the idea? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I've got other questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I can mark it, mark the whole document, since we don't have enough paper in the file already. All right, this will be Exhibit 568, 568. And that's EPA Introduction to MOVES for Non-Modelers.

	Page 98		Page 100
1	marked for identification.)	1	Q If you would turn to page 3 of your rebuttal
2	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	report, on page 3, in the middle section, as I read it you
3	Q Mr. Sullivan, if I show you page 17 of what's been	3	conclude that all of the mall areas are urban, which I
4	marked as Exhibit No. 568, if you'd take a look at that, do	4	think is consistent with your earlier testimony, is that
5	you remember seeing that?	5	correct?
6	A I don't specifically recall seeing this, no.	6	A You're referring to the statement that says Dr.
7	Again, I don't believe I relied upon this reference.	7	Cole conceded that all areas within the mall parcel can be
8	Q Okay.	8	characterized as urban?
9	A I don't remember using it.	9	Q I'm reading lower down, where it says this
10	Q So you don't have any reason why	10	rebuttal report shows that the air parcel traveling from the
11	A I don't remember why it's on my list.	11	south toward the ring road would be 100 percent urban,
12	Q it's in your list.	12	adjusted to mall land use by the time it reaches the queue.
13	A I don't.	13	A That's what it says.
14	Q Okay. All right. If I go to page 5 of that same	14	Q Okay. And then finishing that sentence, you say
15	document, Exhibit 586, page 5 has a caption that says why	15	which would also apply to all trajectories. Can you explain
16	did EPA develop MOVES, and there's three bullets. Would you	16	what that means?
17	read the second bullet into the record, please?	17	A Well, a trajectory from the north, for example,
18	A FORTRAN code used in MOBILE6.2 is obsolete and	18	the air would have to travel throughout the entire mall
19	difficult to maintain. More modern data base design needed.	19	area, or from the east or west. The closest trajectory for
20	Q Okay. And is there a reason why you didn't use	20	the neighborhood is from the south.
21	more modern as in MOVES?	21	Q So here you're referencing the air that's
22	A Just an aside, EPA uses FORTRAN for AERMOD	22	traveling across the mall parcel, and regardless of which
23	modeling, and all the predecessor modelings that I've ever	23	direction, once it gets to the queue area it's all urban.
24	seen. FORTRAN is a tool. It allows you to program	24	A Correct.
25	different things. They're not saying that FORTRAN gives you	25	Q Okay. In your rebuttal report you say that Dr.
	Page 99		Page 101
1	Page 99 the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases	1	
1 2	C C	1 2	Ĵ
	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases		Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be
2	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to	2	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban
2 3	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN.	2 3	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most
2 3 4 5 6	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll supply a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never assigned 50-50, first of all. And I just said that at those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll supply a clip. Your other thing's loose, too.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never assigned 50-50, first of all. And I just said that at those locations it would be midway between. I didn't assign a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll supply a clip. Your other thing's loose, too. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll turn it in when we take a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never assigned 50-50, first of all. And I just said that at those locations it would be midway between. I didn't assign a number.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll supply a clip. Your other thing's loose, too. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll turn it in when we take a break.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never assigned 50-50, first of all. And I just said that at those locations it would be midway between. I didn't assign a number. Q If you could turn to appendix C of your report.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the wrong answer. They're saying there's new data bases that can be relied upon, but for modeling EPA continues to rely upon FORTRAN. And we've been using it for 40 years, mostly dentists. I used to use it. And so we continue to do so. There's nothing wrong with FORTRAN. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry? MS. CORDRY: Marking off questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Hopefully we're near the end. If you're finished with that exhibit, return it to me, because it's now an exhibit. MS. ROSENFELD: Actually I am through with it for now. I will have other questions on it for our rebuttal witnesses, surrebuttal. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I don't have a clip. Is it okay if it's loose? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll supply a clip. Your other thing's loose, too. MS. ROSENFELD: I'll turn it in when we take a break. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Cole was in error when he stated that the gas queue would be located in a transition zone between rural and urban conditions. And when Dr. Cole concluded that the most appropriate dispersion rate would be intermediary between urban and rural, correct? A Yes. Q You disagree with his conclusion? A I didn't agree with, I believe he's in error. I stated he's in error. Q On page 26 of your November 2012 report though, did you not say that the most accurate characterization of nearby sources would be expected to be between the urban and rural results? A Well, if you look at it in context, I was referring to the fact that we modeled urban and rural, like the closest homes and school and pool and so forth. And my statement didn't apply to the mall. It pertained to the area off the mall, where those properties were. And I never assigned 50-50, first of all. And I just said that at those locations it would be midway between. I didn't assign a number. Q If you could turn to appendix C of your report. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is that on?

	Page 102		Page 104
-		-	MD. CDOCOMANY Okov, this will be Exhibit 560
1	BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Distance for adjusted to new surface conditions at	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, this will be Exhibit 569. And it's pages 150 through 153 of Panofsky and Dutton, 1984
3	the mall area, on that page 35 you cite to a formula from a	2	text, textbook. And what's it entitled, Mr. Sullivan, the
4	study reference by Panofsky and Dutton. It's part of your	4	textbook?
5	conclusion that wind will achieve equilibrium with the new	5	(Hearing Exhibit No. 569 was
6	surface, correct?	6	marked for identification.)
7	A That's a textbook authorized by Hans Panofsky and	7	THE WITNESS: Atmospheric Turbulence. The sub-
8	John Dutton, 1984.	8	heading under there, I don't recall the exact wording of it,
9	Q And you state that you use the Panofsky and Dutton	9	but Atmospheric Turbulence.
10	formula to determine the distance required for wind to	10	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, Atmospheric. I take it
11	achieve equilibrium? Is that go ahead.	11	it never made it to the best seller list.
12	A That's correct. As I testified earlier, I used	12	THE WITNESS: It's hard to get now, but it's at
13	that reference as an example. There are many others that	13	the Library of Congress.
14	could be used as well with similar conclusions.	14	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
15	Q And did you include the Panofsky and Dutton	15	THE WITNESS: That was my advisor at Penn State.
16	reference in your list of references?	16	Hans Panofsky wrote the book.
17	A I think it was inadvertently left out, but I	17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18	believe it was in an earlier reference list, but I certainly	18	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19	relied upon it before.	19	Q All right, so on page 35 of your rebuttal report
20	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he does list it in appendix	20	you say that you derived the formula shown on page 35 from
21		21	this Panofsky and Dutton paper. And you say it came from
22	MS. ROSENFELD: Excuse me?	22	page 50, 150. When I look at page 150 I actually see two
23	MR. GROSSMAN: You said did he list it. It is	23	formulas on that page. Can you tell me which one you're
24	THE WITNESS: Oh, it is correct.	24	referencing on page 35 of your report?
25	MR. GROSSMAN: referenced in	25	A Referencing a formula that I believe is formula
	Page 103		Page 105
1		1	-
1	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list.	1	two.
2	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list,	2	two. Q Under number two?
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report.	2 3	two. Q Under number two? A Correct.
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I	2	two. Q Under number two? A Correct. Q And does number two include within it the formula
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is	2 3 4	two. Q Under number two? A Correct. Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I	2 3 4 5	two. Q Under number two? A Correct. Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	two. Q Under number two? A Correct. Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one? A Does formula two include within it reference one? It was derived from equation one. Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote, Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I do have what was provided. Mr. Grossman, if we could have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an adjustment, that interface, or not. But this was not an</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: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I do have what was provided. Mr. Grossman, if we could have this marked as an exhibit, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an adjustment, that interface, or not. But this was not an EPA, this is a textbook, not an EPA-related document.</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: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I do have what was provided. Mr. Grossman, if we could have this marked as an exhibit, please. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an adjustment, that interface, or not. But this was not an EPA, this is a textbook, not an EPA-related document.</li> <li>Q And looking at page 151, just under the number</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: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I do have what was provided. Mr. Grossman, if we could have this marked as an exhibit, please. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: These are the four pages from 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>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an adjustment, that interface, or not. But this was not an EPA, this is a textbook, not an EPA-related document.</li> <li>Q And looking at page 151, just under the number four on the right-hand side, there's a sentence 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	MS. ROSENFELD: In his reference list. MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's not in the reference list, but it's actually on page 35 of his report. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mentioned the name, but I haven't provided the full reference. I mean it certainly is a, it's an available textbook basically is what it is. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Did I understand correctly from Ms. Harris that you got pages 150 to 153 of the Panofsky and Dutton article from the Library of Congress? A I have the whole text. Q You have the whole text? A Yes. Q Can you explain why the whole text was not provided after I requested it? A I think we provided the pages that you asked for, the methodology. It's a several hundred page book. It's available through the library. I mean I didn't copy the whole book. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, not having the whole text, I do have what was provided. Mr. Grossman, if we could have this marked as an exhibit, please. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>two.</li> <li>Q Under number two?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q And does number two include within it the formula under, in parentheses one?</li> <li>A Does formula two include within it reference one?</li> <li>It was derived from equation one.</li> <li>Q It was derived from. And equation one, if I read just above that it says Miaki (phonetic sp.), quote,</li> <li>Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, end quote, argued that the vertical signal velocity in neutral air should be proportional to the friction velocity, thus, and then you go into, and then they cite the formula under subparagraph one. Are you aware as to whether or not this formula from this unpublished thesis has been recognized by the EPA?</li> <li>A Well, this formula, formula number one, was evaluated by Dr. Panofsky and Dr. Dutton. That's how they arrived at equation number two. This had nothing to do with EPA. I don't know if EPA has a position on the slope of an adjustment, that interface, or not. But this was not an EPA, this is a textbook, not an EPA-related document.</li> <li>Q And looking at page 151, just under the number</li> </ul>

	Page 106		Page 108
1	avoid the simple assumption one.	1	Q Well, I'm not asking you to do a calculation, but
2	A Where are you finding that?	2	I am asking you to explain to me how the factors and the
3	MR. GROSSMAN: That's in the middle of page 151.	3	ratios that are shown in two correlate with the ones that
4	It's like the third paragraph down, right under in general	4	are shown on page 35 of your report.
5	however, it says most theories avoid.	5	A Well, for example there's terms that are in this
6	THE WITNESS: Okay, I'm with you.	6	equation, too. KA is approximately a value of .4 or .39 is
7	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	7	what that constant would be. And the B as a factor is 1.3.
8	Q In your formula on the bottom of page 35 of your	8	Surface roughness is an input, a Z zero, which we solve for.
9	report, did your incorporate or did you avoid the assumption	9	And those terms have been rearranged solving for X. That's
10	under paragraph one on page 150?	10	what we did. H being the height of the interface above
11	A We certainly didn't go into applying the equation	11	ground level.
12	of motion and the equation of continuity to derive our own	12	Q All right. Could we start at the left on the
13	equation. We used equation two with reordering of the, you	13	Panofsky report, and could you explain to me what those
14	know, combining terms, which we're showing in our equation	14	terms mean?
15	here, to estimate the front, the height, how many feet per,	15	A H, you're referring to equation two?
16	of height rise per feet of distance crossed.	16	Q Yes, I am.
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Just so you can, I don't do	17	A H is the height of the interface. Z zero is
18	suspense well, so is Dr. Cole going to dispute the	18	surface roughness, length. KA is a constant, usually held
19 20	application of this theorem? MR. COLE: Oh, yeah.	19 20	between .39 or .4 as a simplification. B is a constant which is set to 1.3, an empirical constant. And X is the
20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	20	downwind distance of the
22	MS. ROSENFELD: For the record, yes.	22	Q X is distance?
23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	23	A from the interface.
24	Q The Panofsky and Dutton article was published I	24	MR. GROSSMAN: What does L sub N refer to, or LN?
25	think you said in 1984. Have there been any advances in the	25	Within the bracket.
	Page 107		Page 109
1	Page 107 methodology shown on page 150 since then?	1	Page 109 THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm.
1 2	-	1 2	
	methodology shown on page 150 since then?		THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm.
2	methodology shown on page 150 since then? A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,	2	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3	methodology shown on page 150 since then? A I looked at other formulas on line and I did, there are others that I found were consistent with the slope	2 3	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5	methodology shown on page 150 since then? A I looked at other formulas on line and I did, there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.	2 3	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> <li>A I'm not going to derive the calculation on the stand. We took the terms and combined terms and solved for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Does H vary with distance, or is it a constant?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> <li>A I'm not going to derive the calculation on the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Does H vary with distance, or is it a constant? A H varies with distance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> <li>A I'm not going to derive the calculation on the stand. We took the terms and combined terms and solved for X. I'd prefer not to do calculations on the stand. 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	THE WITNESS: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Does H vary with distance, or is it a constant? A H varies with distance. Q H is the height of the interface. So if H is 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>methodology shown on page 150 since then?</li> <li>A I looked at other formulas on line and I did,</li> <li>there are others that I found were consistent with the slope factors that Panofsky showed. So yes, there are others. I don't have the full references with me, but there clearly were.</li> <li>Q Do you know if the methodology used in the Panofsky and Dutton article has been extensively used or cited by others?</li> <li>A I don't know how often it's been cited by others, but I can say that it was consistent with the other reports that I reviewed.</li> <li>Q When I look at page 35 of the report, is this the same formula that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky report?</li> <li>A My recollection is it's terms that have been combined, but it's a consistent formula. Terms of been rearranged.</li> <li>Q Would you walk me through, please, the changes?</li> <li>A I'm not going to derive the calculation on the stand. We took the terms and combined terms and solved for X. I'd prefer not to do calculations on the stand. We reevaluate how we come up with that formulation from equation</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: Log, natural logarithm. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So going back to my question, is the formula that you show on 35 the same formula that's shown on the Panofsky article? A My answer was it's the same formula but rearranged terms. Q And what do you mean, rearranged terms? A We're solving for X, we're solving for X. Q Right. A You have a KA multiplied times a B. Those are both constants, so they've been combined. That's what I recall we did in rearranging the terms and solving for the X distance. X basically is telling you how far you have to go across the new surface to have the conditions adjusted at a particular height. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: H varies with distance. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Does H vary with distance, or is it a constant? A H varies with distance. Q H is the height of the interface. So if H is the height of the interface, tell me how that relates to what

	Page 110		Page 112
1	is a dominant source of interest, and the breathing height,	1	Q But isn't dispersion directly affected by wind
2	is five feet, approximately five feet, 1.5 meters. And	2	speed and turbulence?
3	actually for the gas queue, that source model, that's .75	3	A It's affected by both.
4	meters, which is about two and a half to three feet above	4	Q So why didn't you have to factor that into this
5	ground level.	5	equation?
6	For our sources the height of interest is very	6	A Well, I mentioned, I looked at, there's a
7	low, because the growth of the front of adjusted air is a	7	reference that I mentioned earlier, Raynor 1979, that
8	function of distance, to get to a height of two to three	8	evaluated from a turbulent intensity point of view what the
9	feet or take it up to five feet, the upper bound, it doesn't	9	speed of transfer was. And what he concluded, in the first
10	take very long. It adjusts very quickly, as shown by this	10	kilometer it's quite fast, a slope of one-to-three to one-
11	formula and others you can review in the literature.	11	to-four. We have a one-to-four in this formula, and that's
12	Q So in your formula on page 35, there's an H in the	12	considering turbulent intensity. So yes, I mean this scale
13	middle of the formula. Is that, what height does that	13	of analysis, this close to an interface, that slope change
14	represent?	14	is very quick, and even quicker than I'm showing on page 35,
15	A Well, if you put your height in, the H and X are	15	because a lot of times that surface is unstable.
16	the two variables, so and you set the surface roughness	16	In other words it's a, there's going to be a
17	term. If you put in H of 1.5 meters, you solve for how many	17	faster upward signal than showing what this formula is based
18	meters for X would match that value, or vice versa.	18	on neutral conditions. So you put it all together for, as I
19	Q And does this take into account the fact that	19	mentioned here, for any conceivable surface roughness value.
20	there's a slope from the area of the homes up to the queue?	20	That transition occurs prior to the wind reaching the start
21	A That's not the issue here. We're talking about	21	of the gas queue, and is way past by the time it gets to the
22	air that has moved up the hill and is going across the	22	midpoint or end of the gas queue. It's going to be urban-
23	parking lot. Sure, there's a slight slope there as well.	23	related dispersion conditions at that location.
24	But it's not getting into that level of detail. It's an	24	Q And the article also says
25	approximate formula that's showing how fast it'll adjust to	25	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mean the textbook?
-			
	Page 111		Page 113
1	Page 111 a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is	1	Page 113 MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but
1 2	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input.	1 2	-
	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that		MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time
2	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that	2	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so
2 3	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that	2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time
2 3 4	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in	2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly
2 3 4 5 6 7	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment.	2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're	2 3 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150? A For this analysis we did not have to do that. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of 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	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150? A For this analysis we did not have to do that. You certainly can do that, and there's references that show what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q On page 36 of your report you reference a paper by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150? A For this analysis we did not have to do that. You certainly can do that, and there's references that show what the speed change would be and what the turbulent intensity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q On page 36 of your report you reference a paper by Lettau (phonetic sp.), and you cite to a formula to estimate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150? A For this analysis we did not have to do that. You certainly can do that, and there's references that show what the speed change would be and what the turbulent intensity change would be. This formula is to define the height of	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: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q On page 36 of your report you reference a paper by Lettau (phonetic sp.), and you cite to a formula to estimate surface roughness in a parking area. Z-O equals .5 H* S/S,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a new surface. But clearly the slope of the parking lot is not an input. Q And does it take into account the fact that there's going to be an eight-foot wall at the top of that slope? A All that would do is make it transfer sooner, in my judgment. MR. SILVERMAN: Transfer what sooner? THE WITNESS: It's going to adjust, the turbulence is going to flow across, to have more mixing than we're accounting for. It would dilute the pollutants more so than we're modelling it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And looking at the last sentence on page 150 of the Panofsky paper, it says Miaki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface, but not the change of wind speeds, stress, and turbulent intensity after the air comes under the influence of terrain change. Are those factors that need to be calculated independently of this formula that's shown on page 150? A For this analysis we did not have to do that. You certainly can do that, and there's references that show what the speed change would be and what the turbulent intensity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: The textbook. It may say it, but I can't find it, so MR. GROSSMAN: I'll think we've spent enough time on the textbook, don't you think, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think what Mr. Sullivan has testified is that his formula does not directly correlate with the formula that he, that is shown on page 150 of the Panofsky article. MR. GROSSMAN: That's certainly not what he testified. He didn't say that. He said he derived from that by rearranging, substituted the values and then he rearranged it and solved for X. That's what he testified. MS. ROSENFELD: And I think I asked him to walk us through that and he declined to do so. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he said he's not going to go, he actually did walk you through and told you what each of the elements was in that formula. He didn't say, he didn't go through the calculation of how he did it. But you can have your expert testify if he disagrees with the reformulation of it. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q On page 36 of your report you reference a paper by Lettau (phonetic sp.), and you cite to a formula to estimate surface roughness in a parking area. Z-O equals .5 H* S/S,

	Page 114		Page 116
1	A That's correct.	1	same result as the Panofsky formula?
2	Q And did you plug in the value for this equation	2	A I mentioned Raynor, R-A-Y-N-O-R, in 1979 would be
3	for Z-O or surface roughness into the equation in the	3	one.
4	Panofsky text?	4	Q And is that an article or a book?
5	A In the Panofsky text I ran, I mean I showed the	5	A That's an article. I'll give you the reference.
6	results for Z, a surface roughness ranging from .01 meters	6	It's an article by Gilbert S. Raynor. The title is
7	up to one meter for, basically for 10 centimeter increments.	7	Formation and Characteristics of Coastal Internal Boundary
8	I show it for a wide range of surface roughness values. I	8	Layers During On-Shore Flows. And published by, in Boundary
9	highlighted 12 centimeters, which came out of the example	9	Layer Meteorology, Volume 16, 1979, page 47 to 514.
10	that I showed here.	10	Q Do you have a copy available?
11	Q And where did you show those numbers?	11	A I do.
12	A On page 38.	12	Q Electronic?
13	Q And so what's highlighted on page 38 is the result	13	A Ido.
14	that you got from the combination of the formula on 35 and	14	Q Okay. Would you mind sending that to us?
15	the formula on 36?	15	A I can put it, I can transfer it through maybe Mr.
16	A On page, using the formula for surface roughness	16	Goecke. I have it on my flash drive.
17	estimation at the top of page 36, in conjunction with the	17	Q Okay.
18	formula on page 35, I computed the range of heights to	18	A I would have to do it, with the transfer.
19	achieve adjustment as a function of surface roughness	19	Q We can coordinate that during the break. And did
20	ranging from .01 to 1 meter.	20	you conduct any kind of a sensitivity test to determine how
21	Q And so in the first column on the left, the Z-O, what does that reflect on the ground?	21	variation of the inputs under these formulas would determine the outcome of the analysis?
22 23	A Surface roughness length, one centimeter.	22 23	A Yes.
23	Q And the middle column?	23 24	Q And where did you do that?
25	A Actually be the distance in meters to, for	25	A Page 38.
	······································		
	Page 115		Page 117
1	adjustment to 1.5 meters. And the third column is showing	1	Q And the sensitivity test that you ran on 38, is
2	it in feet.	2	that for the Panofsky or is that for Lettau?
3	Q And the distance to 1.5 meters is the height of	3	A That's for Panofsky. I'm very, I'm showing
4	<b>o</b> 1	4	
5	A 1.5 meter, .75 meters is the height, midpoint	5	could be different on a different day with different cars
6	height of the gas queue. 1.5 meters is the breathing	6	parked there, but the given example was 12, .12 meters. I
7	height. I used 1.5 as the example, but actually the gas	7	showed the sensitivity from .01 to 1 meters, run through the
8	queue at .75 adjusts twice as fast as I have here. So at 12	8	Panofsky equation. And showed a range of .7 feet to 38 feet
9	centimeters, at .75, it would adjust within about eight	9	for transition, which is well before the queue, for all of
10	feet. By the time it got to the middle of the ring road, it'd be urban.	10	them.
11 12	Q And did you find any precedent in EPA guidance for	11 12	I could add to that that I also considered .5 centimeters, which is five millimeter roughness, which is,
13	the combination of these two equations?	13	we measure this in the field studies that we do, this sort
14	A I don't recall if EPA has the need to address	14	of thing. And if I have a study where I have a plastic tarp
15	interface. I don't remember them addressing this topic in	15	for several acres of farmland, totally smooth surface, will
16	guidance. They may have somewhere. I've certainly seen	16	measure about a five millimeter or .5 centimeter roughness
17	these, the formula, these formulas used many times before.	17	length. And I put that in and I got 50 feet, and 50 feet
18	Q In combination?	18	was about the distance from the edge, where the southern
19	A Well, I don't know about in combination, but the	19	part of the parking lot, parking space is in the ring road,
20	Letteau method is very well established and tested against	20	up to the start of the ring road.
21	various methods. And the Panofsky equation is just one of	21	So my point is under any conceivable surface
22	many that leads to about the same answer, again the slope of	22	roughness value, the transition is faster than needed. It's
23	one-to-three, one-to-four, when you're that close to an	23	going to be urban by the time it starts the queue. By the
24	interface is what I've seen in multiple references.	24	time it ends the queue it's going to be, that height of
25	Q Can you specify which other methods give you the	25	interface would be well, way above 1.5 meters.
1		1	

	Page 118		Page 120
1	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I think this would	1	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, we were able to
2	be a good time for a lunch break, if it's not too early.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Shorten things?
3	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not so sure. Maybe you can	3	MS. ROSENFELD: delete a number of
4	finish before a lunch break.	4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another way.
5	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, no, no.	5	MS. ROSENFELD: a number of questions that we
6	MR. GROSSMAN: I would be hopeful that you could.	6	covered pretty thoroughly this morning, so.
7	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, not a chance.	7	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
8	MR. GROSSMAN: How much more do you think you	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	have?	9	Q Mr. Sullivan, you've testified that you're
10	MS. ROSENFELD: Probably a couple hours.	10	assuming that there's going to be a 25 percent initial ratio
11	MR. GROSSMAN: That's what you had, that's what	11	of NO2 to NOX, correct? The in-stack ratio?
12	you told me I think before we broke for the	12	A We've conservatively used .25 as our in-stack
13	MS. ROSENFELD: That may be.	13	ratio for each source for NO2 modeling.
14	MR. GROSSMAN: on the 8th.	14	Q And if you would please turn to page 5 of Exhibit
15	MS. ROSENFELD: That may be.	15	407, which is the March 1, 2011 Tyler Fox memo.
16	MS. CORDRY: I think you said four or five hours.	16	MS. ADELMAN: What page was that?
17	MR. GROSSMAN: It's now been	17	MS. ROSENFELD: Five.
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You said about three.	18	THE WITNESS: Page 5, you said?
19	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You said four.	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Two and a half.	20	THE WITNESS: All right.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three.	21	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22	MS. ROSENFELD: This is complicated stuff, Mr.	22	Q Under the second bullet on page 5, there's a
23	Grossman. And I don't think the time this morning in cross-	23	sentence that says general acceptance of .5 is the default
24	examination was wasted time.	24	in-stack ratio of NO2/NOX for input to the PV, MLM, and OLM
25	MR. GROSSMAN: I would never assume it's	25	options within AERMOD, in the absence of more appropriate
	Page 119		Page 121
1	Page 119 MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information	1	Page 121 source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5
		1 2	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5
	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted.		source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?
2	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly	2	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted.	2 3	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do,
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through.	2 3 4	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of	2 3 4 5	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And where is your source-specific information for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct? A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5? A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage two?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m, a luncheon recess was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage two?</li> <li>A Well, we didn't run the numbers. I don't have a</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: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m, a luncheon recess was taken.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage two?</li> <li>A Well, we didn't run the numbers. I don't have a basis to answer that. But it wouldn't be appropriate to use</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: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m, a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record. Resume 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>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default. <ul> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage two?</li> <li>A Well, we didn't run the numbers. I don't have a basis to answer that. But it wouldn't be appropriate to use .5 when, for example, I've already stated that the .25 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	MS. ROSENFELD: There was a lot of information that MR. GROSSMAN: wasted. MS. ROSENFELD: came forward that certainly hadn't been clear to me, and to Mr., to Dr. Cole earlier. There's a lot more to wade through. MS. CORDRY: So this is a 55-page report, all of which was new, so MR. SILVERMAN: Also, Mr. Grossman, Ms. Rosenfeld sacrificed Mother's Day in order to prepare for this. I think we should give her a little leeway. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The Mother's Day argument always wins. I don't want to be taking that thing against Mother's Day, for heaven's sakes. All right. Well, if everybody wants to do that now, and Mr. Silverman is voting to break for lunch, all right, I have no opposition from the other side. All right, we'll break. It's about, it's going to be about 20 to, so we'll break until 1:30 then. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. (Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m, a luncheon recess was taken.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>source-specific information on in-stack ratios. That .5 default number is recommended by this EPA guidance, is that correct?</li> <li>A No. That's not what it says. What it says is if you don't have source-specific information, which we do, that .5 is the default.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We do? What source? BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q And where is your source-specific information for using something other than the .5?</li> <li>A We showed CAPCOA 2011. We discussed that earlier.</li> <li>Appendix D, page number, appendix C, I'm sorry, page 58, shows that for gasoline and diesel light and medium duty vehicles, the recommended ratio is .25, 25 percent. And for heavy duty diesels that it's 11 percent. We used 25 for both categories, and we used that not only for idling but also for running sources, running vehicles.</li> <li>Q If you did use the EPA's .5 default ratio, what would your overall maximum NO2 concentration be under stage two?</li> <li>A Well, we didn't run the numbers. I don't have a basis to answer that. But it wouldn't be appropriate to use</li> </ul>

	Page 122		Page 124
1	Q And your reliance on that .25 figure in the CAPCOA	1	on the speed of the vehicles?
2	report, Exhibit 567, it's appendix C, page 58, is that what	2	A You're referring to this particular reference?
3	you're referencing?	3	Q Just generically speaking.
4	A Yes.	4	A It's a function of speed.
5	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I believe I have	5	Q We heard testimony that there are higher emissions
6	your copy.	6	at idling levels than there are at faster speeds, correct?
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Ah, that's what happened to it.	7	A That's what's shown in Lenner and Lindquist's
8	Thank you. So what page am I on now, Ms. Rosenfeld?	8	reference in my reference set. It provides hard data on
9	MS. ROSENFELD: I believe Mr. Sullivan testified	9	that.
10	that he got the .25 conversion factor from appendix C on	10	Q And does the NO2 to NOX ratio change as vehicle
11	page 58. And if you look at number six, the reference	11	speed changes?
12	number on the left-hand column, if you read across the page	12	A Yes, it does. Q And in what fashion?
13 14	for the gas/diesel MR. GROSSMAN: I see.	13 14	<ul><li>Q And in what fashion?</li><li>A Well, the literature shows, and in Lenner and</li></ul>
15	MS. ROSENFELD: it's .25.	14	Lindquist there's a good example of it, it shows, as I
16	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	16	recall initially if you have a car running, and say for 30
17	Q Is that correct? Is that the number you	17	minutes, that's moving 20 or 30 minutes, and then you put it
18	referenced?	18	into idle mode, it initially goes go about 15 percent ratio.
19	A It's .25 for light and medium duty gas and diesel	19	And then by about 10 minutes into this, into the idle mode,
20	vehicles, and it's .11 for heavy duty diesel vehicles.	20	it'll go to about 20 percent. It'll max out around 25
21	Q And do you know where that number came from in the	21	percent by 20 minutes or so. So it does increase, but the
22	CAPCOA guidance document?	22	moving vehicle component, based upon several tunnel studies,
23	A You mean how they derived that point? I don't	23	shows that moving vehicles typically in the range of five to
24	have that information available as I sit here. I can tell	24	10, sometimes three percent NO2.
25	you that I researched the .25, for example, for gasoline	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, can
	Page 123		Page 125
	- <b>3</b>		1 age 125
1	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very	1	
1 2		1 2	-
	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-		you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set
2	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are	2	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple
2 3	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering.	2 3	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like	2 3 4 5 6	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could
2 3 4 5 6 7	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a	2 3 4 5 6 7	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list. Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site- specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list. Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep. MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep. MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep. MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here. MR. BRANN: It's 74. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you. MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she? MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep. MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In the Boulter, McCrae & Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> </ul> </li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list. <ul> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA</li> <li>report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> </ul> </li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list. <ul> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA</li> <li>report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more than just a function of speed. It depends upon the design</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more than just a function of speed. It depends upon the design of the tunnel. Some of these studies, this being one of</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>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> <li>list probably three or four tunnel studies. I don't recall this specific tunnel study, but I have certainly seen tunnel studies used as a basis to isolate the direct emissions from</li> </ul> </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>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more than just a function of speed. It depends upon the design of the tunnel. Some of these studies, this being one of them, were in single bore tunnels. And a single bore</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>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> <li>list probably three or four tunnel studies. I don't recall this specific tunnel study, but I have certainly seen tunnel studies used as a basis to isolate the direct emissions from vehicles.</li> </ul> </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>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more than just a function of speed. It depends upon the design of the tunnel. Some of these studies, this being one of them, were in single bore tunnels. And a single bore tunnel, single bore tunnels have very different ratios,</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>vehicles, and have confirmed that that 25 percent is very high for moving vehicles, and it's a bit high. Twenty percent would be, based on the literature, more site-specific or source-specific information. These are basically just defaults that they're offering. <ul> <li>But I do provide references, other things like</li> <li>Lenner and Lindquist, for example, that show references as a function of runtime for idling. That's in my reference list.</li> <li>Q If you were to turn to page 59 in the CAPCOA report</li> <li>A Okay.</li> <li>Q reference number six, there's a reference to a study called Primary NO2 Emissions from Road Vehicles in the Hatfield and Bell Commons Tunnels</li> <li>A Right.</li> <li>Q dated July 2007. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with the Bell and Commons study?</li> <li>A I've seen, I think I referenced in my reference</li> <li>list probably three or four tunnel studies. I don't recall this specific tunnel study, but I have certainly seen tunnel studies used as a basis to isolate the direct emissions from</li> </ul> </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>you take a look at the thermostat and see what that's set for? It seems rather warm in here.</li> <li>MR. BRANN: It's 74.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, can you lower that a couple of degrees? Thank you.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: He asked if I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You look guilty.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She did, didn't she?</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Now I look content and comfortable.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you don't want me to look asleep.</li> <li>MS. HARRIS: Well, that is true. You're more important.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q In the Boulter, McCrae &amp; Green study that's referenced in the CAPCOA guidelines, guidance document, do you happen to remember the speed of the vehicles that were studied in that report?</li> <li>A I've already stated I have, I don't recall that report. But the, to interpret a tunnel study, it's more than just a function of speed. It depends upon the design of the tunnel. Some of these studies, this being one of them, were in single bore tunnels. And a single bore</li> </ul>

	Page 126		Page 128
1	have like a piston effect and it clears the air much, much	1	literature. That does describe and comment on the fact that
2	more efficiently.	2	this tunnel produced high NO2 to NOX ratios because of the
3	And so I've seen a big difference between single	3	design.
4	and dual bore tunnels. And I don't know if this is single	4	Q And would you provide that along with the other,
5	bore or not, but levels like 25 percent l've seen in single	5	the report that you're going to provide, in the drop box?
6	bore tunnel studies.	6	A Yeah, is somebody keeping track of these things?
7	Q But let me clarify, what we're talking about right	7	l'm not.
8	now is the in-stack ratio, correct? A But you're talking about a particular reference	8 9	Q I am, yes. A Okay.
10	for a tunnel study, and I'm just pointing out that the ratio	9 10	Q On page 34 of your report
11	is strongly dependent upon whether it's single or dual bore.	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you mean his rebuttal report?
12	And we don't, without having this reference here, I don't	12	MS. ROSENFELD: The rebuttal report.
13	recall which it is, but it's much more similar to single	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14	bore research I have reviewed.	14	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15	Q The title of the document though is called Primary	15	Q And actually I'm going to start at the bottom of
16	Emissions from Road Vehicles.	16	page 35, the last sentence. The modeling in stage three was
17	A Well, I'm referring to whether it has one hole	17	updated based on updated meteorological data and updated NO2
18	through the mountain or two, or under the water. It makes,	18	background and ozone concentrations for the years 2010
19	the literature shows it makes a very large difference. In	19	through 2012, to reduce the positive bias of using older
20	fact they've done studies of single bore where they describe	20	concurrent NO2 background data. Correct?
21	the piston effect in great detail, and say it does create	21	A It's page 34, I believe you're reading from.
22	build-up inside, and the residence time it increases, you	22	Q The last, the sentence actually begins at the
23	get more conversion.	23	bottom of page 33 and carries over to page 34.
24 25	Q I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan, I didn't hear your answer there.	24 25	A Okay. I'm with you now. I'm sorry, what was your question?
2.5		2.5	
	Page 127		Page 129
1	Page 127 MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before,	1	Page 129 Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data
1 2	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between	1 2	Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data
	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore		Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data
2	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right.	2	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set for that purpose here. I always use three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Chemistry, 2001. And actually the title of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three year data set for that purpose here. I always use three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> <li>A What memo?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Chemistry, 2001. And actually the title of the journal is Journal of Environmental Monitoring, excuse me,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> <li>Q June 28th, 2010 memo from Tyler Fox?</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: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Chemistry, 2001. And actually the title of the journal is Journal of Environmental Monitoring, excuse me, 2001, volume three, pages 220 to 225.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> <li>A What memo?</li> <li>Q June 28th, 2010 memo from Tyler Fox?</li> <li>A I don't have that handy. Mine was marked 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	MR. GROSSMAN: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Chemistry, 2001. And actually the title of the journal is Journal of Environmental Monitoring, excuse me, 2001, volume three, pages 220 to 225. Q What were those pages again?	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 Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> <li>A What memo?</li> <li>Q June 28th, 2010 memo from Tyler Fox?</li> <li>A I don't have that handy. Mine was marked for 2011.</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: It's the same as he's given before, a couple of seconds ago. There's a big difference between single bore and double bore MS. ROSENFELD: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: tunnel results, because of the piston effect. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q But my question is does that have an effect on the in-stack ratio? A Yes, it would. I mean if you used a single bore tunnel, which is, as number six may be, it would inflate the estimate of direct emissions, because there'd be enough time inside there to create extra conversion. And I'm looking for the reference. I may not find it right now, but it's clearly described, and I believe it's actually, let me see this that the rest of you have, it's an article by Oddny, I- N-D-R-E-H-U-S, CO and NO2 Pollution in a Long Two-Way Tunnel, road tunnel, investigation of NO2 to NOX ratios, and modelling of NO2 concentrations, in the Journal of the Royal Society of Chemistry, 2001. And actually the title of the journal is Journal of Environmental Monitoring, excuse me, 2001, volume three, pages 220 to 225.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Did you reduce the, you used three years of data for the updated NO2 background and ozone concentrations, correct?</li> <li>A That's correct.</li> <li>Q And did you also use three years of the meteorological data?</li> <li>A It's all concurrent data, 2010 to 2012, three years.</li> <li>Q And did you use EPA, did you follow EPA guidance in using this approach?</li> <li>A It's the exact, we went through that earlier.</li> <li>It's the same approach as used previously. It was stage three, of using three years' worth of data. Three years is a typical data set used for compliance purposes. We used a three years of the model values to estimate model of NO2 concentrations.</li> <li>Q Would you look at Exhibit 391-A, which is the June 29th, 2010 memo?</li> <li>A What memo?</li> <li>Q June 28th, 2010 memo from Tyler Fox?</li> <li>A I don't have that handy. Mine was marked for</li> </ul>

	Page 130		Page 132
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, that's	1	of NWS data.
2	MS. ROSENFELD: And actually, Mr. Grossman, I	2	A I don't see this.
3	think I handed out	3	MR. GROSSMAN: It's right after the sentence that
4	MR. GROSSMAN: You handed one to me.	4	she read before. The sentence she read before says, it
5	MS. ROSENFELD: a convenience copy. Right, it	5	begins with although. The next sentence begins the five-
6	says excepted pages?	6	year average.
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	7	THE WITNESS: I'll find it. The five-year
8	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Okay.	8	average, based on use of National Weather Service data?
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10	Q The second memo on that, which is dated June 28th,	10	Q Yes.
11	2010, I'm looking at page 17 of that document. Mr.	11	A Or an average across one or more years of
12	Sullivan, I'm going to hand you what is an extra of what has	12	available site-specific data. Like I said, we have done
13	been marked as Exhibit 391-A.	13	that procedure in stage two. Stage three was showing what
14	A Okay.	14	it would be for updated conditions.
15	Q And I'm going to need that back.	15	Q And you could have carried forward the more recent
16	A All right.	16	five years of data, correct?
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What page is that?	17	A We could have run
18	MS. ROSENFELD: Seventeen.	18	Q But chose not to do that?
19	THE WITNESS: What was your question?	19	A We could have run many different variations of
20	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	20	this. I ran basically two, and we could have run five years
21	Q I'm looking in the middle of that paragraph, about	21	or more. I showed in stage three an example, based on the
22	halfway down on the far right there's a sentence that	22	most recent three years, that would give Mr. Grossman the
23	begins, although the monitor design value for the one-hour	23	best idea of what kind of concentrations conservatively
24	NO2 standard is defined in terms of the three-year average,	24	would expect to see when the station's built sometime in
25	this definition does not pre-empt or alter the appendix W	25	hopefully 2014 or whenever it's going to be.
	Page 131		Page 133
-			
1	requirement for use of five years of national NWS, National	1	Going back five years there, we could have done
1 2	requirement for use of five years of national NWS, National Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year	1 2	Going back five years there, we could have done it, but it would show what the average would be going back
	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?		it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.
2	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do.	2	<ul><li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back</li><li>to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li><li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn</li></ul>
2 3	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu	2 3	<ul><li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back</li><li>to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li><li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn</li><li>to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back</li> <li>to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn</li> <li>to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back</li> <li>to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn</li> <li>to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't</li> <li>reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what? MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you? A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you? A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2. THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you? A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two. Q And the following sentence says the five-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2. THE WITNESS: What page again, please? MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that way. What is the section again?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you? A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two. Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that way. What is the section again? MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? A I do. Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS? A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure. Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you? A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two. Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2. THE WITNESS: What page again, please? MS. ROSENFELD: 68244. THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again? MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page 68244?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2. THE WITNESS: What page again, please? MS. ROSENFELD: 68244. THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again? MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> <li>68244? THE WITNESS: No. Mine aren't paginated that way.</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>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS, correct?</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>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> <li>68244?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No. Mine aren't paginated that way.</li> <li>I have 71 pages.</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>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS, correct?</li> <li>A I guess I lost track of where you are. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q The following sentence.</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>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> <li>68244?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No. Mine aren't paginated that way.</li> <li>I have 71 pages.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: His isn't the Federal Register. It's</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>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that? <ul> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS, correct?</li> <li>A I guess I lost track of where you are. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q The following sentence.</li> </ul> </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>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't</li> <li>reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> <li>68244?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No. Mine aren't paginated that way.</li> <li>I have 71 pages.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: His isn't the Federal Register. It's a CFR.</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>Weather Service, meteorological data, or at least one year of site-specific data. Do you see that?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q Did you use one year of site-specific data in lieu of the five years of NWS?</li> <li>A No, we used of five years of meteorological data in stage two. Stage three, we did an example showing the most recent three years. So yes, we have run five years. Just like I said, working through it in three-year increments, we followed that procedure.</li> <li>Q But you did not follow it in stage three, did you?</li> <li>A In stage three I showed the most recent three years, the last part of that block. If you want to see the five years rolled through each step, that's in stage two.</li> <li>Q And the following sentence says the five-year average, based on use of NWS data or an average across one or more years of available site-specific data, serves as an unbiased estimate of the three-year average for purposes of modeling demonstrations and compliance with the NAAQS, correct?</li> <li>A I guess I lost track of where you are. I'm sorry.</li> <li>Q The following sentence.</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>it, but it would show what the average would be going back to 2010. That's already available through stage two.</li> <li>Q And just for a reference point, if you would turn to Exhibit 285, which is appendix W.</li> <li>A I don't have appendix W handy.</li> <li>Q In your references MR. GROSSMAN: Which page in index W? MS. ROSENFELD: oh, actually you didn't reference appendix W, did you? I'm sorry, what?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Which page were you referring to? MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at page 68244. THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Section 8.3.1.2.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: What page again, please?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: 68244.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: And I don't have it numbered that</li> <li>way. What is the section again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: In the first, do you have page</li> <li>68244?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No. Mine aren't paginated that way.</li> <li>I have 71 pages.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: His isn't the Federal Register. It's</li> </ul>

	Page 134		Page 136
	action 9.2.1.2 recommendations	-	the heal. Oh it stanned
1	section 8.3.1.2, recommendations.		the back. Oh, it stopped.
2	THE WITNESS: Okay.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: No, there's a bright white light
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Unfortunately the new zoning	3	that flashes in your pocket.
4	ordinance is numbered the same kind of way. A lot of	4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, this.
5	numbers, a couple letters thrown in. It's not that easy to	5	MR. GROSSMAN: And I wouldn't care, except it's
6	follow.	6	distracting when I'm seeing it from here.
7	THE WITNESS: Is there a pending question? I'm	7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Okay. Sorry.
8	Sorry.	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	Q You applied an upper bound of .5 for the ratio in
10	Q I was waiting for you to find the section.	10	your stage two approach, is that correct?
11	A I have it.	11	A You heard the stage three approach?
12	Q Okay. And recommendations under A, the very first	12	Q Stage two.
13	sentence does say five years of representative	13	A No.
14	meteorological data should be used when estimating	14	Q For the area outside? That's actually stage
15	concentrations with an air quality model, is that correct?	15	three, correct?
16	A Correct.	16	A That's correct.
17	Q In lieu of EPA guidance, what did you rely upon in	17	Q Okay. And you say you drew that from an
18	reducing this five-year meteorological data requirement?	18	Environmental Agency report that you reference in your
19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm going to stop you,	19	rebuttal report, is that correct?
20	because he's already answered at least three times that he	20	A I testified there was three or four studies that I
21	used five years in stage two, and then he used three years	21	listed for, on that topic, that all showed that it would
22	in stage three, the more current years.	22	take a long, long time to get to 50 percent, much longer
23	MS. ROSENFELD: Right, and	23	than the grid we had in this modeling.
24	MR. GROSSMAN: So when you say in lieu of EPA	24	Q And in the environmental agency report, which was
25	guidance, he has testified that it is consistent with EPA	25	number one in your reference list, this actually, this is
	Doro 125		
	Page 135		Page 137
1		1	
1 2	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over and	1 2	
	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over and over again?		not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?
2	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified	2	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number
2 3	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's	2 3	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian,
2 3 4	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.	2 3 4	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.
2 3 4 5	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year,	2 3 4 5	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United
2 3 4 5 6	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used	2 3 4 5 6	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think.
2 3 4 5 6 7	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year,	2 3 4 5 6 7	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it? A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency. Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United Kingdom and Wales, I think. MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct? A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again? MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology. MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again. MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is England and Wales.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a</li> <li>leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is</li> <li>England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a</li> <li>leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is</li> <li>England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their decision. And we have done a lot of analysis for this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a</li> <li>leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is</li> <li>England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> <li>And even as high as .85 in urban areas, rural areas?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their decision. And we have done a lot of analysis for this project. I tried to shed light on the most recent period</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> <li>A Well, sure, but that's not what we're talking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their decision. And we have done a lot of analysis for this project. I tried to shed light on the most recent period versus the five-year period. We showed the modeling I don't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> <li>A Well, sure, but that's not what we're talking about. That's not an in-stack ratio. That's how you could</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>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their decision. And we have done a lot of analysis for this project. I tried to shed light on the most recent period versus the five-year period. We showed the modeling I don't know how many different ways during the course of this</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>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a</li> <li>leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is</li> <li>England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> <li>And even as high as .85 in urban areas, rural areas?</li> <li>A Well, sure, but that's not what we're talking about. That's not an in-stack ratio. That's how you could measure in a city. That city has transport from tens of</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>guidance. So why go over the same thing over and over again?</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: No, I don't think he's testified that's it's consistent with EPA guidance. I think he's testified that he chose to use a different methodology.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I heard him say that the five-year, that he did consistent with EPA guidance, because he used five years in stage two, and then he, in addition, ran a three-year one. I don't, he said it over and over again.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Then let me</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't want to go over the same territory over and over and over again.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q Are you asking that the Board of Appeals rely on stage three in making a determination as to compliance with the NAAQS?</li> <li>A I'm hoping that the Board of Appeals will rely upon all the evidence that's presented here to make their decision. And we have done a lot of analysis for this project. I tried to shed light on the most recent period versus the five-year period. We showed the modeling I don't know how many different ways during the course of this activity. Why would not the whole evidence be considered?</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>not the United States Environmental Protection Agency, is it?</li> <li>A No, we've talked about, in the reference number one on my list, no, we've mentioned it's the Australian, it's an Australian regulatory agency.</li> <li>Q Actually I believe it's Bristol, the United</li> <li>Kingdom and Wales, I think.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Yeah, yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: They all have the same accents.</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: True.</li> <li>BY MS. ROSENFELD:</li> <li>Q This is on page 3. The Environment Agency is a</li> <li>leading public body protecting and improving the environment in England and Wales, correct?</li> <li>A I had the wrong part of the British Empire. It is</li> <li>England and Wales.</li> <li>Q And on page 10 of that report, doesn't it include that it can be as high as .59 at urban background sites?</li> <li>And even as high as .85 in urban areas, rural areas?</li> <li>A Well, sure, but that's not what we're talking about. That's not an in-stack ratio. That's how you could measure in a city. That city has transport from tens of miles, from various roads and power plants and what have</li> </ul>

	Page 138		Page 140
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>you composed on your stage three analysis, correct?</li> <li>A But it's apples and oranges. You can't compare the two types.</li> <li>Q In what sense?</li> <li>A Well, the .5 is referring to conversion, total conversion of NO2 to NOX from the sources we're talking about here. The .5 they're talking about here, the average of .47, that's across, if you've got a monitor in the city and you let it run, you know, over and over again, it's getting air from roadway segments 10 miles away and a power plant over in this direction. It has a lot of baking time in the atmosphere, and you're going to get conversion. We're talking about in-stack ratios right next to a source. There is insufficient time to get the mixing to have that happen.</li> <li>Q No, but maybe we're confused. We're talking about your stage three where you cap ozone conversion ratios outside of the tailpipe box at .5, correct?</li> <li>A Well, yeah, but you say a capping. We're setting it at .5 in a mono-domain that just goes about 100 meters or maybe 200 at the most. We're talking about the .5 you're referring to here is where there's miles and miles of air coming in that's converted from the general mix of air in the atmosphere, from much farther away than the grid domain we have here.</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>Q That was a .6 conversion ratio?</li> <li>A That comes from one of your reports, one of the ones you issued last Tuesday. It's called the pilot program, and done by Sonoma Research. It looked into Boise, Baltimore, a couple other cities. If you look at the ratios for Baltimore, for the more, the highest one, which would be the most rural one, it's a .6.</li> <li>Q And in that Sonoma study, weren't the monitors there located between 7 and .5 meters of the roadway?</li> <li>A They were near a roadway, but even in that context, I mean I don't have a blackboard, but you have to consider the geometry of the, what you're asking me. That roadway is the RAN and RAS sites</li> <li>Q I believe there were several roadways.</li> <li>A I wasn't done, though. The RAN and RAS sites that were used in that Baltimore, for Baltimore in that Sonoma study, that stretch of roadway goes on for kilometers. So when you have, flow parallel to there you have kilometers for conversion. But much of the time the flow is coming from the perpendicular. When you have perpendicular flow towards a roadway, you don't get a lot of build-up, because it's going across a little stretch of the road. It's not building up over kilometers. So you're getting a lot ambient background contribution. You add all that up, you'd expect to get a .5, and you do.</li> </ul>
	Page 139		Page 141
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Again, it's apples and oranges comparison. I could show a .5 right away from my modeling if I were to say look, I have stage three. I have 70, what 73 micrograms are coming from background. Background's about .6. We're using Baltimore as the example. If I work back to that end and factor in most of the roadways, I'm doing, I'm using .5 for most everything else. I only have .25 for a very small fraction. If I do a weighted average of all those numbers, it comes in about .5. I get the same kind of answer. So my point is it really does depend. Background dominates, and background has about a .6. MS. CORDRY: Is that a .6 conversion rate here? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no, no, no, no. MS. CORDRY: I'm just MR. GROSSMAN: You're not questioning. You already had your turn MS. CORDRY: Okay, I'm just trying to MR. GROSSMAN: and you already, you can talk to Ms. Rosenfeld MR. GROSSMAN: but I want to make this as fair as possible. Usually only one witness questions from the side, okay? BY MS. ROSENFELD:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	But this situation here, I can get the same number if I just take my number that I'm working with, and we could take the time to do that, but it's going to come out around .5. I mean if you go to, you go to the page you're talking about, stage three, and look at the culpability

	Page 142		Page 144
1	10-minute break, I think we'll be in a position to wrap up	1	close, it's about, this is the, this width is 40 meters.
2	very shortly thereafter.	2	The queue actually, the queue isn't the whole exception
3	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. No more than 10,	3	area. The queue area, which is approximately in the
4	please.	4	southern, southern to central portion of this. I don't have
5	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, no more than 10.	5	the exact location here, but it's a 40-meter by 20, 40-meter
6	MR. GROSSMAN: Because I do want to finish this	6	east-west, 27 meters north-south
7	witness	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	8	THE WITNESS: rectangle. So we're talking
9	MR. GROSSMAN: and move on.	9	about 40 meters outside of that, not the special exception.
10	MS. ROSENFELD: I understand.	10	I'm not sure it's exactly right
11	MR. GROSSMAN: We also have Mr. Silverman's 10	11	MR. GROSSMAN: But it's in the general ballpark.
12	minutes of examination.	12	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yes.
13	MS. ROSENFELD: I understand.	13	THE WITNESS: the generally, let's say it's
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.	14	approximately the right ballpark.
15	(Whereupon, at 2:14 p.m., a brief recess was	15	MS. CORDRY: Ms. Adelman says it's exactly right.
16	taken.)	16	THE WITNESS: To the gas queue, or to the
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.	17	MS. CORDRY: To the gas queue.
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)	18	THE WITNESS: Okay.
19	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	19	MS. CORDRY: She did, I watched her. She was very
20	Q Mr. Sullivan, I'm going to show you the exhibit	20	careful.
21	that has previously been marked as Exhibit No. 230, which is	21	THE WITNESS: The loading dock is here. It'll
22	the illustrious site plan. I will proffer to you that there	22	extend somewhat further out this direction. But let's say
23	is a red circle, basically a red circle drawn around the	23	it's approximately right, 40 meters or so, approximately one
24	queue area. And I proffer that was drawn by Ms. Adelman,	24	area source width.
25	and I'll have her testify later to authenticate that if	25	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
	Da 11 440		
	Page 143		Page 145
1	-	1	
1	necessary.	1 2	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading
	-		
2	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so	2	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-
2 3	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that.	2 3	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?
2 3 4	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li><li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit	2 3 4 5	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors
2 3 4 5 6	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being
2 3 4 5 6 7	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40- meter boundary outside of the queue? A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box. Q So A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So A This receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.</li> <li>A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's</li> <li>Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.</li> <li>A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do you have any reason to think, would you agree that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude receptors that are within 40 meters of the source, that'd be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do you have any reason to think, would you agree that that generally shows that 40-meter distance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box. A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude receptors that are within 40 meters of the source, that'd be the best way to look at it.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do you have any reason to think, would you agree that that generally shows that 40-meter distance? A I can't confirm it is drawn exactly right, but	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 And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.</li> <li>A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude receptors that are within 40 meters of the source, that'd be the best way to look at it.</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	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do you have any reason to think, would you agree that that generally shows that 40-meter distance? A I can't confirm it is drawn exactly right, but that's, you know, generally reasonable. The scale is	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 And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's</li> <li>Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.</li> <li>A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude receptors that are within 40 meters of the source, that'd be the best way to look at it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: But I mean to understand, and I think what Ms. Rosenfeld is getting at, you say 40 meters</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	necessary. MR. GROSSMAN: I can see a red mark around it, so I don't think you have to authenticate that. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, and MR. GROSSMAN: But you can move it a little bit closer to you so I can actually see it better. Thank you. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not going to be looking at it. MR. GROSSMAN: We have a, an easel, if you want it. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's questionable equipment. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, perhaps we could just mark this Exhibit No. 230-A. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. (Hearing Exhibit No. 230-A was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And Mr. Sullivan, that red line reflects generally 40 meters outside of the queue area. In looking at that, do you have any reason to think, would you agree that that generally shows that 40-meter distance? A I can't confirm it is drawn exactly right, but	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 And is there a similar boundary around the loading dock area, or you've just treated everything as that 40-meter boundary outside of the queue?</li> <li>A We have a, the loading dock and the queue on, that I've shown on this map, it's, they're all the receptors within 40 meters of the, those sources are treated as being far too close to have any significant conversion. It's Q But you don't have a similar perimeter around the loading dock, do you? You just have the one tailpipe box.</li> <li>A Any receptor that's within 40 meters of the loading dock source or the queue are considered part of your, what is it called, tailpipe box.</li> <li>Q So</li> <li>A This receptor is not just necessarily a box, but it's the receptors that are in that zone.</li> <li>Q So for purposes of looking at the conversion ratios, should Ms. Adelman have drawn a similar 40-meter circle around the loading dock?</li> <li>A Basically if you look at our modeling files, and look at where the receptors are located, and exclude receptors that are within 40 meters of the source, that'd be the best way to look at it.</li> </ul>

	Page 146		Page 148
1	THE WITNESS: Right.	1	Goecke?
2	MR. GROSSMAN: But we've only talked about one 40-	2	A I believe I independently found this report. You
3	meter area here. But then there would actually be two 40-	3	may have found it as well. I don't know. But I found this
4	meter perimeters, one around the queue and the other around	4	report through my search.
5	the loading dock. Or is that not correct, is there just	5	Q Okay, good. Now during your testimony you talked
6	one?	6	about nationwide data. Was this report an element of the
7	THE WITNESS: There's one. They overlap. Those	7	nationwide data you were referring to?
8	two zones would overlap. It's the zone that would include	8	A I was referring to, for example, nationwide data.
9	all the receptors out in the vicinity of the loading dock,	9	If you go to air data, EPA web site, and you say I want to
10	as well as the gas queue itself. That's all one big basic	10	know, I want to see all the NO2 monitoring sites in the
11	zone.	11	United States for 2013, and identify what's the highest
12	MS. ROSENFELD: So what we need is a	12	reading, 98th percentile, in the entire country last year.
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I understand they would	13	It was 83 parts per billion, which is 156 micrograms per
14	overlap, but I'm asking you would it also extend 40 meters	14	cubic meter. Highest anywhere in the country.
15	to the east of the loading dock?	15	So I just think it's an important perspective. We
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, it would.	16	talk about the 40 meters and the ratios and all these
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So there is a separate	17	things, that the odds of the NO2 at this level being
18	circle that we could be, we should be talking about, in	18	anywhere near 156 are remote. And that's why I'm saying 75
19	effect.	19	to 100 micrograms to me would be the top upper bound I'd
20	THE WITNESS: Yeah, the scale of this map, this is 100.	20	expect to see here for 98th percentile.
21 22	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's 100.	21	Q Well, I think we have discussed how different
22	MS. ADELMAN: An inch to 100.	22 23	regions of the country have designations relating to how close they come to meeting or exceeding EPA standards for
24	THE WITNESS: A hundred feet. It would go further	24	the pollutants for which there are standards. And one of
25	out past, to the east, the loading dock area, than you	25	those pollutants for which there are standards, for which
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	Dawa 4.47		<b>D</b> 444
	Page 147		Page 149
1	Page 147 probably have drawn here.	1	Page 149 there are designations, is NO2, is it not?
1 2		1 2	-
	probably have drawn here.		there are designations, is NO2, is it not?
2	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn	2	there are designations, is NO2, is it not? A That's what I was referring to. We have just made
2 3	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.	2 3	there are designations, is NO2, is it not? A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.
2 3 4	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li><li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li><li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li><li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN:	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q Mr. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	probably have drawn here. MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire. THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon. MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon. CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79. A All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with this report?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA sometimes makes?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with this report?</li> <li>A I've read that report, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA sometimes makes?</li> <li>A I think areas are threatened.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Ant to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with this report?</li> <li>A I've read that report, yes.</li> <li>Q When did you first learn about it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA sometimes makes?</li> <li>A I think areas are threatened.</li> <li>Q Did you ever hear about the designation of</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>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with this report?</li> <li>A I've read that report, yes.</li> <li>Q When did you first learn about it?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</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>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA sometimes makes?</li> <li>A I think areas are threatened.</li> <li>Q Did you ever hear about the designation of attainment, unclassifiable?</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>probably have drawn here.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: So it would almost be like a Venn diagram if you did the entire.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It's sort of a rectangle, more or less, but it depends how the receptors fall, but that's the best way to explain that.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</li> <li>MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I have no further questions.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Mr. Silverman, you're up. MR. SILVERMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Good afternoon.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Mr. Sullivan, I want to ask you about, as I let your counsel know, I want to ask you about Exhibit 342, which is the CRC report, number A-79.</li> <li>A All right.</li> <li>Q Are you familiar with this report?</li> <li>A I've read that report, yes.</li> <li>Q When did you first learn about it?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Did you, as I recall Mr. Goecke questioned 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>there are designations, is NO2, is it not?</li> <li>A That's what I was referring to. We have just made that statement.</li> <li>Q And what is the designated standard for NO2 here in Montgomery County?</li> <li>A Montgomery County has the same standard as the rest of the country. We're talking about 100 parts per billion, 190 micrograms per cubic meter.</li> <li>Q No, not the standard but the designation how well we're doing in meeting or not meeting the standard.</li> <li>A It's meeting the standard.</li> <li>Q So it's your testimony that Montgomery County is at attainment?</li> <li>A For NO2?</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A That's my understanding.</li> <li>Q Well, in addition to a designation of attainment or non-attainment, are there any other designations that EPA sometimes makes?</li> <li>A I think areas are threatened.</li> <li>Q Did you ever hear about the designation of attainment, unclassifiable?</li> <li>A I've heard it.</li> </ul>

	Page 150		Page 152
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, do you have that in evidence,	1	pages, and I thought
2	what you're about to assert? Or are you putting it in	2	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, well, I don't have a
3	evidence?	3	problem with having a smaller exhibit.
4	MR. SILVERMAN: I could. I just, I thought he	4	MR. SILVERMAN: Good.
5	would know it.	5	MR. GROSSMAN: As long as it reflects the report
6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, the question, you're	6	that you're referencing.
7	assuming a fact, and I just want to make sure that the fact	7	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
8	you're assuming is either in evidence or about to be put in	8	MR. GROSSMAN: So let's mark this as Exhibit 570.
9	evidence in the surrebuttal.	9	And this is fact sheet from EPA web site with air quality
10	MR. SILVERMAN: It is about to be put in evidence	10	designations for 2010, primary NO2, NAAQS. All right.
11	as soon as I can find the document.	11	(Hearing Exhibit No. 570 was
12	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	12	marked for identification.)
13	Q Are you aware of a final rule that EPA put on	13	MR. SILVERMAN: All right. And this is a
14	February 17th, 2012? It says this rule establishes air	14	reflection of a 2012 February 17th Federal Register final
15	quality designations for all areas of the United States for	15	rule, which I've given to Mr. Goecke.
16	2010 primary nitrogen dioxide, NEX. Have you ever seen that or heard about that?	16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
17 18	A I don't recall if I've seen that or not.	18	Q So are you aware now that all areas of the country
19	Q Now I think I gave Mr. Goecke my copy of that last	19	have indeed been classified as in attainment? But then
20	time — one second. I'm actually surprised that Mr.	20	these areas have also been designated as unclassifiable
21	Sullivan did not	21	attainment?
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I	22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, which areas? I can't tell
23	MR. SILVERMAN: So I need a moment, if you would.	23	from, what, just show me the particular line you're talking
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.	24	about that says that all areas of the country
25	MS. CORDRY: I have the document on the computer	25	MR. SILVERMAN: It says action, February 20th,
	Page 151		Page 153
			Ŭ
1	if you want to just read from here, or	1	2012, based on the most recent
1 2	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan?	1 2	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine
2 3	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to	2 3	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January.
2 3 4	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits?	2 3 4	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S.
2 3 4 5	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in	2 3 4 5	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in
2 3 4 5 6	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole	2 3 4 5 6	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet	2 3 4 5 6 7	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before? A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before? A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. Silverman?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before? A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010. Q They did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. SilvERMAN: No, no, EPA prepared this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before? A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010. Q They did. A And they felt they didn't have sufficient network
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. Silverman? MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, EPA prepared this. MR. GOECKE: Is this an excerpt from a MR. SILVERMAN: This is a summary of the February 2012 rule about the designation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January. MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before? A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010. Q They did. A And they felt they didn't have sufficient network coverage to make a determination, and then they expanded the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. Silverman? MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, EPA prepared this. MR. GOECKE: Is this an excerpt from a MR. SILVERMAN: This is a summary of the February 2012 rule about the designation. MR. GOECKE: But where does this come from?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S.</li> <li>Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before?</li> <li>A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010.</li> <li>Q They did.</li> <li>A And they felt they didn't have sufficient network coverage to make a determination, and then they expanded the network. And I just read what the maximum was in the United States in 2013 they referred to, and nothing was above 156 micrograms.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. Silverman? MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, EPA prepared this. MR. GOECKE: Is this an excerpt from a MR. SILVERMAN: This is a summary of the February 2012 rule about the designation. MR. GOECKE: But where does this come from? MR. SILVERMAN: From the EPA's web site. And I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S.</li> <li>Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before?</li> <li>A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010.</li> <li>Q They did.</li> <li>A And they felt they didn't have sufficient network coverage to make a determination, and then they expanded the network. And I just read what the maximum was in the United States in 2013 they referred to, and nothing was above 156 micrograms.</li> <li>Q Didn't you testify before that the expansion of</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. GOECKE: May I give a copy to Mr. Sullivan? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. And you have a copy to be marked for the exhibits? MR. SILVERMAN: Actually, I do. So Mr. Goecke, in the interests of saving trees, I did not copy the whole document that I gave to you. But I did copy a fact sheet from the EPA web site, which is in substance the Federal Register report that I referenced, and I'll give you that. MR. GROSSMAN: Is the fact sheet what you want to put in the record? MR. SILVERMAN: I want to put the fact sheet in. If there's an objection MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, as long as Mr. Goecke has an opportunity to look it over and make sure that the fact sheet represents the report that you're referencing. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, this is a fact sheet that you prepared, Mr. Silverman? MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, EPA prepared this. MR. GOECKE: Is this an excerpt from a MR. SILVERMAN: This is a summary of the February 2012 rule about the designation. MR. GOECKE: But where does this come from?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>2012, based on the most recent MR. GROSSMAN: Mine doesn't say February 20. Mine says January.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: January, sorry, January 20th, U.S.</li> <li>Environmental Protection Agency determined that no area in the country violated the 2010 national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Which is what Mr. Sullivan just testified to. Then it says these areas have been designated as unclassifiable attainment.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Have you heard of unclassifiable attainment before?</li> <li>A Well, actually I don't recall hearing that term before, but they just passed a new standard in 2010.</li> <li>Q They did.</li> <li>A And they felt they didn't have sufficient network coverage to make a determination, and then they expanded the network. And I just read what the maximum was in the United States in 2013 they referred to, and nothing was above 156 micrograms.</li> </ul>

	Page 154		Page 156
1	planned to start in 2013, but they started in 2014, and	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, does it have a definition in
2	A This is talking about expanding the network in	2	there of
3	cities and so forth.	3	MR. SILVERMAN: It does.
4	Q Yes.	4	MR. GROSSMAN: unclassifiable, the term
5	A We were talking about the near road. That's	5	unclassifiable slash attainment? You could just read it to
6	another aspect of it. Near road's coming along on line now.	6	me.
7	But I mean there are some near road monitors been around a	7	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay, that'd be good, if there's
8	while, like I-710 I read to you, and some other ones, and	8	no objection to that.
9	even those are not anywhere near the standard.	9	MR. GOECKE: Which document are you referring to?
10	Q Okay, well, before we just leave this, why, do I	10	MR. SILVERMAN: This is the Federal Register final
11 12	understand you to say the reason that EPA uses the word unclassifiable is because there's a new monitoring system	11 12	rule on nitrogen dioxide standards. MR. GROSSMAN: And the date of that?
13	going in that's not in yet, and they don't quite know what	13	MR. SILVERMAN: The date is February 17th, 2012.
14	the actual air quality is?	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15	A You know, I don't interpret it that way. I	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay.
16	interpret it being that they are going to expand their	16	MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, while he's looking for
17	networks to get more complete coverage of other areas	17	that, what exhibit number did this get?
18	around, in large urban areas, to increase the monitors. In	18	MR. GROSSMAN: That is, 570 is the two-page fact
19	the highest locations they expect to get effects across	19	sheet
20	broad communities to make sure that the standards are being	20	MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
21	achieved. It doesn't say anything about the monitors being	21	MR. GROSSMAN: that purportedly described the
22	defective. It says they need more data, which they, by 2013	22	final rule, February 17, 2012, that the EPA put out
23	I presume they have expanded those networks. And the second	23	regarding NO2 standards.
24	stage would be, as I understand it, to expand the near road	24	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I think the critical line is
25	networks which are happening right about now.	25	the EPA and state agencies are currently
	Page 155		Page 157
1	Q So has EPA rescinded its rule, making the whole		
	Q 60 has LI A rescinded its rule, making the whole	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Where are you reading from, sir?
2	country unclassifiable for NO2?	1 2	MR. GROSSMAN: Where are you reading from, sir? MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal
2 3	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm		MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice.
	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you	2 3 4	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page?
3 4 5	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done	2 3 4 5	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section
3 4 5 6	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand
3 4 5 6 7	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register.
3 4 5 6 7 8	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number?
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>country unclassifiable for NO2?</li> <li>A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards</li> <li>Q They will.</li> <li>A The standards aren't been approached, Mr.</li> <li>Silverman.</li> <li>Q That's a little speculative, isn't it?</li> <li>A No, it's not.</li> <li>Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have something that defines the term?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the expanded network, the EPA will be able to evaluate NO2 air
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have something that defines the term? MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. My efforts to save my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the expanded network, the EPA will be able to evaluate NO2 air quality in additional locations.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have something that defines the term? MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. My efforts to save my printing costs failed. I do have a document which Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the expanded network, the EPA will be able to evaluate NO2 air quality in additional locations. MR. GROSSMAN: So that still doesn't answer my
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have something that defines the term? MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. My efforts to save my printing costs failed. I do have a document which Mr. Goecke also has, and maybe we could jump over this and I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the expanded network, the EPA will be able to evaluate NO2 air quality in additional locations. MR. GROSSMAN: So that still doesn't answer my question.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	country unclassifiable for NO2? A I don't know if they have or haven't, but what I'm saying from the data I've reviewed, which I just read to you for 2013, it sounds like they will be, if they haven't done it yet. The standards Q They will. A The standards aren't been approached, Mr. Silverman. Q That's a little speculative, isn't it? A No, it's not. Q You don't know they, you were on from, you have never seen the unclassifiable designation before. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure, what are you asking me to understand from the term unclassifiable slash attainment? What does that mean? MR. SILVERMAN: It means that there's a lot of doubt as to what, how much nitrogen dioxide is in the atmosphere. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that, but do you have something that defines the term? MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. My efforts to save my printing costs failed. I do have a document which Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from the Federal Register notice. MR. GROSSMAN: And what page? MR. SILVERMAN: Section MR. GROSSMAN: It's usually in the top left-hand corner, if you're reading from the Federal Register. MR. SILVERMAN: I'm reading from some, it's call the, it's the Federal Register. It says Federal Register.gov articles. The section number is, it's section number two. The purpose of this action MR. GROSSMAN: What's the section number? MR. SILVERMAN: Section number, Roman numeral two. The purpose of this action. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: It says, the last paragraph of that, it's a four paragraph the EPA and state agencies are currently working to establish and expand the network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013. Once three years of air quality data have been collected from the expanded network, the EPA will be able to evaluate NO2 air quality in additional locations. MR. GROSSMAN: So that still doesn't answer my

	Page 158		Page 160
-			
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Why do I believe that the term unclassifiable slash attainment means that there are	1	MR. SILVERMAN: I'll produce the whole Federal
2	problems with air quality, as opposed to saying that they	2	Register notice for our next meeting, just so it'll be
3 4	don't have the monitoring results yet to evaluate it?	4	complete. MR. GOECKE: Yeah, this is what you provided last
5	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. Yes, the section Roman	5	time.
6	numeral five, second paragraph, and maybe if Mr. Goecke	6	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
7	doesn't have an objection I could put this into evidence,	7	MR. GOECKE: You gave us one copy. Mr. Sullivan
8	too.	8	has it. I have no objection to you relying on it to ask him
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what does it say? Does it	9	questions about this document.
10	define that term?	10	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay, great.
11	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. It says the rule will also	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Would you mark this, Mr. Goecke?
12	set new requirements for the placement of NO2 monitors. The	12	MR. GOECKE: Sure.
13	rule being referenced was the change of standard, the NO2,	13	MR. GROSSMAN: So this will be Exhibit 571, and
14	lowering of the one-hour standard. The EPA and state	14	although I'm running out of room on the page here
15	agencies are currently working to establish an expanded	15	(Hearing Exhibit No. 571 was
16	network of NO2 monitors expected to be deployed in 2013.	16	marked for identification.)
17	NO2 concentrations near major roads are appreciably higher	17	MR. SILVERMAN: I see.
18	than those measured at monitors in the current network.	18	MR. GROSSMAN: so I hope you don't have any
19	Monitoring studies indicate that near roads, within about 50	19	more. So what is this exactly? This is the Federal
20	meters, concentrations of NO2 can be 30 to 100 percent than	20	Register.
21	concentrations away from major roads.	21	MR. SILVERMAN: It's a final rule from the Federal
22	The Clean Air Act requires the EPA to complete the	22	Register.
23	additional area designation process within three years of	23	MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one you just were
24	promulgating a new or revised max. However, if the	24	reading from, or
25	Administrator has insufficient information to make these	25	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
	Page 159		Page 161
1	Page 159 designations within that time frame, the EPA has the	1	Page 161 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
1 2		1 2	
	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the		MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable.
2	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012
2 3	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on
2 3 4	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say?
2 3 4 5 6 7	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it.	2 3 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right.	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: of putting this in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America. And it states whether they're in attainment, not attainment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: of putting this in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America. And it states whether they're in attainment, not attainment or attainment unclassifiable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: of putting this in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. So good. Now let's, let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America. And it states whether they're in attainment, not attainment or attainment unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: of putting this in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. So good. Now let's, let me, Mr. Goecke, do you have an objection if I introduce this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America. And it states whether they're in attainment, not attainment or attainment unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: And I want to just show that to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	designations within that time frame, the EPA has the authority to extend the designated process by up to one additional year. And so MR. GROSSMAN: That doesn't answer my question either. I mean just on its face, I would take the term unclassifiable slash attainment, unquote, to mean that they cannot classify it with regard to whether it's in attainment, not that it's low or high MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: they just can't classify it. MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: So I don't reach any pejorative interpretation of that, which is what you were implying. MR. SILVERMAN: No, no, I didn't mean to suggest one thing or another. There is comment about near road being higher than other places. But I'm just suggesting that there's some uncertainty as to what the actual concentrations in the air are. That's the only purpose MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: of putting this in. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. So good. Now let's, let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Explaining why the NO2 was unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: This is the February 17, 2012 Federal Register, a final rule from EPA on, I guess it's on measuring NO2, is that what you'd say? MR. SILVERMAN: It's designating the attainment or non-attainment. It's just designating areas of the country MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: for attainment or non- attainment MR. GROSSMAN: Designating MR. SILVERMAN: attainment, non-classifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: There it is. An attainment re: NO2. Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Take a quick look at that. And just to, not to put too fine a point on it, but at the end of the rule there's a list of all the counties in America. And it states whether they're in attainment, not attainment or attainment unclassifiable. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

_	Page 162		Page 164
1	MR. GROSSMAN: So we're unclassifiable attainment.	1	Q And the background station is some distance away,
2	MR. SILVERMAN: We are unclassifiable for sure.	2	right?
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Has that changed?	3	A Correct.
4	MR. SILVERMAN: No.	4	Q So we're talking about three monitors near the
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	5	road, is that right?
6	MR. SILVERMAN: Unless it, I'm not aware that it's	6	A We're talking about three near roadway monitors.
7	changed.	7	Q Okay. So was this a peer-reviewed report?
8	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	8	A It's unclear to me if it's peer-reviewed. It was
9	Q Okay, let's go back to the CRC report. I think I	9	produced by the Coordinating Research Council. Whether or
10	was asking whether you relied on this report, assessment of	10	not they peer-reviewed it or not, I don't know.
11	near roadway NO2 concentrations, in saying that the national	11	Q And what is the Coordinating Research Council?
12	data suggests that we don't have NO2 problems.	12	A I don't know their history. They're a non-profit
13	A Well, I said two things. One, I said that this	13	corporation supported by the petroleum and automotive
14	particular report showed a, perhaps one of the highways in	14	
15	the United States that has the highest potential for NO2	15	Q Now with regard to Interstate 710, near the Ports
16	problem, and that would be I-710, which services the Port of	16	of Long Beach and Los Angeles, are you aware of any activity
17	Long Beach. And the reason I said that is it has 190,000	17	in the last five years with the Ports of Long Beach and Los
18	vehicles a day, about 30 to 32,000 of which are heavy duty	18	Angeles, to curb emissions from vehicles going back and
19	diesel trucks servicing the port primarily. And if they	19	forth to the ports?
20	didn't have an issue there, I'd be surprised if they have an	20	A l've read a little bit about that roadway. I
20	addition, a problem at other highways. And as I said, this	20	don't remember any specific special measures that they're
22	report does show concentrations that are well below the	22	taking. But the data that are in here would be within the
22	standard.	22	last five years. It was 2010 and 2011 is what they're
23 24	Q Okay, good. So does this report, was this, how	23 24	reporting.
24	many cities did this report look at?	24 25	Q And you're not aware of the fact that those ports
23		25	
	Page 163		Page 165
1	A I looked at three or four, as I recall. I could	1	have taken extraordinary measures to curb air pollution in
2	look at it and give you a better answer.	2	their area.
3	Q Just take a look at that and make sure.	3	A Well, I don't, I haven't tracked different steps
4	A They were clearly examples. It was Las Vegas, Los	4	they've taken. But you're eeving ourgesting it sould have
			they've taken. But you're saying, suggesting it could have
5	Angeles, actually just those two.	5	been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.
5 6	Angeles, actually just those two. Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those	5 6	
			been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.
6	Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those	6	been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean. Q Yeah, just, now you said that the
6 7	Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?	6 7	been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean. Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I
6 7 8	<ul><li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li><li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li></ul>	6 7 8	been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean. Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if
6 7 8 9	<ul><li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li><li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li><li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li></ul>	6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area? MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area? MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure it is true. And I could</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could MR. GROSSMAN: That's not</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area? MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could MR. GROSSMAN: That's not MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area? MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure it is true. And I could MR. GROSSMAN: That's not MR. SILVERMAN: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That's not</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the east site is 80 meters from the highway,</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That's not</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: you realize.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the east site is 80 meters from the highway, both of which are downwind of the airflow.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That's not</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: you realize.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: I understand. Understood.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the east site is 80 meters from the highway, both of which are downwind of the airflow.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record. MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area? MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could MR. GROSSMAN: That's not MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: you realize.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: I understand. Understood.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And so usually, I mean you're</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Just those two. And how many roadways in those cities did it look at?</li> <li>A I didn't, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways are in Los Angeles?</li> <li>Q No, no, how many roadways did the report examine?</li> <li>A When you say roadways, you mean how many sites did it examine?</li> <li>Q How many sites, yes, how many sites?</li> <li>A It had, as I recall, two sites at each location.</li> <li>Q It had two sites at each location?</li> <li>A Correct. I know there were two sites in I-710.</li> <li>We can look at the other one if you'd like. There's one designated as the west site, which is 15 meters from the highway.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the east site is 80 meters from the highway, both of which are downwind of the airflow.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A If you go to Las Vegas. They appear to have the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>been higher earlier? I'm not sure what you mean.</li> <li>Q Yeah, just, now you said that the MR. GOECKE: I'd like to object, to the extent I</li> <li>don't know if that's in the record or if he's going to, if</li> <li>he's proffering it, he's going to put it in the record.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Are you proffering that there's</li> <li>going to be some evidence in the record that they've taken</li> <li>extraordinary means to reduce pollution in that area?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: That seems real peripheral. I</li> <li>thought he would know that. I know it is true, and I'm sure</li> <li>it is true. And I could</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: That's not</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: quite the same</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: you realize.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: I understand. Understood.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: And so usually, I mean you're</li> </ul>

	Page 166		Page 168
1	on cross-examination	1	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah.	2	Q A reduction of the max to 80 parts per billion
3	MR. GROSSMAN: but you can't assume a fact	3	would likely cause the Los Angeles location to be above the
4	that's not either in evidence or you are, or is not capable	4	standard. Now I want to go just briefly to your, I wish I
5	of being proved.	5	had Ms. Rosenfeld's facility in organizing papers. I want
6	MR. SILVERMAN: Right, it's certainly capable of	6	to go to your
7	being proved, and we'll try to put, I was just surprised	7	MR. GROSSMAN: You didn't work all Mother's Day.
8	that Mr. Sullivan was not aware of those activities.	8	MR. SILVERMAN: Right, yes. I did not.
9	They're huge, but	9	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
10	THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of	10	Q All right, so yes, I want to go to your, in your
11	MR. SILVERMAN: Right.	11	rebuttal report, figure two. And the heading on the, and
12	MR. GROSSMAN: It may not exist, so he may not be	12	this is on page 12. And you show the heading on the top,
13	aware of it.	13	the last phrase, it says, there's a bracket. It says max
14	MR. SILVERMAN: That could be, too. That could	14	equals 156 micrograms per cubic meter at certain points, is
15	be, too. All right. I'll, I will, let me think about	15	that right?
16	whether to build the record some more, but there's plenty to	16	A It shows that below at the loading dock area.
17	go.	17	That's correct.
18	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	18	Q Right. So how do we convert that again to parts
19	Q Okay, so now one of the things discussed in this	19	per billion? I've forgotten how to do that.
20	report is the debate within EPA as to whether to make the	20	A You want to divide by 1.88.
21	NO2 standard 80 or 100? Do you recall that?	21	Q So if we divide 188 by, into 156, what do we get?
22	A I do.	22	A You want to do it?
23	Q And with regard to the I-710, Port of Long Beach,	23	MS. CORDRY: Anybody want me to divide?
24	if, what does the report say would happen there if the	24	MR. GROSSMAN: One-fifty-six by 1.88.
25	standard were lowered to 80?	25	MR. SILVERMAN: One-fifty-six divided by 1.88.
	Page 167		Page 169
1	Page 167	1	Page 169 MS_CORDRY: That would be 82 97 percent
1	A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710	1	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent.
2	A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.	2	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
	A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710		MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality
2 3 4	<ul><li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li><li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li><li>A I would think it would.</li></ul>	2 3 4	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse
2 3	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710.
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710.
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher?</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right. A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot. Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher?</li> <li>UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that while both sites were below the one-hour NO2 max, a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right. A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot. Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two locations with the three monitors, was this a modeling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that while both sites were below the one-hour NO2 max, a reduction of the max to 80 parts per billion would likely</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right. A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot. Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two locations with the three monitors, was this a modeling report or was it a monitor, a monitored report?
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 The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that while both sites were below the one-hour NO2 max, a reduction of the max to 80 parts per billion would likely cause the Los Angeles location to be above the standard.</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. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right. A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot. Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two locations with the three monitors, was this a modeling report or was it a monitor, a monitored report? A It was a monitoring study.
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 The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that while both sites were below the one-hour NO2 max, a reduction of the max to 80 parts per billion would likely cause the Los Angeles location to be above the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I missed the last part of 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 24	<ul> <li>MS. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710.</li> <li>A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct.</li> <li>Q If that was correct.</li> <li>A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year.</li> <li>Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right?</li> <li>A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot.</li> <li>Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two locations with the three monitors, was this a modeling report or was it a monitor, a monitored report?</li> <li>A It was a monitoring study.</li> <li>Q A monitoring study. Is a monitoring study, are</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 The, certainly that monitor 15 meters from I-710 would be over 80, as I recall.</li> <li>Q It would be over 80. It would exceed 80.</li> <li>A I would think it would.</li> <li>Q It would exceed the standard, if the standard went down to 80. Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Eighty what?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: PPB. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Parts per billion.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Parts per billion, yes.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q So and the authors expressed some concern about that, right? Where they alert EPA to the problem here.</li> <li>A I don't remember it saying they alerted EPA to a problem.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a leaky pitcher? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry about that. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Well, let me just read you a paragraph from the ES-2, the last paragraph. This study demonstrates that while both sites were below the one-hour NO2 max, a reduction of the max to 80 parts per billion would likely cause the Los Angeles location to be above the standard.</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. CORDRY: That would be 82.97 percent. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, actually at those two points the air quality in the, at the, in the area we're talking about, is worse than I-710. A It'd be the highest in the United States, if that was correct. Q If that was correct. A I've already pointed out that the modeling here is extremely conservative, and the range would be 75 to 100. I feel very comfortable with that, Mr. Silverman. One-fifty- six occurred, I could find out where, but that's the highest in the U.S. last year. Q The highest monitor. But this is not a monitored concentration. Yours is a model concentration, right? A Mine is a very conservative modeled concentration. Q Right. A And it's surely not, wouldn't be measured at that spot. Q Well, we have a, no, the CRC report at these two locations with the three monitors, was this a modeling report or was it a monitor, a monitored report? A It was a monitoring study.

	Page 170		Page 172
1	A Not necessarily. But it's directly measured, Mr.	1	therefore we couldn't possibly be in exceedance of that.
2	Silverman. It's a directly measured value over a period of	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
3	two years, 15 meters from a very busy and congested road. $$ I	3	MR. SILVERMAN: And what I'm suggesting is that
4	mean I-710 isn't just busy, it's congested. You read that,	4	every situation is sui generis. If we had a 50-city study
5	too. I mean it has a lot of issues.	5	or a three-year study or a five-year study over a whole
6	Q Well, also there's quite a large difference	6	area, you can then use that kind of information, well, in
7	between the Las Vegas site and the Los Angeles site, although the traffic seems to be comparable. Would you	7	Los Angeles, the Port of Los Angeles is not even exceeding 100 at this point. But to just pick a site somewhere, you
9	agree with that?	9	know, find a report which is a very interesting report,
10	A Very different. Very different situation.	10	certainly worth reading, and say oh, this tells us that we
11	Q What are some of the differences?	11	don't have anything to worry about in Wheaton I think is
12	A Well, one big difference is they have like one and	12	totally, it's
13	a half percent diesel trucks in Las Vegas, and they have 15	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and I'm not going to base
14	to 18 percent diesel trucks servicing the Port of Long	14	any findings on what California measurements are. I'm going
15	Beach. Diesel trucks, especially not clean diesels, you	15	to base it on the evidence that pertains to this site, the
16	know, are putting out a lot of NO2.	16	subject site, so
17	Q Well, is it your impression that not clean diesels	17	MR. SILVERMAN: is that your
18	are allowed at the Port of Long Beach?	18	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure where this gets
19	A I don't know for a fact. I assume there's a	19	you. I understand the points you're making.
20	mixture servicing the port. But I don't know for a fact.	20	MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah. MR. GROSSMAN: That to the extent that the
21 22	Q Well, I think I will proffer some evidence here. I can't do it today, but I'll put in evidence that they are	21	applicant draws comfort from the idea that even very busy
22	verboten, they're forbidden	22 23	sites have only a certain level, that's not to say that this
24	A Well, except	24	site couldn't have more if your evidence shows that it has
25	Q at the Port of Los Angeles.	25	more. That's the question, what the evidence shows.
	Ŭ		
	Page 171		Page 173
1	A I'll accept that, Mr. Silverman. The issue is	1	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road	1 2	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I
2 3	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be,	2 3	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710.
2 3 4	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary	2 3 4	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this
2 3 4 5	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las	2 3 4 5	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it
2 3 4 5 6	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many,	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions?
2 3 4 5 6 7	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of	2 3 4 5 6 7	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're
2 3 4 5 6	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different.	2 3 4 5 6	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different.</li> <li>Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference?</li> <li>A Well, it certainly can.</li> <li>Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different.</li> <li>Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference?</li> <li>A Well, it certainly can.</li> <li>Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that's exactly the point,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements around the country show for much busier places than this,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that's exactly the point, Mr. Grossman, that I think one of the things Costco relies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements around the country show for much busier places than this, affected by power plants, highways, what have you, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different.</li> <li>Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference?</li> <li>A Well, it certainly can.</li> <li>Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that's exactly the point, Mr. Grossman, that I think one of the things Costco relies on, and I believe they rely on it in many ways, not just for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements around the country show for much busier places than this, affected by power plants, highways, what have you, you're not seeing that kind of conversion. You're not seeing those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that's exactly the point, Mr. Grossman, that I think one of the things Costco relies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements around the country show for much busier places than this, affected by power plants, highways, what have you, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you have 30,000 heavy duty diesel trucks servicing that road every day. Whether it be clean diesel or whether it be, they be regular diesel, the issue is that is the primary difference between Los Angeles monitoring at I-710, and Las Vegas near Frye (phonetic sp.) school. They have many, their total counts are similar, but the actual amount of heavy diesels is very different. Q So what you see as the difference. How about the presence of ozone, background ozone? You think that makes a difference? A Well, it certainly can. Q And what do the study's authors say? MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman, let me stop you a second. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Where is this really going to get us? In terms of the location, the subject site, as opposed to California. MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that's exactly the point, Mr. Grossman, that I think one of the things Costco relies on, and I believe they rely on it in many ways, not just for evidence, but even perhaps psychologically. They rely on is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Yes, and do you agree with, do you rely on the, I mean in your report you reference the California I-710. You've referenced it several times here, so is this important in you reaching your conclusions, or is it important in validating your conclusions? A Mr. Silverman, I think what's important, we're talking about a lot of complicated complex issues here. Ozone conversion of NO to NO2, various modeling issues. I was trying to provide perspective for the record, cut to the chase. Not just Los Angeles I-710, but the entire country, as I testified today. If there's 822 reporting monitors in the U.S, and the highest one is 156, we're questioning will the loading dock at Costco produce higher values than that. I think it's an important perspective to cut through all the modeling issues and say what's the reality check. And the reality check is you're not going to get high values of NO2 at this ring road. We've modeled it. The measurements around the country show for much busier places than this, affected by power plants, highways, what have you, you're not seeing that kind of conversion. You're not seeing those kind of levels. That's all I'm trying to show.

	Page 174		Page 176
1	MR. SILVERMAN: Right.	1	discussed before, we had these discussions in the past about
2	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that that's, I understand	2	any strange diurnal flows. Well, rather than flowing down
3	his basis for saying that. He's saying if you look all over	3	the hillside, which we show won't happen anyway because of
4	the country, the highest you'll see is 156 parts, not parts	4	the fact that it's so hot on the mall, the wall would act as
5	per billion but micrograms per cubic meter of NO2. And	5	a blocking mechanism at night, much more at night than the
6	hourly. And therefore he says it's very unlikely that this	6	daytime. Daytime it's going to go over the wall much more.
7	site would have that.	7	At night it could flow around the wall.
8	But if the evidence shows that this site has more,	8	MR. GROSSMAN: That testimony was probably a year
9	that's what I would go on. I understand his rationale. I'm	9	ago now.
10	not saying it doesn't exist. And I'm not, I didn't stop you	10	THE WITNESS: It was, at least.
11	from trying to undermine it. But the real direct evidence	11	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
12	is what's going to control here.	12	Q Yeah. Okay. All right. But so you have
13	MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I hope so. I mean really	13	confidence about the wall, even though the authors of this
14	EPA is, why doesn't EPA change the rule about unclassifiable	14	study we're discussing did not have confidence as to
15	if this is all the evidence they need to reach a conclusion?	15	A They were talking about
16	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think, he can't	16	Q what its impact would be.
17	answer why the EPA does or doesn't do something.	17	A the representativenss of a monitor. I'm
18	THE WITNESS: Well, I did find the	18	talking about practical modeling. If you looked at a,
19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, you don't have to,	19	people do not model walls in doing dispersion modeling in
20	there's no question pending.	20	this context.
21	THE WITNESS: Sorry.	21	Q On page 4-1, the first, I'm sorry, yeah, the third
22	MR. GROSSMAN: I sustained my own objection.	22	paragraph
23	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	23	A Of which document?
24	Q At the Las Vegas site there was a wall, wasn't there?	24	Q Of the Exhibit 342. A Okay.
25		25	A Okay.
	Page 175		Page 177
1	Page 175 A There was.	1	ů –
1		1	
	A There was.		Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to
2	<ul><li>A There was.</li><li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the</li></ul>	2	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become
2 3 4	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were</li> </ul>	2 3	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>A There was.</li><li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li><li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a</li></ul>	2 3 4	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A There was. Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings? A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes. Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect? A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models? A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models? A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> <li>Q Yes. Now we've had a lot of sort of tangential</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models? A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix. But for Costco, they don't service diesels, so it really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> <li>Q Yes. Now we've had a lot of sort of tangential conversations about walls, but did you, in your latest</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models? A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix. But for Costco, they don't service diesels, so it really wasn't an issue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> <li>Q Yes. Now we've had a lot of sort of tangential conversations about walls, but did you, in your latest rebuttal report did you model the wall?</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>Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?</li> <li>A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix. But for Costco, they don't service diesels, so it really wasn't an issue.</li> <li>Q But there are diesels in the area, are there 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	<ul> <li>A There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> <li>Q Yes. Now we've had a lot of sort of tangential conversations about walls, but did you, in your latest rebuttal report did you model the wall?</li> <li>A We can't model the wall. Nobody can really model</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>Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?</li> <li>A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix. But for Costco, they don't service diesels, so it really wasn't an issue.</li> <li>Q But there are diesels in the area, are there not?</li> <li>A Right, but we're talking really about a gas</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 There was.</li> <li>Q And isn't it a fact that that wall caused the authors of the study to scratch their heads and they were unclear as to how the wall would affect the accuracy of their readings?</li> <li>A I wouldn't have put the monitor near a wall, on a wall myself, but yeah, I think that was a factor to some extent, yes.</li> <li>Q So walls, what are some of the things that walls could do? Could they cause more turbulence and more mixing between NOX and ozone? Could they have that effect?</li> <li>A They could do that. They could block. I think that a better site, and why I emphasize it, was I-710, which is an open area. It's right next to the road, nothing blocking it. The wall, yeah, I'd agree the wall will create more dispersion. It could create some zones that it will flow differently around the monitor.</li> <li>Q Yes.</li> <li>A Under certain wind directions that could happen.</li> <li>Q Yes. Now we've had a lot of sort of tangential conversations about walls, but did you, in your latest rebuttal report did you model the wall?</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>Q So it says, they have, they say a consideration to make here is that as gasoline and diesel engines become increasingly advanced, NOX emissions are decreasing, so future decreases in max may come after a significant reduction of fleet emissions of NO2 have already been achieved. A caveat to this is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations. Given these considerations, care should be exercised when making future predictions of near road NO2 concentrations for individual road segments using current fleet models. Did you take such care and consideration of the, some of the vagaries of so-called fleet models?</li> <li>A Yeah, there's a reference I reviewed in my set about that, where they noticed that the ratio of NO2 to NOX went up, and the conclusion was there was more diesel vehicles, light duty diesel vehicles added to the fleet mix. But for Costco, they don't service diesels, so it really wasn't an issue.</li> <li>Q But there are diesels in the area, are there not?</li> <li>A Right, but we're talking really about a gas station that sells gasoline only. So the gas queue is not</li> </ul>

	Page 178		Page 180
1 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 And the, but exactly, the loading dock primarily clean diesel. There's a suggestion here, if I understood it, maybe you understood it differently, is that the clean diesel would, although it has many benefits, may have a drawback, which is that more of the NOX was converted to NO2. Do you agree with that, or did you consider that?</li> <li>A No, that's not, I think it's, that's not really what I think it's saying. It's saying that is you change your fleet mix and have more diesel vehicles, and there's someplace in Europe that that's happening more than here, that as you add more diesel vehicles to the mix, especially passenger vehicles, that your ratios can change. I recall reading that.</li> <li>Q Well, this, they tested a repeat upward or deciding words, the caveat is that recent studies have found that although NOX from newer diesel vehicles is decreasing, the relative fraction of direct NO2 emissions from these newer vehicles can be considerably higher than for traditional fuels and engine configurations.</li> <li>A So the idea is that they produce much less particulate matter, but maybe a higher fraction of NO2 from NOX.</li> <li>Q Yes. So you agree with that, disagree with it? Are you aware of it?</li> </ul>	1 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 But we're just, so we're going to ignore the Las Vegas section. That's really not relevant. Which has the lower measurements.</li> <li>A I don't agree it's not relevant at all. What I'm saying is I agree it's only a few locations. I think that I-710 is an important one. But we can look across the whole country, or we can look across the entire state of California. And you know, California reported 100, 103 stations reported there for 2013. And the highest one there was 145 micrograms across the entire state. So I think that you know, for broader context, again the odds of a violation occurring at this ring road are extremely remote.</li> <li>Q So but all the measurements you're citing, or I won't say all, because it's maybe not all, but the majority of the references you're citing, the sites you're citing, were developed before the standard was changed and before the EPA started changing the rules about where to put monitors, right?</li> <li>A Well, they are going to put them near major highways, but there's no major highway at the ring, where the ring road is.</li> <li>Q So you have a hypothesis that the air pollution,</li> </ul>
24	Are you aware of it? A I was aware of that. The ratios can change. The	24	
25	A Twas aware of that. The fatios can change. The	25	beltway, are always going to be worse than norm a congested
	Page 179		Page 181
1	literature right now is showing ratios that are quite a bit	1	parking lot or gas station. That's your hypothesis. A I made a statement relative to the Costco Wheaton
2	less than the 25 percent that I used here. Most of the ratios are in the range of five to 10 percent from tunnel	2	A I made a statement relative to the Costco Wheaton facility, that it'd be hard pressed for an analyst to look
4			
	studies and near roadway studies. If you can isolate away	4	at I-710 or the rest of the country, and draw the conclusion
	from the ambient, the background component, which is	4 5	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is
5 6 7	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel.	4 5 6 7	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by
6	from the ambient, the background component, which is		that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by
6 7 8 9	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the	7 8 9	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard. Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not
6 7 8 9 10	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U	7 8 9 10	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard. Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United
6 7 8 9 10 11	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that?	7 8 9 10 11	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard. Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States. Maybe the worst source in the United States has not
6 7 8 9 10	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U	7 8 9 10	that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard. Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United
6 7 9 10 11	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States. Maybe the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States. Maybe the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States. Maybe the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the highway that they were measuring, monitoring in Las Vegas, they found, this is unbelievable, I'm going to move there, during the study period the speeds at Las Vegas were never	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some clunkers in there, but not 822.</li> <li>Q Well, the majority. I mean why would EPA be unable to classify the air quality if they have confidence</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the highway that they were measuring, monitoring in Las Vegas, they found, this is unbelievable, I'm going to move there, during the study period the speeds at Las Vegas were never less than 45 miles per hour. So that Las Vegas might be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some clunkers in there, but not 822.</li> <li>Q Well, the majority. I mean why would EPA be unable to classify the air quality if they have confidence in those 822 monitors?</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the highway that they were measuring, monitoring in Las Vegas, they found, this is unbelievable, I'm going to move there, during the study period the speeds at Las Vegas were never	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some clunkers in there, but not 822.</li> <li>Q Well, the majority. I mean why would EPA be unable to classify the air quality if they have confidence</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the highway that they were measuring, monitoring in Las Vegas, they found, this is unbelievable, I'm going to move there, during the study period the speeds at Las Vegas were never less than 45 miles per hour. So that Las Vegas might be very relevant to a queued line, would it? A Well, we could flip that, though. I mean you've been to L.A., right? L.A., all their, pretty much all their	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States. Maybe the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some clunkers in there, but not 822.</li> <li>Q Well, the majority. I mean why would EPA be unable to classify the air quality if they have confidence in those 822 monitors?</li> <li>A I'm not going to read it, but the document you have, it tells you why. It's shown, I'll just cite the page number, 12056</li> </ul>
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from the ambient, the background component, which is difficult to do if it's in a tunnel. Q Page 3-9, the last paragraph, do you agree with this? Models of NOX emissions from vehicles reach a minimum at approximately 40 miles per hour, and increase as the vehicle speeds either decreases or increases, forming a U shape. Do you agree with that? A I don't have any reason to disagree with it. I did not realize that above 40 miles an hour you get a drop, but we're not modeling anything above 30 miles an hour in this particular study. Q And again, not to beat a dead horse here, the highway that they were measuring, monitoring in Las Vegas, they found, this is unbelievable, I'm going to move there, during the study period the speeds at Las Vegas were never less than 45 miles per hour. So that Las Vegas might be very relevant to a queued line, would it? A Well, we could flip that, though. I mean you've	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>that for some reason the ring road and this gas station is going to be the greatest source in the United States by about 40 micrograms per cubic meter to hit the standard.</li> <li>Q Well, it will exceed what questionable monitors have shown in other parts of the United States. That's not necessarily saying it's the worst source in the United States has not been measured. Is that possible?</li> <li>A Well, Mr. Silverman, there's in 2013 there's 822 sites the EPA is reporting as of today.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A And the highest is 156. And they may have some clunkers in there, but not 822.</li> <li>Q Well, the majority. I mean why would EPA be unable to classify the air quality if they have confidence in those 822 monitors?</li> <li>A I'm not going to read it, but the document you have, it tells you why. It's shown, I'll just cite the page</li> </ul>

	Page 182		Page 184
1	MR. GROSSMAN: What's the exhibit number on that?	1	one word, A-I-R-D-A-T-A, data base.
2	THE WITNESS: I don't know. Air quality	2	MR. GROSSMAN: And is that in the record? No?
3	designations for the 2010 primary NO2 standard. The rule,	3	MS. CORDRY: No, that's something that's on-line
4	it's the February 17th, 2012 Federal Register.	4	and you can query it for, which we've both been querying a
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, the one he just referenced?	5	different kind. Some of those print-outs that I did, and
6	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: Is that the same?	6	that Mr. Sullivan has put in, come from querying that on- line data base.
7	MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah, February 17th.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess we should have that,
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's Exhibit 571.	9	since you've referenced it a number of times.
10	MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah.	10	MR. GOECKE: We can provide that.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: And what were you reading from	11	THE WITNESS: We can provide it.
12	there?	12	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
13	THE WITNESS: You want me to read it?	13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we allowed to have on-
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, but I wanted to get what	14	line data bases?
15	section it was.	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I've allowed on-line, that are
16	THE WITNESS: Oh, it's in section number six. The	16	verifiable, and exchanged, and the information is exchanged.
17 18	end of section six MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	17	I've questioned whether you can put in on-line things that are subject to being changed, like somebody's writing in
19	THE WITNESS: the last full sentence.	18 19	their opinion on something and that kind of thing. So it
20	MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on. That's not what the, the	20	depends on its verifiability and so on.
21	last sentence in what I have for section six says	21	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
22	THE WITNESS: Do you have a page 12056? Either	22	Q Let me ask you a question about the urban and
23	yours aren't numbered the same	23	rural. Suppose Mr. Agliata and Westfield suddenly see the
24	MR. GROSSMAN: No, what's	24	light and decide to plant trees all around the parking lot.
25	THE WITNESS: The last section, yeah, it's the	25	Would that change the calculation of urban and rural?
	Page 183		Page 185
1	Page 183 last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence?	1	Page 185 A It would not.
1 2		1 2	
	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence?		<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was,</li> </ul>
2	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying.	2 3 4	A It would not. Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?
2 3 4 5	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements,	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A It would not. Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural? A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A It would not. Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural? A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall? MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A It would not. Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural? A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall? MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A It would not. Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural? A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall? MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that. THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 national ambient air quality</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 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	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> <li>A No, Mr. Silverman, the parking lot is a hot source relative to the rest of the environment. We measured that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 national ambient air quality</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 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	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> <li>A No, Mr. Silverman, the parking lot is a hot source relative to the rest of the environment. We measured that on several nights. I've put that on the record. It's</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>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 national ambient air quality standards.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I was actually, yeah, you read that. I understand that. But I, you had mentioned the</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 It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> <li>A No, Mr. Silverman, the parking lot is a hot source relative to the rest of the environment. We measured that on several nights. I've put that on the record. It's urban. It has heat. It's going to not get the stable nighttime conditions that a rural area would get. I think we have agreement that it's an urban source, between the two</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>last part of section six. Should I read it, the sentence? MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I just want to make sure, I want to find the sentence in here. So if it's the last sentence in section six, it doesn't say what you're saying. THE WITNESS: Okay. It talks about designations and boundaries. Section six, what guidance did the EPA issue and how did the EPA apply the statutory requirements, applicable guidance for determining area, designations and boundaries.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I have that heading. THE WITNESS: And then the last sentence of it gets into the issue about unclassifiable attainment. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, the last, yes, okay, so go ahead and read that. THE WITNESS: The EPA uses this designation practice, which is referring to unclassifiable slash attainment, for initial designations to mean that available information does not indicate that the air quality in these areas exceeds the 2010 NO2 national ambient air quality standards.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I was actually, yeah, you read that. I understand that. But I, you had mentioned the site, that there were, there were 882 sites in the U.S., 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	<ul> <li>A It would not.</li> <li>Q And the area that was the original area for the first gas station proposal, that's grassy now. If that was, if that remained grassy, would that change the urban/rural?</li> <li>A For the whole model, no. But I was mentioning was that was going to be not grassy in the future.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the evidence here, is that that's not going to be grassy, that's going to be MR. SILVERMAN: But I mean are we frozen here in time as to how much greenery gets into the mall?</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean we evaluate the site as it is proposed to be, and then my understanding that the site and that surrounding parking lot would be a parking lot once, you know, if this is approved.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q And there were some, also some stormwater elements to handle the stormwater from the gas station, which are green. And would these affect the urban/rural?</li> <li>A No, Mr. Silverman, the parking lot is a hot source relative to the rest of the environment. We measured that on several nights. I've put that on the record. It's urban. It has heat. It's going to not get the stable nighttime conditions that a rural area would get. I think</li> </ul>

	Page 186		Page 188
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	here or a tree there. It's not going to change the fact it's a big mall with a parking lot and a ring road and a gas station queue. That's what it is. It's an urban kind of a warm surface that's going to produce mixing, unlike a rural designation would. Q All right, well, don't people plant trees and vegetation to mitigate urban hot spots? Isn't that something that people do sometimes? A Well, sometimes they have a park in the middle of a city, which will create a cool spot. And so that, it will, at night it will flow from the cool spot to the rest of the area and cool it down. But here it's the opposite. We have a hot spot and the air's going to flow into the mall, and when it does it's going to cross a hot, well- mixing, urban-type dispersion condition. Q Okay. So you're, no matter how much Westfield decides to green up this mall, it's not going to change your calculation at all in the future. A Well, that's an extreme. If they were to tear out the parking lot and put in trees, make a little forest in there, that'd be a different situation. But putting a tree here and there is not going to change the overall dynamics. Q You said, you described, today you described your analysis in your rebuttal report as extremely conservative,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 23	MR. GROSSMAN: I'll make the jokes. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. Thank you. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Okay, the, oh yeah, background. We were talking about margins of error in your modeling. You distinguish between taking a 50 percent margin of error for the modeling, and you said well, the background is different because that's a fixed number. And so we don't take the 50 percent for the margin of error, if that's the right term, for the background. We just do it for the modeling. I think you and Mr. Grossman had that conversation. A We did. I mean actually when I said it was plus or minus 50 percent, I was close. But the EPA actually says plus or minus 10 to 40 percent in the appendix W. Q But that's for the modeling. Now is there any margin of error in the background? A I think the margin of error refers to the modeling analysis, which is of the part you're modeling. First of all EPA, I have quotes from appendix W, that clarifies this issue. EPA recommends that you do not modify the modeling beyond a bright line. And they make it clear that, and I could put it into evidence if you'd like, that they don't recommend doing that. They provide it for perspective for decision-makers, but they don't recommend scaling things up
25	so what about your prior reports? Were they, would you use	25	to make decisions.
	Page 187		Page 189
2 3 4 5 6	the same adverb, that they are extremely conservative? Or would use another adverb? A I'd say they were very conservative. Q They're very conservative. A Extreme is, I don't know where you draw the line between very and extreme, but I have no doubt in my mind that the modeling of each of these reports is overstating the actual impact. Q I'm sure you have no doubt in your mind. But I'm trying to get the words. We started out the year 2012 reports as being, well, they were extremely conservative too, right? A I don't recall the MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what difference does it make how we characterize them? He's called them conservative. He says this current one is conservative. Whether you call that first one ultra-conservative or whatever, certain products are described only as large, enormous and gigantic enormous, you know? MR. SILVERMAN: Well, I mean I guess the point is that each of your iterations is a little bit less conservative than the one before, so I don't know what the first one would be called. I guess it would be called ridiculously conservative. MS. ADELMAN: Tea Party conservative.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I mean that may be one of those differences here that, not mentioned by the opposition, but where there's an advantage to the process here in that we can consider those potential errors or they potential for uncertainty, whereas apparently the EPA does not. So all these methods have their different benefits or deficits. THE WITNESS: Mm-hmm. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the question I have is how confident are you that the measured background at the particular site in Arlington or wherever it is, you pick it, actually reflects what you breathe when you walk down the Wheaton mall? A Well, if you ask me does it hit it every day at every location, I'd say no, it can't do that. But over the course of a year or multiple years, is it providing representative data on the distribution? I'll say yes, and probably conservatively so. MR. GROSSMAN: But I think that Mr. Silverman's question is a good one. That is, when we discussed it the other day, you corrected my assumption that the 50 percent would apply to the whole amount, and said no, it would only, the 50 percent error potential only applied to modeled amount and not to the background. Is there an uncertainty factor for the monitored locations that you can apply in the

	Page 190		Page 192
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	same ways you could apply a 50 percent plus or minus for the modeled? THE WITNESS: Are you referring to the monitor, plus or minus a tolerance range MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: for accuracy? They, each one does have its own reported value, plus or minus a certain tolerance value. It's usually contained in the existing protocol of what the target data quality objectives are. And they'll define it, and these instruments do have defined uncertainty ranges. MR. GROSSMAN: But I'm actually talking about once you have the statistical information, that is, you've got the read-outs over a longer period of time, is there an uncertainty level to that average read-out level that you are relying on in your, to plug into your model? THE WITNESS: Are you referring to how it was represented at a specific location? MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I mean you have a, you get some results from the, let's say the two monitors in Beltsville and you average them together, and they cover a certain period of time. And let's say the level is 50. Is there a plus or minus two or five or 10 to that 50, that you could attach in evaluating the potential uncertainty to the monitored amount?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE WITNESS: Like I said, I've never seen that shown or used. And that's certainly a logical question to ask, but I've never seen that quantified. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Do you have an expert opinion on that? THE WITNESS: I think that, you know, what we're doing here is we're modeling all the major roadways that are going to have a significance effect on this location. So in that sense we're covering the nearby, you know, most significance sources anyway. If you take a location like the Arlington monitor, which you know, is in a pretty congested area too, and you would add that, and there's roads going near that too that we, that have not been, that are contributing to that MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: location. I think in that kind of context it is conservative. If we didn't model the nearby roadways, it may be a different story, but we did. And so my expectation is that factor, coupled with the fact the trend is dropping, for the gas stations built in 2014 and '15 that trend should likely be less than it is now, which would give you some buffer. How much and how to quantify that, you know, the trend line could be used to give some indication of a drop in that sense. But you're asking about the other way. too.
25	monitored amount?	25	asking about the other way, too.
	Page 191		Page 193
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	THE WITNESS: It's easier to do it for the actual instrument accuracy MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: which is why I was, tended to try to be conservative. So for example for PM2.5, you know, we'd hit the higher of Rockville versus Beltsville. Does that, could you argue could it be possibly higher? Well, I suppose you could argue that, but the issue is we are, we continue to show a downward trend. The question is by the time they actually build this gas station will the trend be, will the numbers be lower, and the odds are they will be. And so in that context the values we use now are probably going to overstate to some degree, but I don't usually see people with error values on those. I've never actually ever seen that. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. But see my, that doesn't exactly answer my question. I'm not saying what you're saying is illogical. I'm just saying in trying to analyze this, and analyze what is the margin for error in your predictions, you supplied me with a figure of 50 percent for the modeled amount, but you didn't supply me with a figure in terms of margin of error for the monitored amount. And I'm asking you is there some accepted figure when you have two years or three years of monitor results for a margin of error for that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: The other end, too, yes. THE WITNESS: The other way, too, is a little bit difficult to quantify. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And you don't, do you agree with the CRC report that's saying that near roadway measurements could be 30 to 100 percent higher than on the more distant monitors? Would you agree with that? A I would say based upon looking at the data they collected there, versus the data I've seen for other parts of the country and more typical sites, it seems right. Near a highly traveled busy roadway, concentrations should be substantially higher than places removed. Q And you do acknowledge that the monitoring network that gives us the backgrounds is undergoing a thoroughgoing change. A Free zone NO2? Q Yes. A Well, they said in 2013, and we've already talked about the near roadway, again my position on that is that there are no highways here, that that's not the issue. So I don't see that impacting this site in any way. Q So your hypothesis is that, again I think I'd asked you this before, just I'm not sure I got an answer, is

	Page 194		Page 196
1	that a congested parking lot will never be as bad as a busy	1	A I don't recall error bars this year and I should
2	highway.	2	have mentioned to you in the
3	A I don't like to use the word never.	3	Q I just draw your attention to it, maybe I don't
4	Q Uh-huh.	4	understand what an error bar is, but I thought I did. Here,
5	A But if you're asking like 98th percentile kind of	5	for example, on page 310
6	a distributional sense, I can't imagine a mall parking lot	6	A They're showing a distribution there, as I read
7	having the same degree of congestion as I-95, I-395 at rush	7	that, with each of the ends they're showing the max and the
8	hour when you have an accident, which happens unfortunately	8	mins, and it's showing, I'd have to read this in more
9	too often, that blocks traffic for long periods of time.	9	detail, but the percentile, probably 25th percentile, 50th,
10	It's in the data sets. That's not going to, I can't	10	and 75th percentile. It's showing ranges of measured
11	envision that happening in a mall.	11	values.
12	Q You can't envision queues and lines and idling	12	Q Those rectangles are not error bars, that's not a
13	cars in the mall?	13	proper phrase?
14	A Well, I didn't say I couldn't envision idling cars	14	A I said I'd have to read the report in greater
15	in the mall, but I can't, I have never been to a mall when	15	detail, but those kind of plots generally what we use to
16	there's long lines of cars like I-395 would have, you know,	16	present quartiles of measured data.
17	stalled there for long periods of time. I mean I haven't	17	Q Yeah, how about page C-11?
18	seen that at a mall.	18	MR. GROSSMAN: C-11?
19	Q Okay. So in your report, you have a conclusion in	19	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
20	your latest report that	20	THE WITNESS: I don't have a C-11.
21	MR. GROSSMAN: The rebuttal report.	21	MR. SILVERMAN: I'm sorry, it's 311. I'm sorry.
22	MR. SILVERMAN: The rebuttal report.	22	THE WITNESS: To me, though, I mean again we could
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	23	look at the, maybe there's some greater detail, but I don't
24	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	24	read that as suggesting error bars but rather presenting the
25	Q Yes, here it is, on page 10, it looks like. Oh,	25	data showing the extremes going from, in this case it looks
	Page 195		Page 197
1		1	
1	Page 195 yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific	1	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're
	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's		
2	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific	2	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.
2 3	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not	2 3	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes
2 3 4	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities.	2 3 4	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing
2 3 4 5	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you	2 3 4 5	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.
2 3 4 5 6	yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?	2 3 4 5 6	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low. A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> </ul>	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low. A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low. A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now than I was, from doing all this additional analysis. I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Grossman, I object. I mean his premise is flawed. This is actual data. This isn't a</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now than I was, from doing all this additional analysis. I don't know how to answer that question, but I stand by the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Grossman, I object. I mean his premise is flawed. This is actual data. This isn't a modeling report.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now than I was, from doing all this additional analysis. I don't know how to answer that question, but I stand by the statement you just read.</li> <li>Q And do you have, there's been a lot of talk about error bars. I notice the CRC report has a lot of error</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Grossman, I object. I mean his premise is flawed. This is actual data. This isn't a modeling report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. And I think the witness answered that.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</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>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now than I was, from doing all this additional analysis. I don't know how to answer that question, but I stand by the statement you just read.</li> <li>Q And do you have, there's been a lot of talk about</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>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb.</li> <li>We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Grossman, I object. I mean his premise is flawed. This is actual data. This isn't a modeling report.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q In the CRC report, and in many reports, it's 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 24	<ul> <li>yeah, it's on page 20. Conclusion, it is Mr. Sullivan's expert opinion, with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not violate any applicable federal or state UV air qualities. So a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A More likely than not.</li> <li>Q More likely than not. And did you have that same reasonable degree of scientific certainty when you did your August report?</li> <li>A I did.</li> <li>Q You did. It's the same.</li> <li>A I have, I mean I've looked at this gas station for four years I've been doing these reports. I have not had concerns that, based on any analysis I've done, that the station will violate any standards.</li> <li>Q So your level of certainty hasn't changed.</li> <li>A I won't say that I, I may be more confident now than I was, from doing all this additional analysis. I don't know how to answer that question, but I stand by the statement you just read.</li> <li>Q And do you have, there's been a lot of talk about error bars. I notice the CRC report has a lot of error</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>like zero up to, for example on 311, figure 3-8, they're showing some stars and outliers maybe at 82 ppb and 75 ppb. We'd have to read closer to what each of these boxes implies. But again, usually it's described as showing quartiles in extremes of data. BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Extremes of data. That could be a high and there could be a low.</li> <li>A Well, there are high, we measured data sets for two years. You're going to get highs and you're going to have lows.</li> <li>Q So you don't regard this as a discussion of error.</li> <li>A Well, I've answered the question, Mr. Silverman.</li> <li>I'd have to read this in greater detail. As I said, it didn't seem to be that. It seems to be showing, it's labeled as trends, 3-3 temporal trends. I could see, but it looks to me like it's measured data.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Grossman, I object. I mean his premise is flawed. This is actual data. This isn't a modeling report.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. And I think the witness answered that.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> </ul>

	Page 198		Page 200
1	things you have to worry about, some things we're not sure	1	MR. SILVERMAN: We'll let Dr. Cole speak to that.
2	of. We get areas of doubt, areas of further investigation.	2	I think, I think I am done.
3	Have you ever seen that kind of language in scientific	3	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
4	reports?	4	MR. SILVERMAN: Did I do what I said?
5	A In research?	5	MR. GROSSMAN: You did. Well, not exactly 10
6	Q Yeah.	6	minutes, but you were pretty good.
7	A I've certainly seen and done that. And in certain	7	MR. SILVERMAN: Eleven.
8	modeling that's based upon a different criteria than here,	8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: More than 10 minutes.
9	yes, I've seen that done. Have I seen it done for air	9	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was an uncertainty
10	quality modeling of this nature? No, I have not.	10	thing.
11	Appendix W says for the present, continued use of	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Mr. Goecke, is there any
12	the best estimate is acceptable and is consistent with the	12	redirect?
13	generic Clean Air Act requirements. That's what the State	13	MR. GOECKE: There is some limited redirect.
14	and the EPA wants to see. That's what they're provided	14	MR. GROSSMAN: There's no requirement for
15	with.	15	redirect.
16	Q Why would the State and EPA make one method a	16	MR. GOECKE: I understand. I understand. We'll
17	default method, and another method requiring lots of supervision? I mean what were their concerns?	17	be quick. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
18 19	A Well, that's a different issue. I mean the issue,	18 19	BY MR. GOECKE:
19 20	what I'm referring to, yes, you meet with the agency, you	20	Q Mr. Sullivan, leaving, picking up where Mr.
21	agree upon a protocol. You implement the protocol. They	21	Silverman left off, the uncertainty that he's been focusing
22	see if you did it right. If you did, if you're a tenth over	22	on, talk about this process in terms of how it addresses any
23	you failed. If you're a tenth under, you passed. That's	23	uncertainty or potential uncertainty.
24	how the system is workable. Otherwise it'd be very	24	A Well, inherently the way the Clean Air Act has
25	difficult to have any kind of national or state program that	25	been developed, it's developed with the intent and stated
	Page 199		Page 201
1	Page 199 was, every application was done differently.	1	Page 201 expressed requirement to have a margin of safety
1 2	was, every application was done differently. Q And during those discussions do they not question	1 2	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they
	<ul><li>was, every application was done differently.</li><li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of</li></ul>		expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've
2 3 4	was, every application was done differently. Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?	2 3 4	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>was, every application was done differently.</li><li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li><li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You've highlighted the point over</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You've highlighted the point over and over.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: You've highlighted the point over and over.</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: No, I just, there's a quotation</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you didn't let Ms. Harris near the thermostat, did you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: No, I just, there's a quotation from the, Mr. Fox's memos, the fact that the more you strike from the default values, the less confidence one should have in the result.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you didn't let Ms. Harris near the thermostat, did you? MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I've been watching.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: No, I just, there's a quotation from the, Mr. Fox's memos, the fact that the more you strike from the default values, the less confidence one should have in the result.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you didn't let Ms. Harris near the thermostat, did you? MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I ve been watching. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says 73.
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, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: No, I just, there's a quotation from the, Mr. Fox's memos, the fact that the more you strike from the default values, the less confidence one should have in the result.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Can you read that quote to me, Mr. Silverman? I don't know if that's in there 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 24	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you didn't let Ms. Harris near the thermostat, did you? MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I did not. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says 73. MR. GROSSMAN: See that? It's snuck up again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>was, every application was done differently.</li> <li>Q And during those discussions do they not question you about the areas of uncertainty and the viability of your, the reliability of your sources of information?</li> <li>A I've never been questioned about uncertainty ranges in emissions, or things of that nature. They certainly do question in those discussions about methodology, and yes, sometimes discussion about how various treatments would be done. But once you finish that protocol stage, you do the model and they check it. That's done. Then you see if you passed or failed.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think there's been a certain amount of questioning here?</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: A certain amount. There has certainly been, yes. I just want, just to highlight the point, I think in</li> <li>MR. SILVERMAN: No, I just, there's a quotation from the, Mr. Fox's memos, the fact that the more you strike from the default values, the less confidence one should have in the result.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	expressed requirement to have a margin of safety incorporated into the standards themselves. That's how they developed. And so that's one safety margin, and as I've mentioned for many, many hours, there are, there's many number of steps in this model that are conservative. And I'll use NO2 as an example. The modeling 120 to 150, 160, I expect they will come in around, so if you were, we were to monitor it, I'm not suggesting we do, 75 to 100 would be the max I'd ever expect to see. That's conservatism. I'm suggesting, that example, probably a factor of approximately two. So the issue is there is safety margin. There is consideration of uncertainty with those two steps alone, such that there really isn't a need to apply another margin of safety in terms of a plus or minus 10 to 40 percent uncertainty range. That's more than compensated by the other uncertainty that's already in the analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me a second. Mr. Brann, you didn't let Ms. Harris near the thermostat, did you? MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I did not. MR. BRANN: I ve been watching. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says 73.

	Page 202		Page 204
1	saga nationally, there's a lot of angst about that topic	1	multiple versions of this out there. My notes here say
2	because, you know, power plants	2	10.1, but it's 9.1. The most recent one is 9.1. So section
3	MR. GROSSMAN: It's about to go on, by the way.	3	9.1, uncertainty I believe is the title to it.
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
5	THE WITNESS: power plants in various sources	5	THE WITNESS: And what it says is that models are
6	are doing the modeling, and they're getting numbers that are	6	more reliable for estimating longer time-averaged
7	way above what's going to be measured, and that's why Mr.	7	concentrations than for estimating short-terms
8	Fox has issued two memos, the one you're referred to, plus	8	concentrations at specific locations, and two, the models
9	in the following year trying to provide guidance. The	9	are reasonably reliable in estimating the magnitude of the
10	industry is not happy with that, because it's still over-	10	highest concentrations occurring sometime, somewhere within
11	predicting.	11	an area.
12	So there's, it's too high to start with, by a lot.	12	For example, areas in highest estimated
13	If you applied a 40 percent safety factor onto, say, a 150	13	concentrations of plus or minus 10 to 40 percent are found
14	value, you'd get 210. You could get over the standard	14	to be typical. That is certainly well within the often
15	mathematically if you wanted to, but that wouldn't be real.	15	quoted factor of two accuracy that has long, let me find
16	If you compare it to what's going on, as I've mentioned too	16	this here, has long been recognized for these models.
17	many times, the highest in the country, last year it was 156	17	However, estimates of concentration that occur at a specific
18	micrograms per cubic meter. So you take yourself out of the	18	time and site are poorly correlated with actual observed
19	range of realism into hypothetical that you, really is not	19	concentrations and are much less reliable.
20	going to, would not occur. There's no reason to expect that	20	For this analysis we aren't doing any estimates of
21	it would occur.	21	modeling in space and time, and showing that as the end
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	point of the modeling. We're showing in a distributional
23	THE WITNESS: We have put a lot of, the remaining	23	sense, for example, for the highest 98th percentile, that
24	conservatism I've already stated. I can summarize it.	24	you'd expect to see a certain concentration at some place
25	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think you've testified at	25	near the gas queue, and on some day. We're not saying which
	Dogo 202		Da 112 005
	Page 203		Page 205
1		1	
1	length. I don't think you have to go over it again.	1	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the
2	length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right.	2	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent.
2 3	length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my
2 3 4	length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned	2	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for
2 3 4 5	length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this
2 3 4 5	length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find	2 3 4 5	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right.</li> <li>BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that? A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference. THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that? A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference. THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is,</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour.</li> <li>BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result?</li> <li>A My experience is usually there's conservatism</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that? A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference. THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that? A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference. THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And I can provide the quote, which</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could you pick a location that's further, in a more rural area
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that? A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it. MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference. THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And I can provide the quote, which would allow anyone to find it electronically.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could you pick a location that's further, in a more rural area that would give you a lower number? That could happen. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And I can provide the quote, which would allow anyone to find it electronically. MR. GROSSMAN: Let me look up 9.1 first.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could you pick a location that's further, in a more rural area that would give you a lower number? That could happen. I'm not recommending that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And I can provide the quote, which would allow anyone to find it electronically. MR. GROSSMAN: Let me look up 9.1 first. MS. ROSENFELD: If I could just ask 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	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could you pick a location that's further, in a more rural area that would give you a lower number? That could happen. I'm not recommending that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>length. I don't think you have to go over it again. THE WITNESS: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:</li> <li>Q The 10 to 40 percent range that you mentioned today, do you have a citation for that, or where can we find that?</li> <li>A That's in the appendix W, and section, it's the uncertainty section in appendix W, which let me see what I've got here. The actual quote that appears in the UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's get this blown up so we can read it.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Page reference? THE WITNESS: It's, I don't, unfortunately. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, then a section reference.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: It depends which version you're looking at, but it's either 9.1 or 10.1, I believe it is, the uncertainty description. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And I can provide the quote, which would allow anyone to find it electronically. MR. GROSSMAN: Let me look up 9.1 first.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	day and which spot. That from EPA perspective, you hit the distribution and general location within 10 to 40 percent. So I mean that's how EPA views this. But in my experience where I've done model performance testing for EPA, I've found numbers similar to this. So I believe this is a reasonable estimate of what you'd expect to see in a real world situation. But if you wanted, if the requirement was I have to model NO2 and the northwest corner of the gas queue on July 3rd, you know, 2014, or in the past, 2013, it would be off. But that's not how the standard is written. The standard is for any location in that general area, and for a distributional sense for pollutants such as NO2 one hour. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Are there things that a modeler might do that would result in models predicting concentrations that are 10 to 40 percent lower than what actually would result? A My experience is usually there's conservatism remaining in modeling. That is generally the goal. Could you pick a location that's further, in a more rural area that would give you a lower number? That could happen. I'm not recommending that.

	Page 206		Page 208
1	over-predicting rather than under-predicting.	1	A So if we use stage two as an example, if we went
2	Q And in your opinion is that true for the modeling	2	to the very conservative approach of using the 98th
3	you've done for the proposed Costco gas station?	3	percentile from Arlington, and we assume that that happens
4	A Oh, it is true, in my opinion.	4	all the time, every hour for three years or five years, for
5	Q And I believe you testified earlier that EPA's	5	stage three for three years, that would be conservative,
6	recommended application is the best estimate approach. Do	6	because many, most of the time it's going to be a lot less
7	you have a citation for that?	7	than that. We'll get a third of that or less.
8	A It's in the same section, and I read that off a	8	If we did that in stage three, we would be, the
9	little bit earlier. There's more information on that in the	9	background as I showed in the culpability was 73 micrograms.
10	same, section 9.1 document. I could read it into the record	10	The 98th percentile Arlington background value for 2013 as
11	if you want. It's about a paragraph long.	11	an example was 83, 10 micrograms higher.
12	Q If you have that handy, that'd be great.	12	So to address your question, maybe this would
13	A Looking at, I believe it's section 9.2,	13	cover it. If we added 10 micrograms to the 121, that would
14	recommendations. No specific guidance on the consideration	14	show a more, a very conservative way to address background
15	of model uncertainty and decision-making is being given at	15	using that site. And perhaps the range would be 121 to 131.
16	this time. There is incomplete technical information on	16	If we went to stage two with a similar argument, it would be
17	measures of a model uncertainty that are most relevant to	17	something on the order of 10 micrograms higher instead of
18	the decision-maker. It is not clear how a decision-maker	18	150 whatever it was, 156 to 166. So there are ways of doing
19	could use such information, particularly given the	19	that in a more conservative way. But from what EPA is
20	limitations of the Clean Air Act.	20	suggesting here, and you aren't bound by that, there really,
21 22	As procedures for considering uncertainty develop	21 22	it's hard to know what to do with that data. Q Okay. Thank you. I'd like to turn now to Ms.
22	and become implementable, this guidance will be changed and expanded. For the present, continued use of the best	22	Cordry's questioning about her conversation with David Krask
24	estimate, which I've called the bright line, is acceptable	24	at MDE. She made some statements about things he had told
25	and is consistent with the Clean Air Act requirements.	25	her. Have you had a chance to speak with Mr. Krask since
	Page 207		Page 209
1	Page 207 Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a	1	
1 2	-	1 2	
	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a		you testified last week?
2	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with	2	<ul><li>you testified last week?</li><li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li><li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same</li></ul>
2 3	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels?	2 3	you testified last week? A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning. Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?
2 3 4	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a	2 3 4	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative Q You know, the term has been used a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative Q You know, the term has been used a number of times, paired background. Perhaps you should state for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day it's used for duplication purposes. Site three is the BAM</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative Q You know, the term has been used a number of times, paired background. Perhaps you should state for the record exactly what that is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day it's used for duplication purposes. Site three is the BAM that we talked about before. He and I both agreed that the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative</li> <li>Q You know, the term has been used a number of times, paired background. Perhaps you should state for the record exactly what that is.</li> <li>A Concurrent background, where it's using an hour, matched hour by hour basis, it'll pull the corresponding NO2 concentration from Arlington to match up with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day it's used for duplication purposes. Site three is the BAM that we talked about before. He and I both agreed that the BAM has positive bias relative to the federal reference method.</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>Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative</li> <li>Q You know, the term has been used a number of times, paired background. Perhaps you should state for the record exactly what that is.</li> <li>A Concurrent background, where it's using an hour, matched hour by hour basis, it'll pull the corresponding NO2 concentration from Arlington to match up with the meteorological data set you're modeling.</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>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day it's used for duplication purposes. Site three is the BAM that we talked about before. He and I both agreed that the BAM has positive bias relative to the federal reference method.</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>Q Thanks. Going back to Mr. Grossman's question a moment ago about the variability or the uncertainty with background levels, actual measured levels, does the 98th percentile application modeling, is that intended to address any uncertainty or variability with those measured levels? A Well, it's intended to of course come up with a very high-end near-tail distribution to be conservative. It doesn't use the highest, because I think we all can agree that model bias will occur from time to time, and outliers will occur. That's why they go to the 98th percentile. But by going to the 98th percentile you tend to overstate, plus you know, I suppose one way I could answer Mr. Grossman's question, if we wanted to go more conservative on background for NO2 one hour, for example, we used a paired background in this analysis, stage two and stage three, hour by hour match with Arlington. If we were to say no, we'll be more conservative</li> <li>Q You know, the term has been used a number of times, paired background. Perhaps you should state for the record exactly what that is.</li> <li>A Concurrent background, where it's using an hour, matched hour by hour basis, it'll pull the corresponding NO2 concentration from Arlington to match up with 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>you testified last week?</li> <li>A I spoke to Mr. Krask this morning.</li> <li>Q And can you tell us whether or not Ms. Cordry's description of what he told her, did he give you the same responses?</li> <li>A Similar. He had additional context that I think would be helpful.</li> <li>Q And just to put it in context, we were talking about the different monitors used at the Beltsville location, correct?</li> <li>A Correct. There's three monitors. We discussed the three of them.</li> <li>Q And tell us again what the difference is with one of them.</li> <li>A Site number one at Beltsville is the primary.</li> <li>It's the federal reference method, the gold standard monitor. Site number two is the duplicate for that site, for fed reference method, that he confirmed every 12th day it's used for duplication purposes. Site three is the BAM that we talked about before. He and I both agreed that the BAM has positive bias relative to the federal reference method.</li> </ul>

	Page 210		Page 212
1	reference method. He said in Maryland his director prefers	1	<ul> <li>called display of bias of federal equipment monitors such as BAMs in comparison to federal reference methods, and summary of EPA position on the use of FEMs. Do you recognize this document?</li> <li>A I do.</li> <li>Q And tell us what this document is.</li> <li>A This is a document from EPA, EPA's web page, and we could use the projector now, if you think that'd be helpful.</li> <li>Q I've passed out copies of it, so</li> <li>A Okay, so everybody has a copy.</li> <li>Q Yeah.</li> <li>A The earlier part of this is based upon the web page reference provided near the top of the page in blue.</li> <li>And basically it allows you the opportunity to compare the</li> </ul>
2	to be conservative, and at this point they're in attainment.	2	
3	And what they do is very much like Ms. Cordry said is they	3	
4	will take, on days when they have a reading in the federal	4	
5	reference method, it'll use it. On days they don't, which	5	
6	is two thirds of the time, they'll fill with the BAM. They	6	
7	recognize it's high. It's about 30 percent higher than the	7	
8	others. But it's a conservative way to address the issue.	8	
9	Now the proper way that they use it is they will	9	
10	take and they will, from their point of view they will	10	
11	weight the BAM two thirds weighting, and they'll weight the	11	
12	federal reference method one third weighting. And for	12	
13	example if you did that with that data set, I'm using 2011	13	
14	as an example, the site one, the federal reference method,	14	
15	had an average of 8.7 micrograms per cubic meter for PM2.5.	15	
16	Site number three had an average of 11.6, quite a bit	16	bias for different sites around the country. We're
17	higher. If you assume two thirds 11.6, one third 8.7, you'd	17	highlighting Beltsville, the site that's in the discussion
18	have it 10.6. So it would go up to 10.6. We used a 9.8 in	18	here.
19	our analysis. You could use a 10.6 if you chose to. We're	19	And the easiest way to refer to this, if you see
20	only contributing .9 micrograms. Again, the standard.	20	there's six boxes on this chart on page one. If you go to
21	But he clarified a very important point, and the	21	the first row and go to the right side, you see a box that
22	point that he clarified, which I had heard before, is that	22	shows colored dots that are green, orange, blue, various
23	the standard itself is based upon the federal reference	23	colors. What that's showing you, it's showing you, well,
24	method. So the actual 12 micrograms is tied to that method.	24	what the BAM is doing relative to the reference method
25	The health studies that they relied upon were based upon	25	monitor. And you can see it says, there's a zero line.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Page 211 those readings. So that you know, if the BAM is reading higher, it's inconsistent with the health records that were the basis for the standard. It's conservative treatment. And what some areas will do if they're going to bump up against the standard, then a decision will be made are you going to continue using that BAM or not. The EPA gives the states discretion. They can use it or not use it. Most states don't. In the case of Maryland they're being conservative. When they hit the standard, if they do, they will have to reassess it at that point in time. He didn't say what they would do, and I'm not going to put, you know, put out any suggestions that I know what they would do. But that was kind of the description he gave to me. For these purposes here, we know, for my purposes, we know it's biased. It's high. It's much higher than the, the BAM is much higher than the gold standard. And from my point of view, I chose not to use it. I still stand by that decision. I'm not criticizing the State. They have a different objective. But my goal was to be accurate. And if I'm using a standard that I know is 30 percent biased high relative to the gold standard, I prefer not to use it. But if I did, it's academic. It's not going to change the attainment status at all. That was pretty much my notes from the discussion.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Page 213 Then it shows what's, when the BAM is higher and when it's lower. And maybe out of all these points, out of the 121 points a year shown here, there's a couple of times when the BAM was actually lower. But in nearly every case, the BAM is higher, and by quite a lot. And it's across all four seasons. If you now go down two rows and go to the far left, you can then see how things compare there. The FRM is again the gold standard. The continuous is the BAM, so that's in the third and fourth column on the table that's in the bottom left portion of page one. As you can see consistently through each season, for all data for this example here was 8.8 versus 11.6. But you see that bias occurring each time. As a monitoring person, which I do a lot of, I don't like to use data that has bias built into it. I can see why the State does, for their purposes, but for modeling analysis like this, I see no reason to use a monitor that I realize has substantial bias. MR. GROSSMAN: Let's call this two-page print-out Exhibit 572, and that is display of bias of federal equivalent monitors, fondly known as FEMs, in comparison to reference methods. (Hearing Exhibit No. 572 was

	Page 214		Page 216
1	MR. GROSSMAN: What does BAM stand for again?	1	attention now to Exhibit 565-A. This is one of the monitor
2	MR. GOECKE: You know, I don't recall what the	2	values report that Ms. Cordry had asked you about in her
3	initials stand for. There's BAMs, and I don't remember	3	cross-examination. If I may approach.
4	the designation of either one, but Beta, I mean I just	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
5	MS. CORDRY: Beta Attenuation Mass Monitor.	5	BY MR. GOECKE:
6	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That sounds correct.	6	Q One of the issues that came out during your cross-
7	MR. GROSSMAN: BAM is Beta	7	examination testimony was the frequency with which results
8	MS. CORDRY: Attenuation Mass Monitor.	8	were, are published for each of the locations. And can you
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Attenuation Mass Monitor you	9	tell us again what's your understanding of why that might
10	said?	10	be?
11	MS. CORDRY: Yes.	11	A Yes. In talking to Mr. Krask, I asked him the
12	MR. GROSSMAN: So it's two M's in BAM?	12	frequency, the standard frequency. He said it was once
13	MS. CORDRY: Yes, BAM monitor.	13	every 12 days. So they monitor every three days for the
14	THE WITNESS: It's usually listed as one M, BAM.	14	federal reference method primary number one monitor. And
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And now they have to say	15	then every four times they'll have a duplicate sample.
16	it's a bias, because it's compared to the reference point.	16	Thirty duplicates a year is sufficient. That's why they
17	Why is the reference point more accurate than the BAM?	17	have 32 shown here. A duplicate and 121 for the main
18	THE WITNESS: Well, it may not be, but the issue	18	monitoring site.
19	is the standards. All the health scientists were involved.	19	Q And Ms. Cordry has pressed the point that we
20 21	They were using federal reference method data to form their conclusions. So as a matched data set, you'd need to rely	20 21	should be using or you should be using locations showing the highest levels that had been measured. Do you recall that?
22	upon the same thing.	21	A Yes, I do.
22	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. Okay.	22	Q And if you read the highlighted portion
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So that's the logic there.	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think she said that that
25	THE WITNESS: And this first page was the	25	was part of the agreed protocol.
23			
	Page 215		Page 217
	r age 213		Fage 217
1	comparison of 2010 to 2012.	1	MS. CORDRY: Yes.
1 2	-	1 2	-
	comparison of 2010 to 2012.		MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think
2	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical	2	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting.
2 3 4 5	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the	2 3	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think
2 3 4 5	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.)	2 3 4	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the
2 3 4 5	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond	2 3 4 5	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross-	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No. THE WITNESS: but it's pretty clear that EPA is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand her distinction. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No. THE WITNESS: but it's pretty clear that EPA is saying sometimes these BAMs work, and sometimes they don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand her distinction. It may not be what you recollect. But all right, go ahead, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No. THE WITNESS: but it's pretty clear that EPA is saying sometimes these BAMs work, and sometimes they don't work so well, and recognizing there is some bias relative to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand her distinction. It may not be what you recollect. But all right, go ahead, so what's your question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No. THE WITNESS: but it's pretty clear that EPA is saying sometimes these BAMs work, and sometimes they don't work so well, and recognizing there is some bias relative to the federal reference method.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand her distinction. It may not be what you recollect. But all right, go ahead, so what's your question? BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	comparison of 2010 to 2012. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd object to that. I don't think Mr. Sullivan knows what the health experts, you know, the science, air quality science committee, CASAC, what medical measurement they're looking at when they're looking at the FRM and other things. In fact Dr. Bryce (phonetic sp.) testified about a few measurements. I think he's gone beyond his expertise. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll let you ask a cross- examination question. I'm not going to prohibit him from saying why he thinks the reference method is used rather than the BAM. All right. THE WITNESS: The second part is based upon a reference shown at the top of page 2. It shows a figure here, which I'm not going to focus on right now, and then it goes to the conclusions, which I don't know if I need to read into the record MR. GROSSMAN: No. THE WITNESS: but it's pretty clear that EPA is saying sometimes these BAMs work, and sometimes they don't work so well, and recognizing there is some bias relative to the federal reference method. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CORDRY: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's what her point was. I don't know if it was or wasn't. I'm just saying I think that was what she was asserting. MS. CORDRY: Yes, I think I stated that he testified numerous times that he was saying he was using the highest value, and that the protocol in fact specifically agreed to use that particular monitor at Dr. Cole's request, so that's what I said. MR. GOECKE: So it's not your position that he should have used the highest level. MS. CORDRY: Well, I am saying I'm going to leave that to Dr. Cole. What I am saying is that when I, the part he was disagreeing with me on background monitor, when you're saying I should have done this or I should have done that, my memo basically said what Dr., I'm sorry, what Mr. Sullivan said he was doing when I was pointing out what he said he was doing versus what he actually did at times. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand her distinction. It may not be what you recollect. But all right, go ahead, so what's your question? BY MR. GOECKE: Q So I'd like to draw everyone's attention to, and

	Page 218		Page 220
1	is in all the monitor reports that you passed out. The	1	Q Thank you. Turning now to your rebuttal report,
2	third paragraph reads readers are cautioned not to rank	2	Exhibit 466, do you have a copy of that in front of you?
3	order, to rank order geographic areas based on air data	3	And if you would flip to figure two on page 12, there's been
4	reports. Air pollution levels measured at a particular	4	a lot of focus from the opposition about the traffic levels
5	monitoring site are not necessarily representative of air	5	at the site, and one of their contentions is that the
6	quality for an entire county or urban area. Did I read that	6	traffic that Mr. Guckert projects is actually 15 percent
7	correctly?	7	lower that what they think it will be.
8	A You did.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, 15 percent
9	Q And in your expert opinion, what does that mean in	9	MR. GOECKE: Fifteen percent.
10	terms of taking these numbers and ranking the various	10	MR. GROSSMAN: lower than their observations
11	monitoring locations in terms of which one has more	11	MR. GOECKE: Than Mr. Guckert's, their
12	significance pollution levels?	12	observations
13	A Well, I read it to say, as we discussed earlier,	13	MR. GROSSMAN: from Dr. Adelman and Mrs.
14	you don't take a monitor from the middle of Washington, D.C.	14	Adelman.
15	or from a monitor in Colburn Road (phonetic sp.) in	15	MR. GOECKE: Thank you. Right. And it's my
16	Alexandria that is a commercial type location, and apply	16	understanding that they've, they're extrapolating that to be
17	that to a location that is very different. You should be	17	representative of more
18	picking representative locations. That's how I read it.	18	MR. GROSSMAN: As everybody is extrapolating their
19	Q And in the paragraph above that, if you would just	19	observations, yes.
20	read that to yourself, or you could read it out loud,	20	MR. GOECKE: No, no, that's fine.
21	actually.	21	BY MR. GOECKE:
22	A Air data reports are produced from a direct query	22	Q So my first question to you, Mr. Sullivan, is
23	of the AQS data marks. The data represent the best and most	23	would a 15 percent increase in traffic correlate with a 15
24	recent information available to EPA from state agencies.	24	percent increase with model concentrations of pollutants?
25	However, some states may be absent, some values may be	25	A No, it would not.
	Page 219		Page 221
1	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may	1	Q Okay. And why not?
1 2	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data	1 2	<ul><li>Q Okay. And why not?</li><li>A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and</li></ul>
	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal		<ul><li>Q Okay. And why not?</li><li>A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The</li></ul>
2 3 4	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact	2	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of
2 3 4	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any	2 3	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near
2 3 4 5 6	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems.	2 3 4 5 6	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads
2 3 4 5	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an	2 3 4 5	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision,	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems.</li> <li>Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location?</li> <li>A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest monitoring site, and we never indicated we would use the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms. MS. CORDRY: 15 percent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest monitoring site, and we never indicated we would use the highest among the three Beltsville sites. We did average	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms. MS. CORDRY: 15 percent? THE WITNESS: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest monitoring site, and we never indicated we would use the highest among the three Beltsville sites. We did average them in 2012, and we stopped doing that because of the bias	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms. MS. CORDRY: 15 percent? THE WITNESS: No. MS. CORDRY: That's right, 47 plus 18.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest monitoring site, and we never indicated we would use the highest among the three Beltsville sites. We did average them in 2012, and we stopped doing that because of the bias after that point in time. But Mr. Krask did clearly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms. MS. CORDRY: 15 percent? THE WITNESS: No. MS. CORDRY: That's right, 47 plus 18. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Save your questions for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	absent due to incomplete reporting, and some values may change due to quality assurance activities. The AQS data base is updated daily by state, local, and tribal organizations, who own and submit the data. Please contact the appropriate air quality monitoring agency to report any data problems. Q So in your opinion, does that provide an explanation for why there might be less frequent monitor reports from each location? A Well, no, I think that the logic was you don't need to have coverage, one to one coverage for defining method precision. I mean the duplicates define precision, how well, how precise are the measurements. If you have 30 measurements per year for precision, that's plenty. And that's why it's, they don't need a complete data set for that, and that's why they don't have it. Q Okay. A But the point I was, I think you mentioned before, if I remember correctly, we were not using the highest monitoring site, and we never indicated we would use the highest among the three Beltsville sites. We did average them in 2012, and we stopped doing that because of the bias	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. And why not? A Well, you have to look at the contributions, and what is actually shown in these culpability plots. The actual ring road and other roadways is only a fraction of the contribution, so for example the maximum location near the gas queue is 147. The ring road is 43. The other roads is 17. So it's about 57, it's about 60, it's less than half of the total impact. So if you had a 15 percent change, it would not be a large change in the actual bottom line concentration. If it was, we could do the math here, let me get my calculator out. If we have, take the ring road and put it at 43 micrograms, and then bring in the roadways at 18, and the parking lot let's say at one, you get 62 micrograms. And you multiply that times .15, it would be 9 micrograms. So you go from 147 to 156. MS. CORDRY: Actually wouldn't it be 165 if you multiply the 1.5 times, or the 1.88 times THE WITNESS: These are micrograms. MS. CORDRY: 15 percent? THE WITNESS: No. MS. CORDRY: That's right, 47 plus 18.

	Page 222		Page 224
1	MR. GROSSMAN: You can cross-examine.	1	done, we had decided it would be simplest if I just used
2	THE WITNESS: So my point is, two points. One	2	them rather than try to tell it to Ms. Rosenfeld. All
3	point, if I did it mathematically, it's nine micrograms	3	right.
4	more. But let's keep in mind what we're doing. Mr.	4	RECROSS EXAMINATION
5	Guckert's most recent analysis said the peak weekly value	5	BY MS. CORDRY:
6	traffic numbers are 15 percent higher, and that's occurring	6	Q Looking at the same figure 2 in your rebuttal
7	on Saturday or Sunday, 11:00 to 12:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m. to	7	report that you were just talking about
8	12:00 noon.	8	A Okay.
9	Well, the assumption I just made was well, if that	9	Q and actually we've used this term culpability
10	peak hour happened all the time, every hour the mall was	10	analysis a lot. I'm not quite sure we've ever really
11	open, Monday through Sunday, it would go up nine micrograms.	11	defined it. By that do you mean that, is this a culpability
12	But that's not real. I mean it's actually if you put in, if	12	analysis, and can you define for sure what that means, so we
13	you had accurate numbers for every hour of the week, it	13	have that as I'm going forward?
14	would be less than what we have right now, because right now	14	A Yes, it is a culpability analysis, and it's
15	I'm modeling the peak weekday hour all the time.	15	different than a legal term. Nobody's done anything wrong
16	So you put that together, it's a very small	16	here.
17	factor. And if it was accurately stated rather than	17	Q Right.
18	conservative, it would be less than the 147.	18	A It's talking about what sources contribute to the
19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	19	total.
20	BY MR. GOECKE:	20	Q Okay. And when you did it before in your
21	Q And turning now to the OLM analysis that you	21	November, December, January reports, and I thought I'd found
22	performed, you stated to testify earlier today that you had	22	a mistake then, but you explained it before I got the point
23	actually conducted some OLM analysis inside the area that	23	out that it was a mistake, at that point you had a number of
24	Ms. Rosenfeld is referring to as the tailpipe box. What were the results of those calculations?	24	these lines like this, 10 or 12 or 15 lines of different
25		25	factors that could contribute. And when you did those
	Page 223		Page 225
	с С		1 dge 220
1		1	
1 2		1 2	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest
	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming,		charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I
2	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But	2 3	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest
2 3 4	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location	2 3	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of
2 3 4 5	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM	2 3 4	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the
2 3 4 5 6	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM,	2 3 4 5	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom.
2 3 4 5 6	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149.	2 3 4 5 6	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about	2 3 4 5 6 7	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. (Whereupon, at 4:12 p.m., a brief recess was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers? A Well, you can see the two, if you look at the iso
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. (Whereupon, at 4:12 p.m., a brief recess was taken.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers? A Well, you can see the two, if you look at the iso lines
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. (Whereupon, at 4:12 p.m., a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: The final lap. All right, any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers? A Well, you can see the two, if you look at the iso lines Q Mm-hmm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. (Whereupon, at 4:12 p.m., a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: The final lap. All right, any recross questions?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom.</li> <li>A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom.</li> <li>Q Right.</li> <li>A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add.</li> <li>Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two?</li> <li>A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers?</li> <li>A Well, you can see the two, if you look at the iso lines</li> <li>Q Mm-hmm.</li> <li>A you can see there's two maximum locations</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A We did. We did testing of the model, assuming, it's like a discussion. I'm not saying this is real. But assuming for the sake of discussion that any location outside the source, that source area, you would use the OLM method, and we did. And we found if you use straight OLM, doing each source separately, we showed a maximum of 172. If we used the OLM group approach, which for multi sources is more accurate and less conservative, we had a 149. So the point there is we can talk a lot about conversion and we can talk a lot about the box, but the reality is if we cut to the chase and just take the files we have and just make some very minor changes and we look at it that way, we're way under the standard, either of one of those options, right up to the source itself. Q Thank you. I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Recross? MS. CORDRY: Can we take about four minutes or so, just to talk and coordinate that with everybody? MR. GROSSMAN: All right. (Whereupon, at 4:12 p.m., a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: The final lap. All right, any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	charts for the home and the school and the pool, as I understand it in that variation of it you gave the highest one for each one of the different factors. So the total of that didn't necessarily add up to your total modeled at the bottom. A It was done differently. That did not add up to the bottom. Q Right. A That's correct. These totals were done in a common run. They should add. They should add. Q So this is for this, this is the particular highest spot, for instance the 156.18, that's the highest that you found in this run for stage two? A Correct. That's the highest near the loading dock, and the 147.4 is the highest associated with the gas queue, gas station operations. Q Okay. Is this the second highest one, or is this, there may be some more loading dock ones between these two numbers? A Well, you can see the two, if you look at the iso lines Q Mm-hmm.

	Page 226		Page 228
1	one of those two locations.	1	answer here.
2	Q Okay. Okay. And so yeah, and so these do, each	2	MS. CORDRY: Okay.
3	one of these add up. These are the, so and the loading dock	3	MR. GROSSMAN: So but I didn't quite understand
4	is the highest of any of these for this stage two.	4	MS. CORDRY: We agreed it's 83, okay.
5	A For this, and also for these assumptions, that's	5	MR. GROSSMAN: the 86 you referred to for 2012.
6	correct.	6	MS. CORDRY: I think we said 83.
7	Q If you went back and were doing it the way you had	7	THE WITNESS: It was 83 for 2013.
8	done before, it's possible that there might be a ring road	8	BY MS. CORDRY:
9	number that was higher than 46.95 but never associated with	9	Q Okay, so 2012 would be even higher?
10	a total that was higher than 156.18, is that	10	A Correct.
11	A That's correct.	11	Q Okay. But we can even stick with 83, so that's 14
12	Q Okay.	12	to 15, another 14 to 15 points that you would add on to that
13	A There'd be some shifting in the culpability.	13	166 that we just mentioned?
14	Q Okay. And the same thing for the roads, all of	14	A Right.
15	these. You might have, if you did the same for each one of	15	Q So that's getting you up to 180.
16	those, the highest number, it might be different.	16	A Well, again, I do want to give a clear answer
17	A The ratios of each source, the total could change.	17	here. We're adding things together, although there are a
18	Q Okay. And just, you did the example of a 15	18	bunch of what ifs here. But again, the road emissions that
19	percent increase in the road with the gas station queue. If	19	you're adding, we're assuming that that peak Saturday hour
20	we did the same thing on the other one there with the	20	from 11:00 to 12:00 happens all the time, and it's not even
21	loading dock, where you have roughly 47 plus 18 plus the	21	close to doing that.
22	parking, that gets you to roughly 65, is that correct?	22	Q I understand that.
23	A I'd have to check. So we have, let's see, we're	23	A So it's a mathematical
24	talking about the ring road, 47; parking .2; other roads,	24	MR. GROSSMAN: We understand that. She's getting
25	17.7; equals, yeah, 65.	25	to some hypothetical number. We realize the
	D. 007		
	Page 227		Page 229
1	, and the second s	1	
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	qualifications
	Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come		
2	Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?	2	qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right.
2 3	Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct? A Yeah, about 10.	2 3	qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li><li>A Yeah, about 10.</li><li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that</li></ul>	2 3 4	qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your</li> <li>revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic</li> <li>and you put the background level back to what you've been</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your</li> <li>revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your</li> <li>revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic</li> <li>and you put the background level back to what you've been</li> <li>doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15</li> <li>percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before.</li> <li>BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>qualifications</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: Right.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. You can't speak both at the same time.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> <li>A Not from this plot, no.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. You can't</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. You can't speak both at the same time.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> <li>A Not from this plot, no.</li> <li>Q Okay, so we'll just, I mean you have not done any, as we say, sensitivity, uncertainty, any kind of analyses</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>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. You can't speak both at the same time.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I asked him a mathematical question.</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>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> <li>A Not from this plot, no.</li> <li>Q Okay, so we'll just, I mean you have not done any,</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>Q Okay. And if we take 15 percent of that we come out with 10, is that correct?</li> <li>A Yeah, about 10.</li> <li>Q Okay. And that, you would say you could add that on to the 156.18?</li> <li>A Correct.</li> <li>Q Okay. And if we were still using the 98th percentile number, which was 83 you said for 2012 A Mm-hmm.</li> <li>Q as opposed to 68, that's another 14 higher there?</li> <li>A No, it's actually the, well, since I did it, the most recent NO2 value is 83.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>A Because this trend is going down. It depends how you did the slice on that. But again, when you're, I want to emphasize</li> <li>Q Well, just, please, Mr. Sullivan</li> <li>A when you're adding, when you're talking</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. You can't speak both at the same time.</li> <li>MS. CORDRY: I asked him a mathematical question.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I think that's fair.</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>qualifications MS. CORDRY: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: that you placed on it before. BY MS. CORDRY:</li> <li>Q And I'm getting the point that yes, even with your revised assumptions in stage two, if you raise the traffic and you put the background level back to what you've been doing before you got to be less conservative, with a 15 percent increase you're already up at 180. And I think we've had discussions before about whether 190 is the immaculate number there or not, but we'll certainly start with that. Is there a culpability analysis on your data disk for figure one?</li> <li>A No, I don't believe so.</li> <li>Q And was there one done, is there one like that back in August? Would he be able to find anything there?</li> <li>A I don't recall.</li> <li>Q Okay. Is there any way then to tell from this what would be, in stage one what would be the effect of increasing the road traffic?</li> <li>A Not from this plot, no.</li> <li>Q Okay, so we'll just, I mean you have not done any, as we say, sensitivity, uncertainty, any kind of analyses</li> </ul>

	Page 230		Page 232
1	we talked about 156 was the highest in the United States	1	Q Okay.
2	last year, so uncertainty analysis, how uncertain I am that	2	A And I would say with the best estimate, I would
3	it would be 180 at the ring road, I'm pretty certain it	3	say somewhere less than half of that range, so something
4	wouldn't be 180 at the ring road.	4	less than 77. I'm saying that based upon the consideration,
5	Q I'm not asking what you think about that. I'm	5	the uncertain, the conservatism in the modeling, and
6	asking what the analyses and the charts you've done here,	6	considering the measured data available at various locations
7	and the numbers you've laid out here, have you done, you	7	around the country. I wouldn't expect it to exceed the 70,
8	have not done anything in terms of adjusting Mr. Guckert's	8	much above 75, but I give myself some range.
9	traffic numbers for the possibilities they could be higher.	9	Q So your, just to be clear then, your position is
10	A There is not a need to.	10	that this station, with the cars lined up and idling in the
11	Q So you didn't do it.	11	middle of a busy mall next to major roadways, the actual
12	A I did not, as I've testified to this, that I did	12	number is going to be less than the number, the background
13	not modify Mr. Guckert's traffic counts, that it was a small factor and I did not modify it. And again, if we're going	13	number being measured at Arlington.
14		14	A In the future, well it's going to be not very different
15 16	to hypotheticals, you know, stage three is far more accurate when you can do the same assessment there, it'd be a much	15 16	Q No, no, no, you're talking about right now, aren't
17	smaller number. So you could show a range of hypothetical	17	you, Mr. Sullivan? Or are you talking about right how, aren't
18	mathematical calculations if you choose to. They're going	18	road?
19	to be way over what would be plausible to measure at this	19	A The gas station doesn't exist right now.
20	location.	20	Q Well, you're trying to model what it will be, so
21	MR. GROSSMAN: I know you went over this before,	21	you're saying in a couple of years from now when the gas
22	but for some reason I'm having a little mental block.	22	station gets built it would be 75?
23	What's the culpability study on the left-hand side of page	23	A All my discussions, when the gas station is built.
24	12?	24	I don't know when it gets built. Let's say a year or two
25	THE WITNESS: That's the relative maxima occurring	25	from now, whenever it's going to be, I would say it's 75 to
	Page 231		Page 233
1	near the gas queue. That's caused by the gas queue, mostly.	1	100, and I think it's going to be something on the order of
2	The biggest contributor on that side, compared to the right	2	75 micrograms.
3	side is showing the loading dock where the gas station is	3	Q And that's because the background is continually
4	contributing 1.65 micrograms, where it's a more, it's	4	coming down and down and down.
5	higher, it's 15 micrograms on the left side.	5	A Correct. And again, in fairness, I gave a range.
6	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Oh yeah, the arrow tells the	6	
7		Ŭ	Q Okay. And that's because the government is doing
		7	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct?
8	THE WITNESS: Right.	7 8	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe
9	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that.	7 8 9	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck
9 10	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay.	7 8 9 10	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what?
9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY:	7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct?</li> <li>A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe</li> <li>emissions on truck</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, requiring what?</li> <li>A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know,	7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct?</li> <li>A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe</li> <li>emissions on truck</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, requiring what?</li> <li>A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that</li> <li>is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I</li> </ul>
9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've	7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct?</li> <li>A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe</li> <li>emissions on truck</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, requiring what?</li> <li>A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that</li> <li>is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I</li> <li>think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct?</li> <li>A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe</li> <li>emissions on truck</li> <li>Q I'm sorry, requiring what?</li> <li>A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that</li> <li>is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I</li> </ul>
9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what? Q For NO2. A One hour? Q Yeah, one hour NO2.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located? THE WITNESS: Right in the middle of the gas queue. MR. GROSSMAN: In the queue, okay.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what? Q For NO2. A One hour? Q Yeah, one hour NO2. A I've testified that in my professional opinion,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located? THE WITNESS: Right in the middle of the gas queue. MR. GROSSMAN: In the queue, okay. THE WITNESS: If you're going to measure, which
<ol> <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> </ol>	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what? Q For NO2. A One hour? Q Yeah, one hour NO2. A I've testified that in my professional opinion, and I'm saying this is my view with a great deal of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located? THE WITNESS: Right in the middle of the gas queue. MR. GROSSMAN: In the queue, okay. THE WITNESS: If you're going to measure, which I'm not advocating be done, you could measure in the middle
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what? Q For NO2. A One hour? Q Yeah, one hour NO2. A I've testified that in my professional opinion, and I'm saying this is my view with a great deal of confidence, that it would be extremely unlikely that the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located? THE WITNESS: Right in the middle of the gas queue. MR. GROSSMAN: In the queue, okay. THE WITNESS: If you're going to measure, which I'm not advocating be done, you could measure in the middle of a gas queue.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know why I forgot that. Okay. BY MS. CORDRY: Q One last question, before I forget it. So I know, just you said several times, I just want to make sure I've got it down clearly in my record. What do you think the true number is here? I'm going to give you the chance to say it. A For what? Q For NO2. A One hour? Q Yeah, one hour NO2. A I've testified that in my professional opinion, and I'm saying this is my view with a great deal of	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	all kinds of efforts to bring down those numbers, correct? A Well, the government is requiring tailpipe emissions on truck Q I'm sorry, requiring what? A Tailpipe emissions on cars and trucks. And that is having the expected effect. It's coming down. And I think that what I did say is somewhere in the middle of that range, which would actually be 87 would be the midpoint between 75 and 100. MR. GROSSMAN: And where would you expect that to be located? THE WITNESS: Right in the middle of the gas queue. MR. GROSSMAN: In the queue, okay. THE WITNESS: If you're going to measure, which I'm not advocating be done, you could measure in the middle

	Page 234		Page 236
1	Q You keep saying if you wanted to do something, but	1	this area.
	you're not advocating it should be done. Doesn't that sound	2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah.
3	a whole lot like what Dr. Cole has said? And you're	3	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's a fair question.
4	certainly not advocating that we do these things, are you?	4	THE WITNESS: Well, I mean it's certainly
5	A It's the opposite of what Dr. Cole said.	5	desirable to maintain stations, core stations, to show
6	Q He said, well, and I'm	6	trends over a long period of time, and I agree with that,
7	A Do you want me to answer the question?	7	Larry. And to maintain consistency in monitoring is a good
8	Q I withdraw the question.	8	idea. I mean obviously in some pollutants like PM2.5,
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Beyond the scope	9	there's some different things being tried and used. Will
10	of the redirect anyway, so.	10	they eventually settle on one? Maybe they will.
11	MS. CORDRY: Well, in any case, I think, okay, I	11	BY MR. SILVERMAN:
12	think we're done.	12	Q So that the fact that there's a federal reference
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman, is there any recross	13	monitor doesn't necessarily mean that that is the most
14	for the coalition?	14	accurate, and EPA is not necessarily saying that is the most
15	MR. SILVERMAN: Really just a couple of things.	15	accurate in the sense of giving the truest number, does it?
16	So since	16	A Well, as I mentioned before, I mean my
17	MS. ADELMAN: Yes.	17	understanding is that it gives the truest number relative to
18	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.	18	the health studies reviewed in forming the current standard.
19	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	19	If in the future they have more BAMs and PMs, and a judgment
20	Q Since Costco opened its doors, has the air quality	20	is made between the two, which one is more accurate, maybe
21	in the Wheaton Mall gotten better or worse?	21	if they set a standard based upon the BAM, then that would
22	MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope.	22	become the standard. But right now the standards are based
23	MR. GROSSMAN: It is. That's beyond the scope of the	23 24	upon the federal reference method, and so that's the defining gold standard.
24 25	MR. SILVERMAN: He is saying the trends are all in	24 25	Q Well, isn't it true that the actual health studies
25		25	
	Page 235		Page 237
1	the right direction and everything's getting better.	1	use all sorts of equipment to measure the levels of
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, I'll let it go.	2	pollutants and their health effects?
3	THE WITNESS: I don't have an opinion on that.	3	A Of course whether the standard is written, it's
4	BY MR. SILVERMAN:	_	tied to the FRM. So in EPA's judgment they consider the FRM
5	Q You don't have an opinion on that?	5	to be the most definitive and most applicable standard that
6	A No. Q And how would you go about forming an opinion	6 7	they set. MR. GROSSMAN: FRM meaning?
7	about that?	8	THE WITNESS: Federal reference method.
9		0	
		9	BY MR SILVERMAN
10	A I could do an analysis, and do modeling with monitors.	9 10	BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one
10 11	monitors.	10	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one
10 11 12	monitors. Q Okay.		Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a
11	monitors.	10 11	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and
11 12	monitors. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.	10 11 12	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a
11 12 13	monitors. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports. BY MR. SILVERMAN:	10 11 12 13	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma.
11 12 13 14	monitors. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to	10 11 12 13 14	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2
11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in
11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct? A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> <li>Q And if EPA should decide to stick with one type of monitor, it may be that they want to do that in order to keep consistency in their data so they could look at the</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a</li> <li>Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and</li> <li>Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma.</li> <li>And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct?</li> <li>A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question.</li> <li>Q Right. And the, his Exhibit 17, chronic exposure,</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> <li>Q And if EPA should decide to stick with one type of monitor, it may be that they want to do that in order to keep consistency in their data so they could look at the direction of things.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a</li> <li>Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and</li> <li>Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma.</li> <li>And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct?</li> <li>A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question.</li> <li>Q Right. And the, his Exhibit 17, chronic exposure, fine particles and mortality, extended follow-up of the</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> <li>Q And if EPA should decide to stick with one type of monitor, it may be that they want to do that in order to keep consistency in their data so they could look at the direction of things.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Speculative and beyond</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a</li> <li>Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and</li> <li>Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma.</li> <li>And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct?</li> <li>A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question.</li> <li>Q Right. And the, his Exhibit 17, chronic exposure, fine particles and mortality, extended follow-up of the Harvard six-city studies from 1974, 2009, which, you don't</li> </ul>
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> <li>Q And if EPA should decide to stick with one type of monitor, it may be that they want to do that in order to keep consistency in their data so they could look at the direction of things.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Speculative and beyond the scope.</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma. And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct? A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question. Q Right. And the, his Exhibit 17, chronic exposure, fine particles and mortality, extended follow-up of the Harvard six-city studies from 1974, 2009, which, you don't know, you wouldn't know what sort of monitors were used,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>monitors.</li> <li>Q Okay.</li> <li>MR. GROSSMAN: No more reports.</li> <li>BY MR. SILVERMAN:</li> <li>Q Now Dr. Bryce, with regard to, let's see how to say this, with regard to reference monitors, do you agree that having the same monitor over a period of years is generally a good thing in detecting trends?</li> <li>A I agree with that.</li> <li>Q And if EPA should decide to stick with one type of monitor, it may be that they want to do that in order to keep consistency in their data so they could look at the direction of things.</li> <li>MR. GOECKE: Objection. Speculative and beyond</li> </ul>	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q Well, for example, Dr. Bryce, his, let me find one here, his, I think it's Exhibit 13, it's called a</li> <li>Longitudinal Study of Indoor Nitrogen Dioxide and</li> <li>Respiratory symptoms in Inner-city Children with Asthma.</li> <li>And he says that every 20 part per billion increase in NO2 exposure was associated significantly with an increase in the number of days with limited speech, and so forth. So that measurement, we don't really know what kind of equipment was used for that measurement, correct?</li> <li>A You know, I'm not a health expert. I'm relying upon EPA standards. I can't answer your question.</li> <li>Q Right. And the, his Exhibit 17, chronic exposure, fine particles and mortality, extended follow-up of the Harvard six-city studies from 1974, 2009, which, you don't</li> </ul>

	Page 238		Page 240
1	same kind of monitor in every city?	1	Core (phonetic sp.) might come back, so I forget if we
2	MR. GOECKE: Objection. Beyond the scope.	2	called him before or not.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's not really beyond the	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, once again, it's got to be
4	scope, because we talk about the monitors being used. But	4	rebuttal
5	it is, he's already answered the question.	5	MS. CORDRY: Right, I understand.
6	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: surrebuttal, I should say.
7	MR. GROSSMAN: He doesn't, he's not a health	7	MS. ROSENFELD: Right, surrebuttal.
8	expert.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: So all right, and they will
9	MR. SILVERMAN: Okay.	9	represent that they have either heard the testimony or they
10	MR. GROSSMAN: He doesn't know what monitors were	10	have read the transcript? How are they going to
11	used in those health studies. He said that the use of this,	11	MS. CORDRY: They can have them read if there's a
12	the reference, is based on the fact that EPA uses that tool	12	particular piece that they are needing to rebut, yes.
13	and sets its standards by that tool. All right. Well, then	13	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Because I don't want to
14	we are finished with you, Mr. Sullivan. I thank you very	14	have, I don't want just to have repetitive testimony of what
15	much. I've learned a lot from you, and from your direct and	15	Mr. Core testified before.
16	cross-examinations. Thank you very much.	16	MS. CORDRY: No.
17	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.	17	MR. GROSSMAN: I remember his testimony quite
18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. What's the pleasure of	18	well. Okay.
19	the group here? Do we turn to Dr. Cole now, or do we	19	MS. CORDRY: It would not be what either one of
20	discuss objections, or do we just go home?	20	that that appeared at all, and would not have anything to do
21	MR. GOECKE: Well, we've got an environmental free	21	with what Mr. Core testified about.
22	day on the 20th	22	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. How long do you
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	23	anticipate the direct of Dr. Cole?
24	MR. GOECKE: so it seems useful to begin Dr.	24	MS. ROSENFELD: I would expect it would probably
25	Cole now, to take advantage of the time we have with him.	25	take the better part of a day. I think we would probably
	Page 239		Page 241
	Page 239		Page 241
1	MS. ROSENFELD: Please	1	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably
2	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes?	2	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon.
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left?	2 3	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for	2 3 4	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him.	2 3 4 5	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in	2 3 4 5 6	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes?	2 3 4 5 6 7	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very short. And I would expect we can also wrap up anything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels of emissions, and we're entitled to have a health expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very short. And I would expect we can also wrap up anything about the objections on that day as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels of emissions, and we're entitled to have a health expert respond to whether or not that affects conclusions directly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very short. And I would expect we can also wrap up anything about the objections on that day as well. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I remind you, you said that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels of emissions, and we're entitled to have a health expert respond to whether or not that affects conclusions directly related to the impact of the levels of emissions on health.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Please MS. CORDRY: Twenty minutes? MS. ROSENFELD: 20 minutes left? MR. GROSSMAN: We don't have a lot of time for him. MR. SILVERMAN: Can we discuss some objections in the last 20 minutes? MR. GROSSMAN: We could do that. Do you want to do that instead, or MS. CORDRY: Well, there's a few. Maybe we could MS. HARRIS: Well, there's also the question of do we need a new hearing date. And also we would like to know if the opponents and their surrebuttal are providing other witnesses besides Ms. Cordry and Dr. Cole. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, for the 20th I think the witnesses will be Ms. Cordry and two other individuals. MS. CORDRY: Two other people talking about, essentially about traffic issues. If they are, they're very short. And I would expect we can also wrap up anything about the objections on that day as well. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I remind you, you said that you're not calling those other two witnesses. They're just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	finish in a day. But I would expect it to go probably through early mid-afternoon. MS. ADELMAN: So he'll start on the 22nd MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: which happens MR. GROSSMAN: That's the last day we have testimony scheduled. MS. ADELMAN: That's right, and it happens to be his birthday, so we'll have a cake and ice cream. MR. GROSSMAN: No ice cream unless his answers are very short and quick. MS. ROSENFELD: And Mr. Grossman, I do expect that we will also call Dr. Jison back. MS. HARRIS: On what basis? We presented no health, testimony regarding health except for the very few questions that they asked Mr. Sullivan, which was in terms of the standards. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I do think that Mr. Sullivan has provided different analysis with respect to the levels of emissions, and we're entitled to have a health expert respond to whether or not that affects conclusions directly related to the impact of the levels of emissions on health. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually I think they have a fair

	Page 242		Page 244
1	regarding the levels of pollutants. And so I guess one	1	to tell you, I am going to be out of town from June 13
2	could argue that they're entitled to have a health expert	2	through June 21.
3	come in and say that even those levels of pollutants are	3	MS. HARRIS: How about the 29th of May?
4	problematic, I suppose.	4	MR. GROSSMAN: The 29th of May. Do I hear any
5	MR. GOECKE: I think she's already testified to	5	bidders for the 29th of May?
6	that.	6	MR. GOECKE: That works for me.
7	MR. GROSSMAN: She has to some extent, at least	7	MS. ADELMAN: I have to double check. I mean this
8	with regard to PM2.5, saying 2.5, I'm not sure, like I	8	will all be double checked.
9	said, I'd have to look back at the NO2 testimony. But in	9	MS. CORDRY: We have to check with Dr. Jison,
10	any event, so but I would expect it to be directed to that	10	because she's the most likely going to be on that day.
11	narrow a point, that is something	11	MS. ADELMAN: And Dr. Cole needs to check his
12	MS. ROSENFELD: I agree. I agree.	12	calendar, and I'm
13	MR. GROSSMAN: is truly surrebuttal.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Can you all e-mail me
14	MS. ROSENFELD: So based on the rebuttal report.	14	tomorrow?
15	Of course if you rule to strike it, we're happy to withdraw	15	MS. ADELMAN: Mm-hmm.
16	Dr. Jison as a witness.	16	MS. HARRIS: Are we just identifying one day?
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I don't want to, as I said,	17	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we've got three more days, if
18	I don't want to make up my mind on that	18	we count that, so
19	MS. ROSENFELD: Sure.	19	MS. HARRIS: Okay.
20	MR. GROSSMAN: until I hear from Dr. Cole.	20	MR. GROSSMAN: And I have to look back at my
21	Okay, so let's think of some other dates. A lot of people	21	calendar also, but I think I'm okay on the 29th of May. So
22	were expecting us to be done in May, including me.	22	we'll check it out.
23	MS. CORDRY: I think we might get by with one more	23	MR. COLE: Mr. Grossman, I have a commitment on
24	day.	24	June 3rd.
25	DR. COLE: I don't see how.	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
	Page 243		Pogo 245
	· • 9• = ••		Page 245
1	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of	1	
1 2	, and the second s	1	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell.
	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of		MS. HARRIS: Not being committed.
2	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the	2	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell.
2 3 4	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions?	2 3	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm
2 3 4 5	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to	2 3 4	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we	2 3 4 5	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May
2 3 4 5 6	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's	2 3 4 5 6	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30?
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June. MS. CORDRY: So the 26th is Memorial Day, correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd? MR. GROSSMAN: The 3rd is no good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June. MS. CORDRY: So the 26th is Memorial Day, correct? And the 28th I am in hearing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd? MR. GROSSMAN: The 3rd is no good UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June. MS. CORDRY: So the 26th is Memorial Day, correct? And the 28th I am in hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: The 28th is a Wednesday anyway.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd? MR. GROSSMAN: The 3rd is no good UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. MR. GROSSMAN: for Dr. Cole.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June. MS. CORDRY: So the 26th is Memorial Day, correct? And the 28th I am in hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: The 28th is a Wednesday anyway. MS. CORDRY: It's Wednesday anyway, okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd? MR. GROSSMAN: The 3rd is no good UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. MR. GROSSMAN: for Dr. Cole. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: June 6th works.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. CORDRY: And I can't recall, the discussion of the conditions, was there going to be a discussion of the conditions? MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I don't see any reason not to have it. I mean there are some that are agreed to, and we can talk about the others. I don't know that anybody's mind's going to change. I usually have a set of conditions I generally use in any event, which would be kind of superimposed on those. And I may or may not accept everything that was said in the proposed conditions, so we'll have to go back over that. I did go over the ones that were submitted, but it's been a number of weeks, and I don't remember exactly what my, all of my conclusions were. I have to look at my notes. All right. So let's talk about dates. MS. ADELMAN: No Wednesdays, right? MR. GROSSMAN: No Wednesdays, because the Board of Appeals is on Wednesdays. MS. ADELMAN: I'm not available on the 5th of June. MS. CORDRY: So the 26th is Memorial Day, correct? And the 28th I am in hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: The 28th is a Wednesday anyway.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. HARRIS: Not being committed. MR. COLE: I don't know. You never can tell. MS. HARRIS: Well, it may be happening. I'm reasonably open that first week in general. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're looking at May 29. Is there an alternative day that, how about May 30? MR. GOECKE: That does not work for me. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, me either. MR. GROSSMAN: All right, how about June 2? MS. ROSENFELD: I have a brief due that day. COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, do you want to go off the record at this point? MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's just do a little bit COURT REPORTER: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: How about June 5? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that works. MR. GOECKE: That works. MS. ADELMAN: I won't be available. MR. GROSSMAN: June 6th? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the 3rd? MR. GROSSMAN: The 3rd is no good UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. MR. GROSSMAN: for Dr. Cole.

	Page 246		Page 248
1	MR. GOECKE: June 6 works for me.	1	CERTIFICATE
2	MS. ADELMAN: Not for me.	2	DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Hmm?	3	the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the
4	MS. ADELMAN: Not for me, sorry.	4	electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the
5	MS. HARRIS: Can we, I mean we have, these	5	Office of Zoning and Administrative Hearings for Montgomery
6	hearings have expended an awful long time, and I feel like	6	County in the matter of:
		7	Petition of Costco Wholesale Corporation
7	we've been very patient and accommodating to everyone's schedules, but I hope people can be as flexible as possible	8	Special Exception No. S-2863
8		9	OZAH No. 13-12
9	at this stage.	10	
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, I would hope so. Well, we're	11	By:
11	trying to figure out another day here. June 9, what does	12	57.
12	that sound like?	13	
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: June 9, going once, going		
14	twice. We probably do need	14	
15	MS. ADELMAN: What date are we on now?	15	
16	MR. GROSSMAN: June 9.	16	Margaret L. vanEkeren, Transcriber
17	MR. GOECKE: I'm available then.	17	
18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, so now we have two days	18	
19	that are, that seem like they're going to be okay, May 29	19	
20	and June 9. So everybody get back to me tomorrow by e-mail.	20	
21	Tell me if those are okay.	21	
22	Let me see, I may just announce them at the public	22	
23	hearing if we select it, rather than sending out the formal	23	
24	notice, given that we're in our surrebuttal case at this	24	
25	point, and just announce it, as were the last two under the	25	
	Page 247		
-	Board of Appeals rules, at the public bearing on May 20		
1	Board of Appeals rules, at the public hearing on May 20,		
2	assuming you would all agree. But I do want to know as soon		
3	as possible. Okay, so e-mail me tomorrow. And I don't		
4	think we have much time for going over the objections now. Let's just pick them up at the next session.		
5	All right, if there's any other business? Hearing		
7			
8	no other business, we are adjourned. Thank you. (Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the hearing was		
。 9	adjourned.)		
_	adjourned.)		
10			
11 12			
13			
14			
15			
16 17			
18 19			
20			
20			
21			
22			
23 24		1	
24 25			
23			
1		1	

	accurately (1)
_	222:17
(1)	<b>achieve (3)</b> 102:5,11;114:19
(1) 150:20	achieved (2)
130.20	154:21;177:6
Α	<b>achieving (1)</b> 37:12
<b>A 70</b> (1)	acknowledge (1)
<b>A-79 (1)</b> 147:17	193:15
Abigail (1)	acknowledged (2)
5:14	43:18,24
ability (1)	acres (1) 117:15
31:16 able (3)	across (15)
<b>able (3)</b> 120:1;157:21;229:16	33:16;100:22;
above (17)	109:16;110:22;111:
20:1;29:13;46:25;	122:12;131:17;132:
81:22;105:9;108:10;	138:8;140:22;154:1
110:4;117:25;153:22;	180:7,8,11;213:5 act (7)
167:23;168:3;179:13, 14;202:7;218:19;	86:23;158:22;176:4
229:24;232:8	198:13;200:24;206:2
absence (1)	25
120:25	action (3)
absent (3)	152:25;157:11,14
9:17;218:25;219:1	activities (2) 166:8;219:2
<b>academic (1)</b> 211:22	activity (2)
accents (1)	135:23;164:16
137:9	actual (18)
accept (2)	16:15;23:14;41:15;
171:1;243:9	74:12;154:14;159:1 171:7;187:8;191:1;
acceptability (1) 86:15	197:19;203:9;204:1
acceptable (2)	207:3;210:24;221:4
198:12;206:24	232:11;236:25
acceptance (1)	Actually (58)
120:23	7:3;9:14,16;27:15; 34:5,12;62:17;63:7;
accepted (4)	71:7,10;76:21;96:2,
85:17;86:2;191:23; 241:24	21;99:13;103:3;
accident (1)	104:22;110:3;113:1
194:8	114:25;115:7;127:1
accommodating (1)	20;128:15,22;130:2
246:7	133:9;136:14,25; 137:6;143:6;144:2;
according (1) 89:12	146:3;150:20;151:5
account (5)	153:16;163:5;169:3
14:17;43:20;88:25;	183:21;188:12,13;
110:19;111:3	189:12;190:12;191:
accounted (1)	14;205:17;213:4; 217:18;218:21;220:
9:2	221:3,17;222:12,23;
accounting (1) 111:11	224:9;227:12;233:1
accuracy (4)	241:23
175:4;190:6;191:2;	add (17)
204:15	19:25;94:17,22,24; 117:11;140:24;175:2
accurate (12)	178:11;185:25;192:
9:10;91:6;101:11; 169:25;211:19;214:17;	225:4,6,10,10;226:3
222:13;223:8;230:15;	227:4;228:12
236:14,15,20	added (2)

177:19:208:13 adding (5) 29:24;94:8;227:19; 228:17,19 addition (7) 46:17;48:1;55:2; 85:12;135:8;149:17; 162:21 additional (10) 5:23:35:13:58:18; 94:8;157:22;158:23; 159:3;195:19;209:6; 241:25 address (8) 22:2;41:13;61:2; 115:14;207:4;208:12, 110:22;111:10; 14;210:8 131:17;132:11; addressed (3) 40:8;42:12;58:3 40:22;154:19; addresses (1) 200:22 58:22:176:4: addressing (1) 200:24;206:20, 115:15 ADELMAN (25) 5:14,15,16;120:16; 142:24;144:15;145:17; 146:23;187:25;220:13, 14;234:13,17;241:3,5, 8;243:16,19;244:7,11, 15:245:18:246:2,4,15 adjoining (2) 13:6:15:13 54:14:159:17; adjourned (2) 247:7.9 203:9;204:18; adjust (3) 10:24;221:4,9; 110:25;111:9;115:9 adjusted (5) 100:12:102:2: 109:16;110:7;111:25 adjusting (1) ;76:21;96:2,4, 230:8 adjustment (8) 110:3;113:16; 43:2;44:1,3,7,11; 115:7;127:15, 105:21;114:19;115:1 15,22;130:2; adjustments (2) 42:18;43:1 adjusts (2) 50:20;151:5; 110:10;115:8 163:5;169:3; administrative (2) 85:22,25 190:12:191:10, Administrator (1) 158:25 218:21;220:6; admissibility (1) 7;222:12,23; 85:20 27:12;233:14; advanced (1) 177:3 advances (1) 106:25 140:24;175:25; advantage (2) 185:25:192:13; 189:3;238:25 ,10,10;226:3; adverb (2) 187:1.2 adverse (5)

87:6;88:12;89:2,20; 90:19 advisor (1) 104:15 advocating (3) 233:22;234:2,4 AERMOD (9) 46:4;52:8;58:24; 59:12,16;71:8;98:22; 120:25:175:24 affect (3) 26:11;175:4;185:18 affected (3) 112:1,3;173:21 affecting (2) 66:25;68:10 affects (1) 241:21 afraid (1) 33:15 afternoon (2) 147:11,12 again (52) 18:16,24;22:9,23; 23:2;25:12;28:6;30:13; 32:6;36:25;42:21;43:8; 44:9;52:21;74:4;75:4; 86:6;89:7;91:1;92:10; 98:7;115:22;127:23; 133:15,18;135:2,9,12; 138:9:139:1:141:23; 168:18;179:16;180:12; 193:21,24;196:22; 197:4;201:24;203:1; 209:13;210:20;213:9; 214:1;216:9;227:16; 228:16,18;229:25; 230:14;233:5;240:3 against (4) 16:9;115:20;119:14; 211:5 agencies (6) 85:22,25;156:25; 157:17;158:15;218:24 agency (16) 35:8,12;36:18;58:9; 59:15;61:5,5;82:18; 136:18,24;137:1,5,12; 153:5;198:20;219:5 Agliata (1) 184:23 ago (3) 127:2;176:9;207:2 agree (27) 11:8;37:2;43:18; 44:17;76:2;80:17; 101:8;143:21;170:9; 173:2;175:15;178:6, 23;179:7,11;180:5,6; 193:6,9;198:21;207:8; 235:15,18;236:6; 242:12,12;247:2 agreed (7)

16:3,5:209:20; 216:25;217:8;228:4; 243:5 agreement (1) 185:24 Ah (1) 122:7 ahead (7) 10:15;40:23;90:7; 102:11;159:25;183:14; 217:20 air (51) 26:8;31:4,21;34:15; 36:19;38:3;56:3;92:11; 100:10,18,21;105:12; 110:7,22;111:17; 126:1;134:15;138:10, 22,23;148:9;150:14; 152:9;153:6;154:14; 157:20,21;158:3,22; 159:18;165:1;169:3; 180:23,24;181:19; 182:2;183:18,19; 195:4;198:9,13; 200:24;206:20,25; 215:4;218:3,4,5,22; 219:5;234:20 air's (1) 186:13 AIRDATA (1) 183:25 A-I-R-D-A-T-A(1)184:1airflow (1) 163:21 alert (1) 167:13 alerted (1) 167:14 Alexandria (1) 218:16 allow (3) 4:6;86:3;203:21 allowed (6) 35:7;37:24;165:23; 170:18;184:13,15 allowing (2) 35:22;43:15 allows (3) 98:24;205:24;212:15 almost (3) 74:6;76:20;147:2 alone (1) 201:13 along (5) 13:13;14:7;26:8; 128:4;154:6 alter (1) 130:25 alternative (3) 35:23;39:20;245:6 although (8) 130:23;132:5;

160:14:170:8:177:7: 178:4.16:228:17 always (7) 11:25;64:18;71:11; 73:1;119:13;129:15; 180:25 ambient (5) 26:8;75:1;140:24; 179:5;183:19 America (1) 161:19 among (5) 8:17;11:18;39:8; 52:18;219:21 amount (12) 59:23;71:23;171:7; 179:25;189:22,24; 190:25;191:21,22; 195:25;199:13,14 analyses (3) 13:22;229:23;230:6 analysis (68) 22:8;24:13,15;30:17, 18;31:8;36:2,22;38:9; 39:25;40:11,14;52:2; 54:12;62:6;67:13;74:2; 77:5;82:5,11,13,23,24; 83:20,20;84:8,21,23; 85:3,4,10;86:2;87:9, 23:88:3,15:89:5,23,24, 24;94:23;95:12; 103:25:111:21:112:13: 116:22:135:19:138:1; 141:7;186:24;188:18; 195:15,19;201:17; 204:20;207:15;210:19; 213:17:222:5,21,23; 224:10,12,14;229:12; 230:2;235:9;241:19 analyst (1) 181:3 analyze (3) 48:11;191:18,19 analyzed (1) 57:9 and/or (1) 81:24 Angeles (12) 163:5,8;164:16,18; 167:23;168:3;170:7, 25;171:5;172:7,7; 173:11 angst (1) 202:1 announce (2) 246:22,25 annual (2) 44:5,5 answered (9) 30:8,23;45:6;90:2; 134:20;141:24;197:13, 22:238:5 anticipate (1)

240:23 anybody's (1) 243:6 apologize (1) 97:4 apparently (2) 49:16;189:5 Appeals (8) 4:4,14,17;36:22; 135:14,17:243:18; 247:1 appear (1) 163:23 appeared (1) 240:20 appears (1) 203:9 appendix (19) 58:12;74:17;81:9,11; 101:22;102:20;121:12, 12;122:2,10;130:25; 133:5,6,10;188:14,19; 198:11;203:7,8 apples (3) 137:24;138:2;139:1 applicable (3) 183:8;195:4;237:5 applicant (4) 35:11;85:14;86:17; 172:22 applicant's (2) 6:20:11:22 application (6) 11:23;84:17;106:19; 199:1;206:6;207:4 applications (1) 49:18 applied (12) 41:4;53:11;54:24; 57:3:64:14:65:2,11; 70:7;81:22;136:9; 189:23:202:13 apply (13) 9:15;26:2;53:17; 67:6;88:4;100:15; 101:17;183:7;189:22, 25;190:1;201:14; 218:16 applying (8) 18:16;20:13;52:24; 53:17,19;65:1,9; 106:11 appreciably (1) 158:17 appreciate (1) 66:11 approach (16) 11:3;35:1;68:21,22; 71:17;82:10,12; 129:10,12;135:24; 136:10,11;206:6; 208:2;216:3;223:7 approached (1)

155:8 approaches (1) 85:23 approaching (2) 25:20;26:5 appropriate (9) 11:8;34:25;35:25; 85:13;101:4;120:25; 121:22;219:5,24 approval (1) 82:18 approve (2) 35:18;36:9 approved (1) 185:14 approximate (1) 110:25 approximately (11) 46:22;91:8;108:6; 110:2;141:14;144:3, 14,23,23;179:9;201:10 approximation (2) 20:6;37:12 April (1) 4:11 AQS (2) 218:23;219:2 arbiters (1) 85:23 area (66) 13:13,15,15:16:21; 19:5.13.23:20:11.11. 15:21:2,5,20,20,21; 22:10,19,19;23:3,4; 26:14,16;37:3;53:11; 56:11,12,20;66:20; 86:14:100:19,23; 101:18:102:3:110:20: 113:24;136:14;142:24; 143:20;144:3,3,24; 145:2;146:3,25;153:5; 158:23;165:2,12; 168:16;169:4;172:6; 175:14;177:22;183:8; 185:2,2,23;186:12; 192:12;204:11;205:11, 20;218:6;222:23; 223:4;236:1 areas (26) 22:7,23;26:18;89:19; 92:1:100:3,7:137:19, 19;149:20;150:15; 152:18,20,22,24; 153:10;154:17,18; 161:8;183:19;198:2,2; 199:3;204:12;211:4; 218:3 aren't (9) 11:1;26:22;87:13; 133:21;155:8;182:23; 204:20;208:20;232:16 argue (3) 191:7,8;242:2

argued (1) 105:11 argument (3) 9:16;119:13;208:16 Arlington (12) 80:6,10,13,16,17; 189:12;192:11;207:16, 23;208:3,10;232:13 around (25) 60:17;62:10;64:5,21, 21;73:6;124:20;141:3; 142:23;143:2,25; 145:1,8,18;146:4,4; 154:7,18;173:20; 175:17;176:7;184:24; 201:7;212:16;232:7 arrived (1) 105:19 arrow (1) 231:6 article (13) 46:14,18;48:22; 103:9;106:24;107:8; 109:6;112:24;113:8; 116:4,5,6;127:16 articles (1) 157:10 artificially (1) 27:22 aside (1) 98:22 asleep (1) 125:11 aspect (1) 154:6 asphalt (3) 19:22:20:4,4 assert (1) 150:2 asserting (1) 217:4 assess (2) 81:23;94:9 assessment (2) 162:10;230:16 assign (1) 101:20 assigned (1) 101:19 associated (3) 225:15;226:9;237:15 Association (2) 31:21;34:16 assume (15) 16:17;20:14;55:7; 59:3,6;62:6;68:8,13; 71:2;93:16;118:25; 166:3;170:19;208:3; 210:17 assumed (4) 56:25,25;71:24; 72:13 assumes (4)

72:3.5;74:25;88:21 Assuming (29) 9:15:10:24:25:12; 27:6,16,23;28:25; 30:18:55:10:56:20; 62:12,20,25;68:18; 71:9,11,12;72:17,23, 25;74:10;120:10; 150:7,8;223:1,3; 228:19:241:24:247:2 assumption (7) 66:25:69:9:74:19: 106:1,9;189:21;222:9 assumptions (5) 30:1;36:14;73:14; 226:5;229:6 assurance (1) 219:2 asterisk (1) 82:16 Asthma (1) 237:13 atmosphere (6) 76:3,16,24;138:12, 24;155:19 Atmospheric (8) 49:17,20;58:9;59:15; 61:5;104:7,9,10 attach (1) 190:24 attached (1) 74:22 attainment (26) 149:13.17.22.25: 152:19,21;153:11,14; 155:16;156:5;158:2; 159:6,8;161:7,11,12, 14,15,20,20,21;162:1; 183:12,17;210:2; 211:23 attention (3) 196:3:216:1:217:23 Attenuation (3) 214:5,8,9 atypical (1) 84:16 Auer (6) 16:6;19:3,19,20; 20:9;22:24 A-U-E-R (2) 16:7:19:5 August (25) 8:7,12,19,22,23;9:18, 23;10:22;14:11;17:4; 21:11,14,15;22:14,15; 23:21;45:4,8,10;46:7; 85:4;95:25;96:18; 195:10;229:16 Australian (2) 137:4,5 authenticate (2) 142:25;143:3 authority (4)

36:6,9:85:14:159:2 authorize (1) 35:14 authorized (1) 102:7 authors (4) 167:12;171:13; 175:3:176:13 automatically (1) 59:17 automobile (1) 4:7 automotive (1) 164:13 available (28) 32:13,14;35:4;57:20; 71:3,7,10,23;73:4,15; 81:18;83:22;90:11; 92:18;103:6,18; 116:10;122:24;127:25; 131:18;132:12;133:3; 183:17;218:24;232:6; 243:19;245:18;246:17 Avenue (2) 13:19;22:6 average (23) 73:6;82:8;83:9,9,11, 12;130:24;131:17,17, 19,25;132:6,8,11; 133:2:138:7:139:8; 141:14:190:15.21; 210:15,16;219:21 averages (1) 131:24 avoid (3) 106:1,5,9 aware (12) 105:14:149:24: 150:13;152:18;162:6; 164:16,25;166:8,10,13; 178:24,25 away (10) 6:14;26:21;54:16; 66:20;138:10,24; 139:2;158:21;164:1; 179:4 awful (1) 246:6 B back (40) 9:13;22:20,21;23:10;

background (66) 9:1,22;24:17,18,19, 20,21,24;25:3,21;26:5, 7;27:2,8;29:10,13,19; 30:20;69:20,22,24; 70:14,17;77:11,16,19; 82:25;83:1,18;84:5,25; 128:18,20;129:2; 137:18;139:4,10,11; 140:24;141:8,16,17; 163:24;164:1;171:10; 179:5;188:4,7,10,16; 189:11,24;207:3,14,15, 19,21;208:9,10,14; 217:14;219:25;223:25; 229:7;232:12;233:3 **Background's** (1) 139:4 backgrounds (1) 193:16 bad (2) 85:24;194:1 bag (1) 20:3 baking (1) 138:11 balancing (1) 69:23 ballpark (2) 144:11,14 Baltimore (5) 139:5;140:5,6,16,16 **BAM (22)** 209:19,21,25;210:6, 11;211:1,6,16;212:24; 213:1,4,4,9;214:1,7,12, 13,14,17;215:12; 219:24;236:21 **BAMs (4)** 212:2;214:3;215:20; 236:19 bar (1) 196:4 bars (5) 195:23,24;196:1,12, 24 **base** (6) 98:19;172:13,15; 184:1,7;219:3 based (53) 10:13:13:20:15:19; 20:23;22:1;23:14; 24:23;27:5;28:1;30:23; 36:23;44:11;45:13; 46:12;56:2;59:11; 60:18;62:19;68:8; 69:19;71:14;74:2;78:2; 85:6;86:1;89:10,11; 90:8;91:5,24,25; 112:17;123:3;124:22; 128:17;131:17,25; 132:8,21;153:1; 193:10;195:15;198:8;

210:23,25;212:13; 215:13:218:3:232:4: 236:21,22;238:12; 242:14 bases (2) 99:1;184:14 basic (1) 146:10 basically (13) 19:19:54:17:55:17; 63:17;103:6;109:15; 114:7;123:5;132:20; 142:23;145:19;212:15; 217:16 basis (19) 16:17;44:17;48:5,23; 52:12;59:5;60:11; 74:20;84:20;85:13; 90:17;95:7;121:22; 123:23;174:3;207:22; 211:3;219:25;241:14 Beach (7) 93:3;162:17;164:16, 17;166:23;170:15,18 beat (1) 179:16 become (3) 177:2;206:22;236:22 becoming (1) 17:16 begin (1) 238:24 begins (4) 128:22;130:23; 132:5,5 begun (1) 4:11behalf (2) 4:14.23belief (1) 11:2 Bell (2) 123:15,19 below (6) 13:24;14:18;82:17; 162:22;167:21;168:16 Beltsville (14) 78:21;79:6,8,11; 80:5,24;81:2,3;190:21; 191:6;209:9,15; 212:17:219:21 beltway (1) 180:25 benchmark (2) 60:25;64:2 benefits (2) 178:4;189:6 besides (1) 239:15 best (11) 20:5;83:4;104:11; 132:23;145:22;147:6; 198:12;206:6,23;

218:23;232:2 Beta (3) 214:4,5,7 better (9) 5:3;56:15;81:5; 143:6;163:2;175:13; 234:21;235:1;240:25 beyond (38) 12:3,11;13:9;15:8, 11:16:19.24.25:17:3.9. 14;18:10;19:1,15; 21:24;29:14;36:25; 46:5;52:25;53:8;56:12; 65:19;68:17;73:4;84:4; 87:10,14,14;88:18; 188:21;215:7;231:24; 234:9,22,23;235:23; 238:2,3 bias (12) 128:19;207:9; 209:21;212:1,16; 213:14,16,19,21; 214:16;215:21;219:22 biased (2) 211:15.20 bidders (1) 244:5 big (10) 10:11;75:12,15,18, 20:126:3:127:2: 146:10;170:12;186:2 biggest (1) 231:2 billion (12) 76:8;92:4;148:13; 149:8;167:9,10,22; 168:2,19:171:25; 174:5;237:14 birthday (1) 241:9 bit (16) 5:4:10:14:45:24; 63:25;88:9;91:22;93:8; 123:2;143:5;164:20; 179:1;187:21;193:2; 206:9;210:16;245:13 blackboard (1) 140:11 block (3) 131:14;175:12; 230:22 blocking (4) 33:21,22;175:15; 176:5 blocks (1) 194:9 blowing (1) 63:22 blown (1) 203:10 blue (2) 212:14,22 breathe (1) Board (8)

4:3,14,17:36:21; 135:14,17;243:17; 247:1 body (1) 137:13 Boise (1) 140:4 **bolded** (1) 75:13 book (6) 49:13,14;103:17,19; 104:16:116:4 bore (13) 125:23,23,24,25; 126:4,5,6,11,14,20; 127:3,3,10 both (13) 22:22;31:3;55:23; 67:10;78:8;109:13; 112:3;121:16;163:21; 167:21;184:4;209:20; 227:21 bottom (13) 58:1,13;70:20;106:8; 128:15,23;161:24,25; 213:11;217:25;221:9; 225:5,7 **Boulevard** (4) 19:16;20:3;22:6; 25:24 Boulter (1) 125:15 bound (4) 110:9;136:9;148:19; 208:20 boundaries (2) 183:6,9 boundary (5) 18:5;116:7,8;145:1,3 bounding (1) 71:16 box (45) 56:14,19,22;57:3,8; 62:7,8,21;63:2,7,10,11, 11;65:7,12,15,16,20; 66:1,1,4,15;67:1,5,20, 20,22;68:4,4,10,11,13, 17,22;70:8;72:25;95:5; 128:5;138:18;145:9, 12,14;212:21;222:24; 223:10 boxes (2) 197:3;212:20 bracket (2) 108:25;168:13 Brann (8) 4:20,20,22;124:25; 125:3;201:18,20,22 break (9) 66:4;99:22;116:19; 118:2,4;119:16,17,18; 142:1

244:20;246:20

25:22;38:14;40:3;

62:4;66:5,9,14,14;

41:24;42:19;43:4;61:9;

81:8;83:13,14,16;84:3;

109:4;119:23;130:15;

133:1,2;136:1;139:5;

162:9:164:18:207:1:

226:7;229:7,16;240:1;

241:13;242:9;243:11;

189:13 breathing (2) 110:1:115:6 brief (5) 66:4,7;142:15; 223:20;245:10 briefly (1) 168:4 bright (3) 136:2;188:21;206:24 bring (5) 14:25;33:1;47:17; 221:13:233:7 brings (1) 62:4 Bristol (1) 137:6 British (1) 137:15 broad (1) 154:20 broader (1) 180:12 broke (1) 118:12 brought (1) 32:24 Brown (1) 33:20 Bryce (3) 215:6;235:14;237:10 buffer (2) 18:11:192:22 build (2) 166:16;191:10 building (1) 140:23 build-up (3) 125:25;126:22; 140:21 built (6) 132:24;192:20; 213:16;232:22,23,24 bullet (2) 98:17;120:22 bullets (1) 98:16 bump (1) 211:5 bunch (1) 228:18 busier (1) 173:20 business (2) 247:6,7 **busy** (8) 94:10;170:3,4; 171:24;172:22;193:13; 194:1;232:11 С

196:17,18,20 C-2(1)4:10cake (1) 241:9 calculated (2) 51:19;111:19 calculation (7) 52:2,3;107:20;108:1; 113:18:184:25:186:18 calculations (4) 73:24:107:22; 222:25;230:18 calculator (1) 221:12 calendar (2) 244:12,21 California (9) 31:21;34:15;92:2,4; 171:19;172:14;173:3; 180:9,9 call (8) 20:2;52:5,7;56:14; 157:8;187:16;213:20; 241:13 called (18) 46:13;53:13;57:12, 13;94:17;95:23;96:5; 123:14;126:15;140:3; 145:12;187:15,23,23; 206:24;212:1;237:11; 240:2 calling (2) 63:6:239:23 Calls (2) 30:22;36:24 came (9) 7:11;40:3;77:4;88:3; 104:21;114:9;119:4; 122:21:216:6 can (109) 6:12,21;10:5,7,12; 14:25;17:19;26:12; 31:4;33:8,15,23;34:5, 12;37:19;38:14,14; 40:4;46:17;47:11,17, 17,19;53:15;57:21; 59:21;61:14,17;85:11; 88:19;89:11;92:11,19; 97:6,21;99:2;100:7,15; 103:14;104:23;106:17; 107:11:110:11:111:22: 113:18;115:25;116:15, 15,19;118:3;122:24; 124:25;125:4;137:18; 139:18;141:1;143:2,5, 6;150:11;158:20; 163:16;171:12;172:6; 175:23;177:9;178:12, 18,25;179:4;180:7.8; 184:4,10,11,17;189:4, 25;199:23;201:21; 202:24;203:5,11,20;

207:8;209:3;211:7; 212:25:213:8.12.16: 216:8;222:1;223:9,10, 17;224:12;225:20,23; 228:11;230:16;239:6, 20;240:11;243:6; 244:13;245:2;246:5,8 can't (24) 9:20;26:15;29:25; 30:3:33:22:39:15; 85:14;113:2;138:2; 143:23;152:22;159:10; 166:3;170:22;174:16; 175:23;189:15;194:6, 10,12,15;227:20; 237:20;243:1 cap(2)84:12;138:17 capable (2) 166:4,6 **CAPCOA (18)** 31:24;32:12,21,22; 33:4;34:15;38:10; 52:12,18;53:15;81:8; 82:22;121:11,24; 122:1,22;123:10; 125:16 capped (1) 83:23 capping (1) 138:19 caption (1) 98:15 car(2)67:4:124:16 care (3) 136:5;177:11,14 careful (2) 17:25;144:20 Carmichael (2) 61:16.22 carried (3) 24:13;25:4;132:15 carries (1) 128:23 cars (16) 52:25;53:12,13,18, 19,22;54:2;64:1,14; 117:5;125:25;194:13, 14,16;232:10;233:11 CASAC(1) 215:4 case (25) 4:18;8:17;11:20,21; 20:2;36:21;38:19; 42:10;51:8;53:22; 67:10;72:20;78:19,24; 85:13,13;89:9,17; 93:14;161:24;196:25; 211:8;213:4;234:11; 246:24 cases (2) 53:6;93:8

categories (2) 19:23:121:16 categorize (1) 19:24 cause (4) 8:24;167:23;168:3; 175:10 caused (2) 175:2;231:1 causes (1) 48:16 cautioned (1) 218:2 caveat (3) 177:6;178:15;217:25 caveats (1) 197:25 centimeter (3) 114:7,23;117:16 centimeters (3) 114:9;115:9;117:12 central (1) 144:4 certain (14) 36:11;48:16;58:21; 168:14;172:23;175:19; 187:17;190:7,22; 198:7;199:12,14; 204:24;230:3 certainly (40) 16:9:20:9:23:18; 32:14:36:3.9.15:38:4. 24:43:23:51:11:53:15: 56:23;59:20,22;60:19; 82:14;87:14;89:14; 102:18;103:5;106:11; 111:22;113:9;115:16; 119:4;123:22;151:3; 166:6;167:1;171:12; 172:10;192:2;198:7; 199:7.15:204:14: 229:11:234:4:236:4 certainty (4) 195:3,5,9,17 **CFR** (1) 133:24 chamber (3) 75:25;76:3,23 chance (3) 118:7;208:25;231:15 change (29) 9:1;11:14;42:16; 63:18;65:3;96:14; 111:16,18,23,24; 112:13;124:10;158:13; 174:14;178:8,12,25; 184:25;185:4;186:1, 17,22;193:17;211:23; 219:2;221:8,9;226:17; 243:7 changed (17) 8:9,9,22;9:12,23,23; 41:6;42:13;44:14;

54:22;162:3,7;180:17; 184:18:195:17:203:25: 206:22 changes (11) 8:7,14,15,17,21; 9:15;42:19;65:4; 107:19;124:11;223:12 changing (1) 180:18 characteristics (3) 46:11;48:24;116:7 characterization (1) 101:11 characterize (1) 187:15 characterized (1) 100:8 chart (1) 212:20 charts (2) 225:1;230:6 chase (2) 173:11;223:11 check (11) 7:5,6;173:17,18; 199:10;201:21;226:23; 244:7,9,11,22 checked (1) 244:8 chemical (1) 78:14 Chemistry (1) 127:20 Children (1) 237:13 choice (2) 38:19:39:3 choices (2) 38:24:41:9 choose (2) 77:22;230:18 chose (4) 132:18;135:5; 210:19;211:17 chronic (1) 237:21 circle (7) 18:17,21;19:25; 142:23,23;145:18; 146:18 circumstance (1) 91:6 circumstances (3) 10:17,18;35:10 citation (2) 203:5;206:7 cite (4) 102:3;105:13; 113:23;181:22 cited (3) 96:25;107:9,10 cities (5) 140:5;154:3;162:25;

C-11 (3)

163:7:237:25 citing (3) 180:14,16,16 City (6) 49:25:137:22,22; 138:8;186:10;238:1 clarification (1) 203:24 clarified (2) 210:21,22 clarifies (1) 188:19 clarify (13) 10:23;35:16;41:4; 44:16;53:2;54:19; 63:14;72:9;88:20;90:6, 6;91:3;126:7 clarity (1) 56:4 classified (2) 152:19;181:25 classify (3) 159:7,10;181:19 Clean (11) 158:22;170:15,17; 171:3;177:25;178:2,3; 198:13;200:24;206:20, 25 clear (18) 14:17:15:8:24:2; 37:21:65:7.10:75:16, 17:76:24:82:16:85:21: 91:15:119:5:188:21; 206:18;215:19;228:16; 232:9 clearly (14) 12:24;16:8;23:12; 26:5:45:21:60:18: 91:22;107:5;111:1; 127:15,25:163:4; 219:23;231:14 clears (1) 126:1 clip (2) 99:17,20 **close** (12) 26:13;42:6;73:1; 74:19;92:8;112:13; 115:23;144:1;145:7; 148:23;188:13;228:21 close-in (2) 23:8.9 closer (5) 11:10;44:20;51:22; 143:6;197:3 closest (10) 11:18;12:12;13:15; 25:15;43:21;44:4,5,9; 100:19;101:16 clunkers (1) 181:17 CO(3) 50:6,21;127:17

Coalition (3) 5:12.15:234:14 Coastal (1) 116:7 **COB** (1) 4:13 code(2)94:17:98:18 coefficient (1) 19:9 coefficients (7) 15:19,21,24,24; 22:16,18;25:7 coincidence (1) 76:14 Colburn (1) 218:15 Cole (34) 7:25;9:5,14;11:2; 16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2;86:13,18,25; 100:7;101:1,3;106:18, 20;119:5;199:25; 200:1;217:13;234:3,5; 238:19,25;239:15; 240:23;241:25;242:20, 25;244:11,23;245:2,23 Cole's (3) 11:5;76:18;217:8 collected (2) 157:20:193:11 college (1) 95:17 co-located (1) 209:24 colored (1) 212:22 colors (1) 212:23 column (5) 114:21,24;115:1; 122:12:213:10 combination (5) 51:9;114:14;115:13, 18,19 combine (1) 94:20 combined (3) 107:17,21;109:13 combining (2) 106:14:107:24 combustion (2) 52:5,13 comfort (1) 172:22 comfortable (2) 125:9;169:11 coming (15) 6:2;52:12;57:8;63:8, 19:64:17:66:16:87:20; 93:9:138:23:139:4: 140:19;154:6;233:4,12 comment (2)

128:1:159:15 comments (2) 11:5:37:25 commercial (1) 218:16 commitment (1) 244:23 committed (1) 245:1 committee (1) 215:4 common (2) 61:23;225:10 Commons (2) 123:15,19 communities (1) 154:20 community (1) 239:24 comparable (1) 170:8 compare (5) 43:13;138:2;202:16; 212:15;213:8 compared (2) 214:16;231:2 comparing (1) 17:12 comparison (5) 88:19:139:1;212:2; 213:22:215:1 compensated (1) 201:16 competent (2) 31:4,18 complete (7) 27:6;74:25;76:15; 154:17;158:22;160:3; 219:15 complex (2) 13:1;173:8 compliance (6) 34:14;35:4;81:23; 129:14;131:20;135:15 complicated (3) 66:11;118:22;173:8 component (2) 124:22;179:5 composed (1) 138:1 compounds (1) 50:23 computed (1) 114:18 computer (1) 150:25 computing (1) 56:1 conceded (2) 85:16:100:7 concedes (1) 89:15 conceivable (2)

112:19:117:21 concentration (17) 13:10;27:3,3;28:13; 50:17;73:23;75:3:89:4: 92:1;121:19;169:15, 15,16;204:17,24; 207:23;221:10 concentrations (33) 13:23;14:18;25:20; 26:3:51:9:59:6:68:25; 77:7;83:16;87:9;88:14; 93:17;127:19;128:18; 129:2,17;132:23; 134:15;158:17,20,21; 159:18;162:11,22; 177:12;193:13;204:7, 8,10,13,19;205:16; 220:24 concern (3) 13:16;22:3;167:12 concerned (1) 93:23 concerns (3) 22:1;195:15;198:18 conclude (3) 46:10;51:17;100:3 concluded (5) 10:8;11:11;86:9; 101:3;112:9 conclusion (12) 25:11:36:25:48:16: 90:18.23:101:7:102:5: 174:15:177:18:181:4: 194:19:195:1 conclusions (7) 102:14;173:5,6; 214:21;215:16;241:21; 243:13 concurrent (3) 128:20;129:7;207:21 condition (1) 186:15 conditions (14) 20:24;23:15;74:3; 101:3;102:2;109:16; 112:18,23;132:14; 185:23;243:2,3,7,10 conduct (1) 116:20 conducted (3) 4:14;36:20;222:23 conferred (1) 86:3 confidence (5) 176:13,14;181:19; 199:21;231:23 confident (2) 189:10:195:18 configurations (2) 177:10:178:19 confirm (1) 143:23 confirmed (5)

45:21:92:19:123:1; 209:18.23 confused (3) 25:2:71:1:138:16 congested (5) 170:3,4;180:25; 192:12:194:1 congestion (4) 42:9,10;180:1;194:7 Congress (3) 50:3;103:10;104:13 conjunction (2) 83:1:114:17 conservatism (8) 90:10;91:7,24;201:9; 202:24;205:18,24; 232:5 conservative (59) 8:24;9:1,10;10:22, 23,24;11:3;30:1,4; 35:22:52:13:53:7: 54:12;57:11;60:25; 68:21;69:1,4,11,13; 70:12;71:16;83:12,17; 84:8,22,24;85:4;89:10; 121:25;169:10,16; 186:24;187:1,3,4,11, 15,16,22,24,25;191:5; 192:17;201:5;207:7, 14,17;208:2,5,14,19; 210:2,8;211:3,9; 222:18:223:8:229:8 conservatively (8) 53:23:60:9:61:2: 68:8;71:19;120:12; 132:23;189:18 consider (9) 18:22;19:17;22:24: 57:14;87:1;140:12; 178:6;189:4;237:4 considerably (3) 51:18;177:9;178:18 consideration (10) 9:7;16:15;85:10; 91:24;177:1,14; 201:13;206:14;229:25; 232:4 considerations (1) 177:11 considered (5) 26:15;42:14;117:11; 135:23:145:11 considering (5) 90:9,10;112:12; 206:21;232:6 considers (1) 57:13 consistency (2) 235:21;236:7 consistent (13) 17:6:45:23:49:2: 82:12;100:4;107:3,11, 17;134:25;135:4,7;

198:12:206:25 consistently (1) 213:12 constant (5) 108:7,18,19,20; 109:20 constants (1) 109:13 construct (1) 4:6 contact (7) 75:2,23,24;76:15,16, 20:219:4 contacts (1) 74:18 contained (6) 13:2;84:17,23;85:4; 92:16;190:8 content (1) 125:9 contentions (1) 220:5 context (9) 43:2;101:14;140:11; 176:20;180:12;191:12; 192:17;209:6,8 continually (1) 233:3 continue (5) 25:23:85:9:99:4; 191:9:211:6 Continued (5) 120:7;142:18; 147:13;198:11;206:23 continues (1) 99:2 continuity (1) 106:12 continuous (1) 213:9 contribute (3) 65:22;224:18,25 contributing (3) 192:14;210:20;231:4 contribution (3) 26:24;140:24;221:5 contributions (2) 16:16;221:2 contributor (1) 231:2 Control (3) 31:21;34:16;174:12 controversial (1) 38:3 convenience (1) 130:5conversation (2) 188:11;208:23 conversations (1) 175:21 conversion (57) 8:16;9:6;27:17,18, 23;29:8;50:19;56:21,

23:58:19,20,21:59:4,9, 11:60:2.19.20:61:24: 62:12,25;63:11;64:14; 65:11:67:8:68:10.14. 18;69:13;70:12;71:2,4, 5,24;72:21;73:15,20, 24;74:10,12;76:19; 85:7;122:10;126:23; 127:13;138:5,6,12,17; 139:12:140:1.19; 145:7,16;173:9,22; 223:10 conversions (1) 59:16 convert (15) 27:24;57:18,19,21; 59:24;65:4;66:24;71:3, 7.10,13;72:6;73:7; 76:9;168:18 converted (6) 51:2;60:24;72:4,18; 138:23:178:5 converting (5) 57:1;60:5,6,16;75:24 cool(3)186:10,11,12 coordinate (2) 116:19;223:18 **Coordinating** (2) 164:9,11 copies (6) 6:11:32:23:33:1: 155:25;212:10;217:24 **copy** (32) 6:12;28:20,21,23; 31:23;32:5,6,20,24; 33:5,6,7;34:5,8,9,10; 75:16;97:2,5;103:18; 116:10;122:6;130:5; 150:19;151:2,3,6,7,25; 160:7;212:11;220:2 Cordry (82) 5:5,5,6,7,25;6:6,9,11, 15,16;7:3,15,16;28:16; 29:3;47:14,17;48:7; 63:7;72:11;75:14,18, 21;99:7,9;118:16; 119:7;133:23;137:8; 139:12,14,17,20; 144:15,17,19;150:25; 168:23;169:1;184:3; 210:3;214:5,8,11,13; 216:2,19:217:1,5,12; 221:17,20,22;223:17, 24;224:5;227:22,24; 228:2,4,6,8;229:2,4; 231:11;233:25;234:11; 239:2,10,15,17,18,25; 240:5,11,16,19;242:23; 243:1,21,24;244:9 Cordry's (2) 208:23;209:3 core (4) court (3)

236:5:240:1,15,21 corner (2) 157:7;205:8 **Corporation** (2) 4:3;164:13 corrected (4) 29:12;70:14,15; 189:21 correctly (8) 45:14:46:10:70:11, 22;87:11;103:8;218:7; 219:19 correlate (3) 108:3;113:7;220:23 correlated (2) 83:4;204:18 correlates (1) 83:3 corresponding (1) 207:22 Costco (14) 4:3,21,24;5:1,12,15; 42:6;171:21;173:15; 177:20;181:2;195:3; 206:3;234:20 costs (1) 155:23 couldn't (6) 6:14;70:2;83:24; 172:1,24:194:14 Council (2) 164:9.11 counsel (1) 147:16 count (1) 244:18 counties (1) 161:19 country (23) 90:11,18;91:25; 92:15;148:12,14,22; 149:7.24:152:18.24; 153:6;155:2;161:9; 173:11,20;174:4; 180:8;181:4;193:12; 202:17;212:16;232:7 counts (3) 41:5;171:7;230:13 County (5) 149:5,6,12;161:25; 218:6 couple (12) 5:21;8:25;52:15; 60:10;118:10;125:4; 127:2;134:5;140:5; 213:3;232:21;234:15 coupled (1) 192:19 course (7) 20:4;26:11;135:22; 189:16;207:6;237:3; 242:15

28:23;245:11,14 courts (1) 85:21 cover (2) 190:21;208:13 coverage (6) 20:20;21:24;153:20; 154:17:219:11.11 covered (4) 13:8:20:9:87:15: 120:6 covering (1) 192:9 **CRC** (6) 147:17;162:9; 169:20;193:6;195:23; 197:24 cream (2) 241:9,10 create (6) 76:16:126:21; 127:13;175:15,16; 186:10 creates (1) 62:1 creating (2) 39:25;74:3 criteria (1) 198:8 critical (1) 156:24 criticizing (1) 211:18 cross (1) 186:14 cross-(6) 17:15;37:14;39:17; 118:23;215:9;216:6 crossed (2) 17:9:106:16 cross-examination (14) 7:21;8:2,4;15:2; 37:5;40:8;86:9;119:24. 24;120:7;142:18; 147:13;166:1;216:3 cross-examinations (1) 238:16 cross-examine (3) 48:8,13;222:1 cross-examined (2) 40:6,7 cubic (12) 25:16;43:22;90:14; 92:14;93:25;148:14; 149:8;168:14;174:5; 181:7;202:18;210:15 culpability (10) 141:6,19;208:9; 221:3;224:9,11,14; 226:13;229:12;230:23 curb (2) 164:18;165:1 current (8)

21:1,22;94:6;134:22; 158:18;177:13;187:16; 236:18 currently (3) 156:25;157:18; 158:15 cut (3)

# 173:10,16;223:11

# D

daily (1) 219:3 dark (1) 75:13 data (92) 28:2;35:13;61:13,19; 69:20,20,21;78:4; 79:16,18,20;80:2,9,10, 12:83:2.22:90:11; 92:12;93:19,24;94:1, 17,22,24;95:8;98:19; 99:1;124:8;127:25; 128:17,20;129:1,6,7, 13,14,15;131:2,3,5,7, 17,18;132:1,8,12,16; 134:14,18;148:6,7,8,9; 154:22;155:4;157:20; 162:12;164:22;184:1, 7,14;189:17;190:9; 193:10.11:194:10: 196:16.25:197:5.7.9. 17,19;207:24;208:21; 210:13;213:13,15; 214:20,21;218:3,22,23, 23;219:2,4,6,15; 229:12;232:6;235:21 date (5) 93:24;156:12,13; 239:13:246:15 dated (4) 18:4;95:25;123:17; 130:10 dates (2) 242:21:243:15 David (1) 208:23 day (30) 4:2;6:7;78:3,5,6,14; 117:5;119:10,12,14; 162:18;168:7;171:3; 189:14,21;204:25; 205:1;209:18;238:22; 239:21;240:25;241:1, 6;242:24;243:21; 244:10,16;245:6,10; 246:11 days (9) 7:4;79:24;210:4,5; 216:13,13;237:16; 244:17;246:18 Davtime (2) 176:6.6

DC (1) 218:14 dead (1) 179:16 deal (2) 10:12;231:22 dealing (1) 16:2 dealt (1) 31:17 debate (1) 166:20 **December (6)** 9:4;12:20;23:11; 54:24;74:7;224:21 decide (2) 184:24;235:19 decided (2) 9:7;224:1 decides (1) 186:17 deciding (1) 178:15 decision (4) 4:18;135:19;211:5, 18 decision-maker (2) 206:18,18 decision-makers (1) 188:24 decision-making (1) 206:15 decisions (3) 35:19:86:1:188:25 declared (1) 149:25 declined (1) 113:14 decreases (2) 177:4:179:10 decreasing (3) 177:3,8:178:16 deemed (1) 35:25 default (7) 120:23;121:2,6,18, 25;198:17;199:21 defaults (3) 85:15,17;123:5 defective (1) 154:22 deficits (1) 189:7 define (5) 111:24;158:10; 190:10;219:12;224:12 defined (4) 63:12;130:24; 190:10;224:11 defines (1) 155:21 defining (2) 219:11;236:24

definition (6) 11:22:12:1.2.2: 130:25:156:1 definitive (1) 237:5 degree (6) 91:24;191:13;194:7; 195:2.5.9 degrees (2) 31:10:125:5 delete (1) 120:3 demonstrate (1) 35:4 demonstrates (1) 167:20 demonstrations (1) 131:20 Dennis (1) 5:18 dentists (1) 99:4 depend (3) 78:15;123:25;139:10 dependent (1) 126:11 depends (7) 19:18;38:1;125:21; 147:5;184:20;203:16; 227:15 deployed (2) 157:19:158:16 derive (3) 40:11:106:12:107:20 derived (9) 80:5,7;91:19;92:20; 104:20;105:7.8; 113:10:122:23 deriving (1) 51:8 describe (5) 52:9,19:61:14; 126:20;128:1 described (12) 41:14;44:9;62:17; 80:10;81:22;82:7; 127:15;156:21;186:23, 23;187:18;197:4 description (4) 81:17;203:18;209:4; 211:13 design (4) 98:19;125:21;128:3; 130:23 designated (6) 19:7;149:4;152:20; 153:10;159:2;163:17 designating (3) 161:7,8,13 designation (11) 12:7;19:24;149:9,17, 21;151:22;155:13; 158:23;183:15;186:5;

214:4designations (10) 148:22;149:1,18; 150:15;152:10;159:1; 182:3:183:5.8.17 desirable (1) 236:5 detail (6) 110:24;126:21; 196:9,15,23;197:14 detecting (1) 235:17 determination (2) 135:15:153:20 determine (4) 36:22;102:10; 116:20,21 determined (1) 153:5 determining (2) 19:8;183:8 develop (2) 98:16;206:21 developed (5) 59:19;180:17; 200:25,25;201:3 developing (1) 85:23 diagram (1) 147:3 didn't (61) 5:23:7:6.6:9:16: 11:8;12:14;13:25;14:1, 4:15:19:16:8:36:11: 41:8;42:3,16,23;43:23; 44:19;46:3,19;49:19; 51:4,24;53:24;54:15; 65:10;70:15;80:11; 88:2,6,7;98:20;101:8, 17,20;103:18;106:11; 112:4;113:10,17,17; 121:21;125:8;126:24; 133:9;153:19,24; 159:14;162:20;163:8; 168:7;174:10;191:21; 192:17;194:14;197:15; 201:19;211:10;225:4; 228:3;230:11 diesel (21) 44:22;121:13; 122:19,20;162:19; 170:13,14,15;171:2,3, 4;177:2,7,18,19,25; 178:2,4,9,11,16 diesels (7) 53:16;121:15; 170:15,17;171:8; 177:20,22 difference (14) 44:21;67:2;69:18; 76:22;126:3,19;127:2; 170:6,12;171:5,9,11; 187:14;209:13

differences (2) 170:11:189:2 different (49) 10:14.18:11:1:13:9: 23:3:31:10,10:36:7,13, 16;37:11,18;63:16; 65:14;70:13;71:20; 82:4:98:25:117:5.5.5: 125:24;132:19;135:5, 22;148:21;165:3; 170:10,10;171:8; 184:5;186:21;188:7; 189:6;192:18;198:8, 19;203:25;209:9; 211:19;212:16;218:17; 224:15,24;225:3; 226:16;232:15;236:9; 241:19 differently (7) 10:19;67:16;88:10; 175:17;178:3;199:1; 225:6 difficult (5) 48:8;98:19;179:6; 193:3;198:25 diffusion (2) 19:9;76:16 dilute (1) 111:11 dilution (1) 175:25 dioxide (5) 150:16:153:7; 155:18:156:11:237:12 direct (17) 39:12,18;40:9;45:13; 50:12:62:20.24:87:15. 16;123:23;127:12; 174:11;177:8;178:17; 218:22;238:15;240:23 directed (2) 88:2;242:10 direction (6) 78:16:100:23; 138:11;144:22;235:1, 22 directions (1) 175:19 directly (17) 50:9,19,23,25;55:25; 57:5;58:3;64:11;83:2; 88:6.7:89:7:112:1: 113:6;170:1,2;241:21 director (1) 210:1 disagree (4) 80:20;101:7;178:23; 179:12 disagreeing (1) 217:14 disagrees (1) 113:19 disapprove (1)

36:10 disconnect (1) 33:21 discovery (1) 36:1 discretion (2) 86:3;211:7 discuss (2) 238:20;239:6 discussed (12) 11:20;24:22;44:14; 51:13;74:10;121:11; 148:21;166:19;176:1; 189:20;209:11;218:13 discussing (1) 176:14 discussion (13) 9:13;18:23;59:2,15; 87:23;197:12;199:8; 211:24;212:17;223:2, 3:243:1,2 discussions (5) 176:1;199:2,7; 229:10;232:23 disk (4) 61:13,19;127:25; 229:13 disperse (2) 68:13,17 dispersion (21) 15:19,21,23,24;19:9; 20:18:22:16:23:25: 25:3,4:46:2,10,12; 48:23;59:12;101:4; 112:1,23:175:16; 176:19;186:15 display (2) 212:1;213:21 dispute (1) 106:18 distance (23) 18:20;26:16;60:25; 71:14;74:9;80:19;81:2, 3;102:2,10;106:16; 108:21,22;109:15,18, 20,21;110:8;114:25; 115:3;117:18;143:22; 164:1 distance-wise (1) 75:7 distant (1) 193:8 distinction (3) 30:11;45:18;217:19 distinctions (1) 37:21 distinguish (1) 188:5 distracting (1) 136:6 distribution (4) 189:17;196:6;205:2; 207:7

5 2000				
distributional (3)	195:24,25;196:20,23;	196:3;217:23	24:19;50:1;62:5;63:10;	elements (2)
194:6;204:22;205:12	197:12;203:13;210:5;	drawback (1)	73:9;86:13;100:4;	113:17;185:16
diurnal (1)	211:8;213:15;215:20;	178:5	102:12,18;112:7;	Eleven (1)
176:2	217:24;218:14;219:10,	drawn (6)	119:5;121:11;129:11;	200:7
divide (7)	15,16;235:3,5;237:17,	92:21;142:23,24;	165:5;206:5,9;212:13;	Ellsworth (1)
27:7,10,15;29:20;	23;239:4;242:25;243:4	143:23;145:17;147:1	218:13;222:22	31:13
168:20,21,23	done (58)	draws (1)	early (4)	else (4)
divided (1)	9:21;10:16;16:17;	172:22	17:12;74:5;118:2;	12:8;61:21;89:13;
168:25	17:13;20:16;21:11;	drew (2)	241:2	139:7
dock (40)	22:1,21;23:14;30:1;	61:7;136:17	easel (1)	e-mail (5)
8:20;22:4,11;23:4;	31:15;37:17;49:23;	drift (1)	143:9	6:25;7:9;244:13;
41:15;42:2;53:14;54:1;	55:25;57:11,21;59:20;	68:4	easier (2)	246:20;247:3
56:24;60:17;62:9;64:6;	61:13;67:15,15;70:8;	drifts (1)	17:24;191:1	e-mailed (1)
65:16;66:16,22;67:19;	83:24;84:19;85:16;	67:5	easiest (1)	6:24
68:1,17;72:24;84:16;	126:20;132:12;133:1;	drive (1)	212:19	emission (6)
144:21;145:2,4,9,11,	135:19;140:4,15;	116:16	easily (2)	38:21;41:3;51:5;
18,25;146:5,9,15,25;	155:5;195:15;198:7,9,	driveways (1)	6:22;92:19	62:21,24;93:11
168:16;173:15;177:25;	9;199:1,9,10;200:2;	19:22	east (8)	emissions (36)
		driving (1)	21:5;42:7;80:24;	12:15;41:12,21,22,
178:1;225:15,18;	205:4;206:3;217:15, 15;224:1,15;225:6,9;	53:22		
226:3,21;231:3			81:3;100:19;146:15,	23;43:19;44:22;45:22;
doctor (1)	226:8;229:15,22,25;	drop (3)	25;163:20	53:22;57:8;65:12;
90:21 document (35)	230:6,7,8;233:22; 234:2,12;242:22	128:5;179:13;192:24	<b>east-west (1)</b> 144:6	66:16,17;68:3,10,12,
		dropping (2)		16;94:11;123:14,23,
31:22;32:14,21,22;	doors (1)	84:5;192:20	easy (2)	25;124:5;126:16;
38:11;58:10;81:9;	234:20	dual (3)	56:18;134:5	127:12;164:18;177:3,
84:18;95:23,25;96:1,	dots (1)	125:25;126:4,11	edge (1)	5,8;178:17;179:8;
14,19,22;97:22;98:15;	212:22	Duckett (2)	117:18	199:6;228:18;233:9,
105:22;122:22;125:16;	double (5)	5:17,17	education (1)	11;241:20,22
126:15;130:11;150:11,	7:5;82:16;127:3;	due (4)	31:7	emits (1)
25;151:7;155:23;	244:7,8	16:14;219:1,2;	effect (9)	67:5
156:9;159:24;160:9;	doubt (4)	245:10	126:1,21;127:6,8;	emphasis (1)
176:23;181:21;206:10;	155:18;187:6,9;	duplicate (3)	146:19;175:11;192:8;	12:4
211:25;212:4,6,7	198:2	209:17;216:15,17	229:19;233:12	emphasize (2)
documents (1)	down (31)	duplicates (2)	effects (14)	175:13;227:17
9:9	13:21;22:6;25:3,15;	216:16;219:12	67:20;87:7,12,16,19;	Empire (1)
domain (3)	26:17;29:21;33:22;	duplication (1)	88:3,7,12;89:3,13,20;	137:15
16:6;23:6;138:24	45:2,15,16,24;61:25;	209:19	90:19;154:19;237:2	empirical (1)
dominant (1)	62:2;75:1;82:17;100:9;	during (16)	efficiently (1)	108:20
110:1	106:4;130:22;167:6;	8:19;37:25;40:9;	126:2	end (12)
dominates (1)	176:2;186:12;189:13;	59:25;74:2,4,6,6;78:5;	efforts (2)	31:5;94:18,25;99:10;
139:11	213:7;227:15;231:14;	116:8,19;135:22;	155:22;233:7	105:11;112:22;119:24;
don't (99)	232:17;233:4,4,4,7,12	148:5;179:19;199:2;	eight (1)	139:5;161:18;182:17;
6:7,10;12:2;15:4,23;	downward (1)	216:6	115:9	193:1;204:21
16:10,10;18:23;23:1;	191:9	duties (1)	eight-foot (1)	ends (2)
28:20,23;30:12;32:5,	downwind (2)	90:9 Dertton (14)	111:4 Fishtry (1)	117:24;196:7
23;38:4;49:16;57:22;	108:21;163:21	<b>Dutton (14)</b>	Eighty (1)	engine (2)
59:11;65:19;69:8;74:1;	Dr (44)	49:15,17,22;102:4,8,	167:7	177:10;178:19
75:22,23;79:15,20;			oithor (15)	
	7:25;9:4,14;11:2,5;	9,15;103:9,25;104:2,	either (15)	engines (1)
80:19,20;81:7;89:14;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17;	21;105:18;106:24;	10:13;66:19;78:13;	177:2
91:11;93:20;96:1,24;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4;	177:2 England (2)
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b>	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17,	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b> 121:13,15;122:19,	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13;	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2)
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b> 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2;	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b> 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1)	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8)
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1)	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 <b>Eleanor (1)</b> 5:17	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19,	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b> 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2)	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13,	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23;	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 <b>duty (7)</b> 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 <b>dynamics (1)</b> 186:22	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 <b>Eleanor (1)</b> 5:17 <b>electronic (2)</b> 6:24;116:12	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20,	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1)	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1)	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18)
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4; 159:12;160:18;162:12;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20, 25;244:9,11;245:23	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1) 186:22 E	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1) 203:21	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18) 13:1,8;22:19;23:6;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4; 159:12;160:18;162:12; 172:11;174:19;177:20;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20, 25;244:9,11;245:23 <b>drain (1)</b>	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1) 186:22 E e- (2)	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1) 203:21 element (1)	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18) 13:1,8;22:19;23:6; 34:8,9;39:17;79:12,14;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4; 159:12;160:18;162:12; 172:11;174:19;177:20; 179:12;180:5;186:6;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20, 25;244:9,11;245:23 <b>drain (1)</b> 185:25	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1) 186:22 E e- (2) 5:23;82:12	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1) 203:21 element (1) 148:6	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18) 13:1,8;22:19;23:6; 34:8,9;39:17;79:12,14; 92:3;100:18;141:17;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4; 159:12;160:18;162:12; 172:11;174:19;177:20; 179:12;180:5;186:6; 188:8,22,24;191:13;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20, 25;244:9,11;245:23 <b>drain (1)</b> 185:25 <b>draw (5)</b>	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1) 186:22 E e- (2) 5:23;82:12 earlier (23)	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1) 203:21 element (1) 148:6 Elementary (1)	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18) 13:1,8;22:19;23:6; 34:8,9;39:17;79:12,14; 92:3;100:18;141:17; 147:3;148:12;173:11;
91:11;93:20;96:1,24; 97:1,3,5,22;98:10,13; 99:17;106:17;107:5; 113:4;121:5,21; 125:10;126:12;129:22; 132:2;133:6,17;135:9; 140:11,21;144:4; 145:8;152:2;154:13, 15;155:12;158:4; 159:12;160:18;162:12; 172:11;174:19;177:20; 179:12;180:5;186:6;	16:2;18:8;43:18;44:17; 76:2,18;86:13,18,25; 100:6,25;101:3; 105:18,18;106:18; 119:5;199:25;200:1; 215:6;217:8,13,16; 220:13;234:3,5; 235:14;237:10;238:19, 24;239:15;240:23; 241:13,25;242:16,20, 25;244:9,11;245:23 <b>drain (1)</b> 185:25	21;105:18;106:24; 107:8 duty (7) 121:13,15;122:19, 20;162:18;171:2; 177:19 dynamics (1) 186:22 E e- (2) 5:23;82:12	10:13;66:19;78:13; 150:8;159:5;166:4; 179:10;182:22;203:17, 24;214:4;223:13; 240:9,19;245:8 Eleanor (1) 5:17 electronic (2) 6:24;116:12 electronically (1) 203:21 element (1) 148:6	177:2 England (2) 137:14,16 enormous (2) 187:18,19 enough (8) 64:8;66:24;71:11,12; 73:15;97:22;113:3; 127:12 entire (18) 13:1,8;22:19;23:6; 34:8,9;39:17;79:12,14; 92:3;100:18;141:17;

entitled (3) 104:3:241:20:242:2 **Environment (3)** 137:12.13:185:20 **Environmental (8)** 5:19;61:5;127:21; 136:18,24;137:1; 153:5:238:21 envision (3) 194:11,12,14 EPA (99) 9:9:16:9,12;17:7; 30:19,20;31:2,18; 35:17;36:19;37:17,23; 49:11,12;51:13;77:10; 84:17;85:15;86:3; 89:12,17;90:24;92:21; 93:4,6,10,16,16;94:2; 95:24;96:17;97:13,24; 98:16,22;99:2;105:16, 20,20,22;115:12,14; 121:2;129:9,9;134:17, 24,25;135:4,7;148:9, 23;149:18;150:13; 151:8,19;152:9; 154:11;155:1;156:22, 25;157:17,21;158:14, 22;159:1;161:5; 166:20;167:13,14; 174:14,14,17;180:18; 181:14,18;183:6,7,15, 25:188:13.19.20: 189:5;198:14,16; 205:1,3,5;208:19; 211:6;212:3,7;215:19; 218:24;235:19;236:14; 237:20:238:12 **EPA's** (10) 16:6;90:14,17,20; 92:11:121:18:151:24; 206:5;212:7;237:4 **EPA-related** (1) 105:22 equal (1) 81:2 equals (3) 113:24;168:14; 226:25 equation (16) 105:7,8,19;106:11, 12,13,13,14;107:23; 108:6.15:112:5:114:2. 3;115:21;117:8 equations (1) 115:13 equilibriating (1) 46:24 equilibrium (2) 102:5,11 equipment (4) 143:12;212:1;237:1, 18 equivalent (1)

213:22 Erich (1) 4:20error (24) 29:8,10,13;101:1,8, 9;188:5,6,9,16,17; 189:23;191:14,19,22, 25;195:23,23,25;196:1, 4,12,24;197:12 errors (1) 189:4 ES-2(1) 167:20 especially (5) 16:14;75:6;170:15; 178:11;179:24 essentially (2) 27:24;239:19 establish (3) 89:21;157:18;158:15 established (1) 115:20 establishes (1) 150:14 estimate (13) 51:12;81:6;106:15; 113:23;127:12;129:16; 131:19;195:25;198:12; 205:6;206:6,24;232:2 estimated (1) 204:12 estimates (3) 84:11:204:17,20 estimating (4) 134:14;204:6,7,9 estimation (1) 114:17 Europe (1) 178:10 evaluate (8) 50:5.23:77:23.25: 107:23;157:21;158:4; 185:11 evaluated (3) 79:3;105:18;112:8 evaluating (1) 190:24 even (17) 53:15;58:5;62:18; 92:8;112:14;137:19; 140:10;154:9;171:23; 172:7,22;176:13; 228:9,11,20;229:5; 242:3 evening (1) 74:5 evenly (1) 12:25 event (2) 242:10:243:8 eventually (1) 236:10 everybody (6)

48:14:119:15; 212:11;220:18;223:18; 246:20 everyone's (2) 217:23;246:7 everything's (1) 235:1 everywhere (1) 26:9 evidence (28) 4:16;10:13;37:14; 42:9:86:8:87:2:135:18, 23;150:1,3,8,9,10; 158:7;165:11;166:4; 170:21,22;171:23; 172:15,24,25;174:8,11, 15;185:7;188:22; 241:25 evidentiary (1) 86:16 exact (4) 81:3;104:8;129:11; 144:5 exactly (17) 11:6;35:9;54:20; 63:24;80:2,19;82:15; 143:23;144:10,15; 160:19;171:20;178:1; 191:17;200:5;207:20; 243:13 examination (9) 17:16:37:15:39:18: 118:24;142:12;200:18; 215:10:216:7:224:4 examine (2) 163:9,11 Examiner (3) 4:15;36:21;37:14 example (44) 26:13:31:12:44:4; 46:21;49:1;60:8;61:17, 18;68:12;83:15;92:2; 100:17;102:13;108:5; 109:25;114:9;115:7; 117:4,6;121:23; 122:25;123:7;124:15; 131:8;132:21;139:5; 141:19;148:8;191:5; 196:5;197:1;201:6,10; 204:12,23;207:14; 208:1,11:210:13,14; 213:13:221:5:226:18: 237:10 examples (3) 27:5;59:22;163:4 exceed (5) 25:5;167:3,5;181:8; 232:7 exceedance (1) 172:1 exceedances (3) 14:1,7,8 exceeded (1)

15:10 exceeding (2) 148:23:172:7 exceeds (1) 183:19 except (5) 48:10;72:24;136:5; 170:24;241:15 excepted (1) 130:6 exception (9) 4:5;11:23;18:5; 24:17;26:14,16;41:10; 144:2.9 excerpt (3) 96:8,9;151:20 exchanged (2) 184:16,16 exclude (1) 145:20 excluded (1) 86:8 exclusively (1) 219:25 Excuse (4) 102:22;124:25; 127:21;201:18 exercised (1) 177:11 exhaust (1) 63:23 exhausted (1) 5:22 Exhibit (52) 18:3,22;24:3;25:22; 28:15;34:2,11,13,16, 17;52:22;81:12,13; 96:9,10;97:7,10,23,25; 98:4,15;99:11,12; 103:22;104:1,5; 120:14;122:2;129:18, 24:130:13:133:5: 142:20,21;143:14,16; 147:16;152:3,8,11; 156:17;160:13,15; 176:24;182:1,9; 213:21,24;216:1; 220:2;237:11,21 exhibits (5) 5:23;6:1,2,21;151:4 exist (3) 166:12;174:10; 232:19 existing (1) 190:8 expand (3) 154:16,24;157:18 expanded (5) 153:20;154:23; 157:21;158:15;206:23 expanding (1) 154:2 expansion (1)

153:24 expect (18) 28:2;132:24;140:25; 148:20;154:19;201:7, 9;202:20;204:24; 205:6,25;232:7; 233:16;239:20;240:24; 241:1,12:242:10 expectation (2) 51:21:192:19 expected (4) 101:12:157:19; 158:16;233:12 expecting (1) 242:22 expended (1) 246:6 experience (4) 30:20;31:11;205:4, 18 experienced (1) 31:14 expert (16) 10:2,5,12;37:8,16; 48:11;87:2;113:19; 192:4;195:2;218:9; 235:25;237:19;238:8; 241:20;242:2 expertise (4) 30:20:35:12:86:5; 215:8 experts (1) 215:3 explain (8) 19:19;59:14;67:17; 100:15;103:14;108:2, 13:147:6 explained (3) 11:13;70:5;224:22 Explaining (1) 161:2 explains (1) 181:25 explanation (1) 219:8 explode (1) 135:25 exposed (1) 88:4 exposure (2) 237:15,21 exposures (2) 87:24;94:9 expressed (4) 88:11;89:1;167:12; 201:1 expressing (1) 89:22 extend (3) 144:22;146:14;159:2 extended (1) 237:22 extensively (1)

107:8 failed (3) extent (5) 69:23;165:7;172:21; fair (5) 175:8:242:7 extra (6) 97:5;127:13;130:12; 175:25,25;217:24 extraordinary (2) 165:1,12 fall (4) extrapolate (2) 61:6,9 extrapolating (2) 220:16,18 fan (1) extreme (3) 186:19;187:5,6 extremely (9) 10:23;30:1,3;169:10; far (13) 180:13;186:24;187:1, 11;231:23 extremes (3) 196:25;197:5,7 eyes (1) 75:18 F face (1) 159:5 fast (6) facility (2) 168:5;181:3 fact (45) faster (3) 8:17:9:2:35:10; 36:16:41:13:43:1: favor (1) 44:21,25;45:11,15; 59:18;69:24;85:12; 87:14;89:20;91:25; 93:5,10;101:15; 110:19;111:3;126:20; 128:1;150:7,7;151:7, 10,12,15,17;152:9; 156:18:164:25:166:3; 170:19.20:175:2: 176:4;186:1;192:19; fed (1) 199:20;215:6;217:7; 236:12;238:12 factor (26) 27:7,15;29:21;41:11, 12;43:2;44:20;58:19; 67:8;69:10;73:3,12,14; 74:13:108:7:112:4; 122:10:139:6:175:7: 189:25:192:19:201:10: 202:13;204:15;222:17; 230:14 factored (1) feel (2) 141:18 factoring (2) 88:22,22 feet (15) factors (6) 78:15:107:4:108:2: 111:18;224:25;225:3 felt (1) facts (1) 10:6

233:5

76:1

6:15

86:11

237:8

**FEMs (2)** 155:23;198:23; 212:3:213:22 few (6) 199:11 24:22:95:19:180:6: 139:22;179:25; 215:7;239:10;241:15 227:23;236:3;241:23 field (1) fairness (1) 117:13 Fife (1) 163:24 82:24:83:5,7:147:5 Fifteen (1) familiar (2) 220:9 123:19:147:19 Fifty (1) 72:12 Fifty-five (1) fantasy (1) 24:5 Fifty-six (1) 28:16 figure (22) 14:18;16:11;22:1; 43:7;54:16;64:23,25; 23:24;24:12,12,12; 93:13;109:15;130:22; 25:3;26:12;58:22; 145:7;213:7;230:15 88:20,24;91:4,17; farmland (1) 122:1;168:11;191:20, 117:15 21,23;197:1;215:14; farther (1) 220:3;224:6;229:13; 138:24 246:11 fashion (1) figures (3) 124:13 13:2;24:9;27:7 file (2) 41:21;58:22;60:20; 5:22;97:23 110:25;112:10;115:8 filed (1) 6:3 112:17;117:22;124:6 files (6) 12:24:36:3,4,4; 145:19;223:11 February (30) fill (3)79:23;80:3;210:6 8:23;10:21;13:11,15; filled (1) 15:8,13:21:1,13,16,22; 22:7;23:10;24:15;25:1; 79:11 filling (1) 30:17;32:2,4;39:22; 41:7,16:150:14; 4:7 151:21;152:14,25; final (7) 153:2;156:13,22; 150:13:152:14; 161:4;182:4,8 156:10,22;160:21; 161:5;223:22 209:18 finally (1) federal (32) 52:1 34:14;133:23;151:8; find (15) 152:14;156:10;157:2, 113:2;115:12; 7,9,9;160:1,19,21; 127:14;132:7;134:10; 161:5;182:4;195:4; 150:11;169:12;172:9; 209:16,21,24,25;210:4, 174:18:183:3:203:5, 12.14.23:212:1.2: 21;204:15;229:16; 213:21;214:20;215:22; 237:10 216:14;236:12,23; finding (1) 106:2 findings (2) 169:11;246:6 87:5;172:14 fine (3) 46:23;106:15,16; 161:18;220:20; 110:2.2.4.9.9:115:2.10: 237:22 117:8,8,17,17;146:24 finish (5) 38:10:118:4:142:6; 153:19 199:9;241:1

finished (2) 99:11:238:14 finishing (1) 100:14 **First (27)** 5:21;28:9;31:1;52:4, 15;58:1;62:2;77:3; 81:14:86:12:97:7; 101:19;112:9;114:21; 133:19;134:12;147:21; 176:21;185:3;187:17, 23;188:18;203:22; 212:21;214:25;220:22; 245:4 fit (1) 86:10 five (40) 14:13,14;27:7,10,12, 13,15;29:21;58:10; 60:23;66:6;79:18; 82:13:83:13,14:110:2, 2,9;117:12,16;118:16; 120:17;124:23;131:1, 6,7,9,15;132:16,20; 133:1;134:13,21; 135:8;158:6;164:17, 23;179:3;190:23;208:4 five- (2) 82:7;132:5 five-year (11) 83:9,12,19,20; 131:16.25:132:7: 134:18;135:6,21;172:5 fixed (1) 188:8 flash (1) 116:16 flashes (1) 136:3 flat (1) 66:17 flawed (1) 197:19 fleet (7) 44:17;45:19;177:5, 13,15,19;178:9 flexible (1) 246:8 flip (2) 179:22;220:3 floor (1) 4:13 flow (8) 111:10;140:18,19, 20;175:17;176:7; 186:11,13 flowing (2) 27:12:176:2 Flows (2) 116:8:176:2 focus (11) 8:18,19;11:14,15; 12:11;13:14;20:18;

22:4,10;215:15;220:4 focused (2) 13:17:23:3 focusing (1) 200:21 folks (1) 201:25 follow (5) 16:6;129:9;131:12; 134:6:205:23 followed (1) 131:11 following (5) 90:17;131:16,23; 201:25;202:9 follow-up (1) 237:22 fondly (1) 213:22 font (1) 75:11 food (1) 41:21 foot (1) 46:25 forbidden (1) 170:23 forest (2) 18:11;186:20 forested (1) 19:23 forget (2) 231:12:240:1 forgot (1) 231:9 forgotten (1) 168:19 form (1) 214:20 formal (1) 246:23 Formation (1) 116:7 forming (3) 179:10;235:7;236:18 formula (43) 46:13;49:10;55:4,18; 58:4,21;60:21;61:8; 102:3,10;104:20,25,25; 105:4,6,13,15,17,17; 106:8;107:14,17; 109:4,5,7;110:11,12, 13,25;111:19,24; 112:11,17;113:6,7,17, 23;114:14,15,16,18; 115:17;116:1 formulas (4) 104:23;107:2; 115:17;116:21 formulation (1) 107:23 forth (8) 8:18;9:14;41:6;

54:22;101:16;154:3; 164:19;237:16 FORTRAN (15) 94:17,20,24;95:4,8, 12,13,16,21;98:18,22, 24,25;99:3,5 Forty (1) 76:10 forward (4) 6:4;119:4;132:15; 224:13 found (13) 73:20;107:3;148:2,3, 3;177:7;178:15; 179:18;204:13;205:5; 223:5;224:21;225:13 four (18) 27:7,10;46:23;47:1; 58:10;59:23;103:24; 105:24;118:16,19; 123:21;136:20;157:17; 163:1;195:14;213:5; 216:15;223:17 fourth (1) 213:10 four-zero (1) 76:10 Fox (4) 82:12;120:15; 129:21:202:8 Fox's (1) 199:20 fraction (9) 51:7;55:12;59:5; 60:7;139:8;177:8; 178:17,21;221:4 frame (1) 159:1 framework (1) 94:14 frankly (2) 21:25:43:17 Free (2) 193:18;238:21 free- (1) 27:11 free-flow (1) 54:9 frequency (3) 216:7,12,12 frequent (1) 219:8 friction (1) 105:12 Friday (2) 7:1,12 **FRM (5)** 213:8;215:6;237:4,4, front (7) 23:22;24:11;46:23; 79:20;106:15;110:7; 220:2

frozen (1) 185:9 Frye (1) 171:6 fuels (2) 177:10;178:19 full (12) 36:1;52:16;58:1; 64:25;79:9,20;83:21, 21;88:24;103:5;107:5; 182:19 function (5) 110:8;114:19;123:8; 124:4;125:21 fundamental (1) 85:19 further (10) 17:6;26:21;36:7; 58:18;144:22;146:24; 147:8;198:2;205:20; 223:15 fusion (1) 75:23 future (6) 177:4,12;185:6; 186:18;232:14;236:19 G garage (5) 42:1,7;54:6,21;64:20 Gas (70) 5:12,15;8:20;12:13; 16:15,23;22:3,10,11; 23:5;26:24;41:12;42:1; 43:18,19;44:23,23; 56:24;60:1,15,16,17; 62:9;64:6,21;65:16; 66:21,23;67:19;72:24; 84:16;94:12,19;101:1; 109:25;110:3;112:21, 22;115:6,7;122:19; 144:16,17;146:10; 177:23,24;181:1,5; 185:3,17;186:2; 191:10;192:20;195:3, 13;204:25;205:8; 206:3;221:6;225:15, 16;226:19;231:1,1,3; 232:19,21,23;233:18, 23 gas/diesel (1) 122:13 gasoline (8) 44:24,24;45:22; 121:13;122:25;141:12; 177:2,24 gave (15) 6:11:9:7:44:4:45:12; 49:15:58:10:117:4: 150:19;151:7;159:24; 160:7;211:13;225:2; 229:24;233:5

Gee (1) 6:25 general (9) 23:5;84:18;106:4; 120:23;138:23;144:11; 205:2,11;245:4 Generally (11) 69:2;83:11;85:17; 143:19,22,24;144:13; 196:15:205:19:235:17; 243:8 generated (1) 68:16 generic (2) 84:14;198:13 generically (1) 124:3 generis (1) 172:4 geographic (1) 218:3 geographical (1) 53:10 geometry (2) 111:16;140:12 Georgia (3) 13:19;15:25;22:6 gets (9) 72:4;100:23;112:21; 172:18;183:12;185:10; 226:22;232:22,24 gigantic (1) 187:18 Gilbert (1) 116:6 given (10) 39:14;78:14,15; 117:6;127:1;152:15; 177:10;206:15,19; 246:24 gives (7) 16:16:37:16:98:25; 111:15;193:16;211:7; 236:17 giving (1) 236:15 global (1) 30:15 goal (2) 205:19;211:19 **GOECKE (75)** 4:25,25;5:2,4;6:23; 7:1,4,7,10,13,18;10:1; 14:19,22;15:1;29:14; 30:22;32:20,23;36:24; 42:21;66:3;87:10;90:1; 116:16;147:23;148:1; 150:19;151:2,5,14,17, 20,23;152:15;155:24; 156:9:158:6:159:23, 25;160:4,7,11,12; 165:7;184:10;197:18; 200:11,13,16,19;203:3;

205:14;214:2;215:24; 216:5:217:10.22: 220:9,11,15,20,21; 222:20;234:22;235:23; 238:2,21,24;242:5; 244:6;245:7,17;246:1, 17 GOERKE (3) 17:8;28:6,17 goes (8) 17:5;20:1;36:25; 65:7;124:18;138:20; 140:17;215:16 gold (5) 209:16;211:16,21; 213:9;236:24 Good (23) 4:20,23,25;5:8,11,14, 20;27:8;85:24;118:2; 124:15;147:11,12; 148:5;152:4;156:7; 159:22;162:24;189:20; 200:6;235:17;236:7; 245:21 government (2) 233:6,8 governmental (1) 85:14 gradation (1) 70:2 gradient (1) 25:19 gradients (1) 26:1gradings (1) 26:2grassy (4) 185:3,4,6,8 great (6) 17:11:40:7:126:21; 160:10:206:12:231:22 greater (4) 196:14,23;197:14; 205:25 greatest (1) 181:6 Green (4) 125:15;185:18; 186:17;212:22 greenery (1) 185:10 grid (9) 13:1;15:22;18:17; 28:12;65:3;73:1; 136:23;138:24;141:17 gross (1) 20:10 **GROSSMAN (495)** 4:2,15,22;5:2,6,8,10, 11,13,14,16,20;6:5,7, 10,14,18,23,25;7:2,6,9, 11,16,19,25;10:3,5,10; 14:3,21,25;15:2;16:22,

24:17:8,14,19,25: 20:21;21:7,15;23:17, 18;24:2,5,7;28:6,8,14, 21;29:2,5,15;30:8,11, 23;32:1,3,6,8,11,15,19; 33:6,10,13,20;34:2,4,7, 10,13,19,22;37:2,7,10; 39:11,14,17,21,23; 40:2,13,16,20,23;41:7; 42:22:43:6,10,14:45:8, 18;47:5,10,19,24; 48:10,19:49:4,7:50:10, 14;52:21;53:24;54:4,7, 10;56:4;57:7;60:13; 62:23;63:2,4,9,15;64:4, 12,23;65:6,17,21,25; 66:2,3,5,9,10;68:24; 69:7,11,16;70:3,10,17, 20,24;71:22;72:2; 73:12;74:21,24;76:5, 10,12,18;77:1,9,11,14, 17;78:24;79:2;81:10, 13,15;85:8;86:12,21, 25;87:13;88:1;90:4,15; 91:11,14;95:1,16;96:7; 97:4,8,12,15,17,21; 99:6,8,10,16,17,19,23; 101:23,25;102:20,23, 25;103:2,21,23;104:1, 10,14,17;106:3,17,21; 108:24;109:2;113:3.9, 15;118:1,3,6,8,11,14, 17,23,25;119:3,9,12, 23;120:2;122:5,7,14; 124:25;125:4,7,10; 127:1,5;128:11,13; 129:24;130:1,2,4,7; 132:3,22;133:8,11; 134:3,19,24;135:6,11, 25:136:2.5:137:9: 139:13.15.18.22: 141:22,25;142:3,6,9, 11,14,17;143:2,5,9,13, 15;144:7,11;145:23; 146:2,13,17;147:7,10, 12;150:1,6,22,24; 151:3,10,14;152:2,5,8, 16,22;153:2,8,12; 155:14,20;156:1,4,12, 14,16,18,21;157:1,4,6, 12,15,23;158:1,9; 159:4,10,12,19,21; 160:11,13,18,23;161:1, 4,10,13,15,22;162:1,3, 5;165:10,16,18,20,22, 25;166:3,12;167:7,9, 16,24;168:7,24;171:14, 17,21;172:2,13,18,21; 173:25;174:2,16,19,22; 176:8:182:1.5.7.9.11. 14,18,20,24;183:2,10, 13,21;184:2,8,12,15; 185:7,11;187:14;

(11) FORTRAN - GROSSMAN

188:1,11:189:1,19; 190:5,12,19;191:3,16; 192:4,15:193:1,4; 194:21,23;196:18; 197:18,21;199:12,17; 200:3,5,11,14;201:18, 21,24;202:3,22,25; 203:12,14,19,22;204:4; 213:20;214:1,7,9,12, 15,23;215:9,18,23; 216:4,24;217:2,19; 220:8,10,13,18;222:1, 19;223:16,19,22; 227:20,23,25;228:3,5, 24;229:3;230:21; 231:6,9;233:16,20,24; 234:9,13,23;235:2,12, 25;236:3;237:7;238:3, 7,10,18,23;239:4,8,22; 240:3,6,8,13,17,22; 241:4,6,10,12,23; 242:7,13,17,20;243:4, 17,23,25;244:4,13,17, 20,23,25;245:5,9,11, 13,15,19,21,23,25; 246:3,10,16,18 Grossman's (2) 207:1,13 ground (7) 46:25:62:1,2:75:2: 108:11:110:5:114:22 group (4) 51:6;57:13;223:7; 238:19 growth (2) 15:13;110:7 Guckert (2) 220:6;229:24 Guckert's (4) 220:11;222:5;230:8, 13 guess (10) 10:19;37:3;89:15,21; 131:22;161:5;184:8; 187:20,23;242:1 guidance (30) 9:9;16:9,12;17:7; 31:22;49:11,13;81:8; 84:15,18,18,19;85:15; 115:12,16;121:2; 122:22;125:16;129:9; 134:17,25;135:1,4,7; 183:6,8;202:9;205:23; 206:14,22 guidelines (1) 125:16 guilty (1) 125:7 Η H\* (1)

hadn't (2) 119:5:147:25 half (11) 72:25;90:14,24;91:9, 21,22;110:4;118:20; 170:13;221:7;232:3 halfway (2) 11:11:130:22 hand (5)17:16:69:18:96:8; 130:12;211:25 handed (2) 130:3,4 handle (1) 185:17 handled (1) 67:17 handy (3) 129:22;133:6;206:12 Hans (2) 102:7;104:16 happen (9) 38:4;58:22;73:5; 125:17;138:15;166:24; 175:19;176:3;205:21 happened (2) 122:7;222:10 happening (5) 60:20;154:25; 178:10:194:11:245:3 happens (9) 18:10:38:3:55:19: 66:20;194:8;208:3; 228:20;241:5,8 happy (4) 33:5;70:6;202:10; 242:15 hard (5)75:14;104:12;124:8; 181:3:208:21 HARRIS (17) 4:23,23;103:8;125:6, 9,12;156:16,20; 201:19;239:12;241:14; 244:3,16,19;245:1,3; 246:5 Harvard (1) 237:23 hasn't (3) 42:13;54:22;195:17 Hatfield (1) 123:15 haven't (12) 6:5;7:17;31:17;38:1, 4;47:14;80:1;103:5; 155:3,5;165:3;194:17 he'll (1) 241:3 He's (38) 10:2;17:20,22;30:8, 12;37:15;40:6;43:13; 47:6,21;48:2;50:14;

62:24;63:5,9,10;90:1;

91:15:101:8,9:113:15: 127:1;134:20;135:3,4; 141:23;156:16;165:8, 9,9;174:3;187:15; 200:21;215:7;221:25; 235:25;238:5,7 headed (1) 19:16 heading (5) 81:25:104:8:168:11, 12;183:10 heads (1) 175:3 health (28) 87:7,12,15,19;88:2,7, 12;89:2,12,16,20,22; 90:19;210:25;211:2; 214:19;215:3;236:18, 25;237:2,19;238:7,11; 241:15,15,20,22;242:2 hear (13) 28:8;49:19;51:4; 86:13,18,25;90:23; 126:24;149:21;241:25; 242:20;243:25;244:4 heard (9) 87:11;124:5;135:6; 136:11;149:23;150:17; 153:14;210:22;240:9 hearing (25) 4:3,11,13,13,15;9:4; 17:23:34:17:36:21: 37:13:42:12:65:13: 97:25;104:5;143:16; 152:11;153:16;160:15; 213:24;239:13;243:22; 246:23:247:1.6.8 hearings (1) 246:6 heat (1) 185:22 heaven's (1) 119:14 heavy (5) 121:15;122:20; 162:18;171:2,8 heavy-duty (1) 53:16 height (19) 106:15,16;108:10, 17:109:17,22,23:110:1, 6,8,13,15;111:24; 115:3,4,5,6,7;117:24 Heights (3) 5:7,9;114:18 held (1) 108:18 help (1) 34:11 helped (1) 38:2 helpful (3) 74:16;209:7;212:9

helps (1) 23:19 Here's (1) 58:18 high (18) 27:22;29:1;69:22; 92:1;121:24;123:2,2; 128:2:137:18.19; 159:8;173:18;197:7,9; 202:12:210:7:211:15, 21 high-end (1) 207:7 higher (43) 29:18;41:13;43:19; 44:18;45:21,22;51:18, 20;68:25;69:13;73:25; 83:16;84:10;124:5; 158:17;159:16;165:5; 173:15;177:9;178:18, 21;191:6,7;193:8,14; 205:25;208:11,17; 210:7,17;211:2,15,16; 213:1,5;222:6;226:9, 10;227:10;228:9; 229:24;230:9;231:5 highest (37) 43:21;73:19;92:3,15, 15;140:6;148:11,14; 154:19:162:15:169:6, 12,14;173:14;174:4; 180:10:181:16:183:24: 202:17;204:10,12,23; 207:8;216:21;217:7, 11;219:19,21;225:2,12, 12,14,15,17;226:4,16; 230:1 highlight (1) 199:15 highlighted (4) 114:9,13;199:17; 216:23 highlighting (1) 212:17 highly (2) 53:6;193:13 highs (2) 197:10;225:25 highway (5) 163:18,20;179:17; 180:21:194:2 highways (9) 93:2;94:9;162:14,21; 171:24;173:21;179:24; 180:21;193:22 hill (1)110:22 hillside (1) 176:3 history (1) 164:12 hit (5)

181:7;189:14;191:6;

205:1:211:9 HLINKA (2) 5:18,18 Hmm (1) 246:3 Hold (6) 24:4;33:20;38:14; 43:6;182:20;227:20 hole (1)126:17 home (6) 43:21;44:4,5,9; 225:1;238:20 homes (4) 11:16;23:14;101:16; 110:20 hope (4) 160:18;174:13; 246:8,10 hopeful (1) 118:6 hopefully (3) 6:21;99:10;132:25 hoping (1) 135:17 horse (1) 179:16 hot (5) 176:4;185:19;186:7, 13,14 hour (47) 6:13;45:16;56:2,21, 21:57:17:58:20,20; 74:6;78:3,6,11,11,15; 83:22,22;88:5,22,24; 92:12;94:17,17,24,24; 95:6,6;179:9,13,14,20; 180:1;194:8;205:13; 207:14,16,16,21,22,22; 208:4;222:10,10,13,15; 228:19;231:19,20 hourly (1) 174:6 hours (7) 74:5,7;79:21,24; 118:10,16;201:4 house (1) 25:15 huge (1) 166:9 hundred (2) 103:17;146:24 hypothesis (3) 180:23;181:1;193:24 hypothetical (4) 10:6;202:19;228:25; 230:17 hypotheticals (2) 10:13;230:15 Ι I-(1)

113:24

127:16	244:12,21;245:3;	142:22	124:21;154:18;	Inner-city (1)
I'd (28)	246:17	imagine (1)	179:9;220:23,24;	237:13
7:4;17:8;31:18,20;	<b>I've (59)</b> 6:20;7:4;10:17;38:2;	194:6 immaculate (1)	226:19;229:9;237:14, 15	<b>input (8)</b> 36:4;46:1;51:11,12;
32:6;37:3;38:6;70:6; 82:14;97:5;107:22;	39:14;45:6;49:3,23,23;	229:11	increased (1)	52:7;108:8;111:2;
148:19;162:20;165:7;	59:14,45:0,49:5,25,25, 50:4;61:12;71:14;	immediate (3)	41:12	120:24
175:15;187:3;189:15;	93:13;96:13;97:20;	11:17;62:10;64:15	increases (2)	inputs (4)
193:24;196:8,14;	98:23;115:16,24;	immediately (1)	126:22;179:10	19:8;36:13;39:4;
197:14;201:9;208:22;	121:23;123:20;125:19;	55:11	increasing (1)	116:21
215:2;217:23;224:21;	126:3,5;145:5;147:20;	impact (6)	229:20	inputted (2)
226:23;242:9	149:23;150:18;152:15;	82:5;92:1;176:16;	increasingly (1)	80:9,10
I'll (29)	155:4;164:20;168:19;	187:8;221:8;241:22	177:3	inside (21)
23:2;30:24;33:5;	169:9;184:15,17;	impacting (1)	increments (2)	18:5,7,9;20:19;
34:10;38:12,13;52:5;	185:21;191:14;192:1,	193:23	114:7;131:11	60:16;64:2;65:16;66:1,
60:9,11;95:2;96:7; 99:21;113:3;116:5;	3;193:11;195:13,14,	<b>impacts (4)</b> 43:21;56:25;62:1;	<b>indeed (1)</b> 152:19	19,19;67:22;72:24; 76:2,3;84:15,16;95:5;
132:7;142:25;151:9;	15;197:13;198:7,9; 199:5;201:3,22;	43.21,30.23,02.1, 70:1	independently (3)	125:25;126:22;127:13;
155:24;160:1;166:15;	202:16,24;203:9;	implement (1)	57:16;111:19;148:2	222:23
170:22;171:1;181:22;	205:4,5;206:24;	198:21	index (1)	insignificant (1)
188:1;189:17;199:25;	212:10;230:12;231:13,	implementable (1)	133:8	16:16
201:6;215:9;235:2	21;238:15	206:22	indicate (4)	in-stack (26)
I'm (167)	I-395 (2)	implies (1)	53:6;158:19;183:18;	52:7,13;53:8,13,25;
10:4,7,9,10,19;12:7;	194:7,16	197:4	219:24	54:24;55:3;60:23;
17:15,21,22;18:21;	I-710 (16)	implying (1)	indicated (1)	62:18;63:3,17;64:17,
19:5,19;22:17;24:9;	93:2;94:10;154:8;	159:13	219:20	24;65:1,2,8,11;66:17;
25:18,22,23;26:1,10,	162:16;163:15;166:23;	important (8)	indication (1)	120:11,12,24;121:1;
12,23,25;27:2,18,20;	167:1;169:5;170:4;	125:13;148:15;	192:24	126:8;127:9;137:21;
29:15,23;30:6;33:11,	171:5;173:3,11;	173:5,6,7,16;180:7; 210:21	<b>individual (1)</b> 177:13	138:13
15;34:20,20;43:6,9,12, 14;50:10,19;53:10;	175:13;179:24;180:7; 181:4	impression (1)	individuals (1)	<b>instance (1)</b> 225:12
55:6;56:14;59:2,21;	<b>I-95 (1)</b>	170:17	239:17	instantaneous (3)
62:12,13;65:6,13;	194:7	improving (1)	Indoor (1)	76:20,21,23
66:11;71:1;74:16;	ice (2)	137:13	237:12	instead (2)
75:10;77:3,12;86:17;	241:9,10	in- (1)	industries (1)	208:17;239:9
88:16,16,18;89:21;	idea (7)	53:2	164:14	instrument (1)
90:4,4,6,19,20,20;	27:8;35:20;97:19;	inadvertently (1)	industry (1)	191:2
91:23;93:17,22;96:8;	132:23;172:22;178:20;	102:17	202:10	instruments (1)
100:9;106:6;107:20;	236:8	inappropriate (1)	inflate (1)	190:10
108:1;112:14;117:3,3;	identification (7)	84:3	127:11	insufficient (2)
118:3;126:10,17,24;	34:18;98:1;104:6;	inch (1)	<b>influence (1)</b> 111:18	138:14;158:25
127:13;128:7,15,24; 130:11,12,15,21;	143:17;152:12;160:16; 213:25	146:23 include (12)	information (24)	<b>intended (2)</b> 207:4,6
133:12;134:19;135:17;	identified (3)	4:7;15:16,18;22:7,	15:5;36:7;48:15;	intensity (4)
136:6;139:6,6,14,17,	40:22;56:11;61:12	17;40:25;54:2;102:15;	52:20;69:18;81:24;	111:17,23;112:8,12
20;141:2,19;142:20;	identify (2)	105:4,6;137:17;146:8	92:16,19;119:1;121:1,	intent (1)
143:7;144:10;146:14;	4:18;148:11	included (5)	5,9;122:24;123:4;	200:25
148:18;150:20;155:3,	identifying (1)	11:22;12:1,19;13:1;	158:25;172:6;183:18;	interest (2)
14;157:2,8;159:16;	244:16	63:10	184:16;190:13;199:4;	110:1,6
160:14;162:6;165:5,	idle (3)	includes (3)	206:9,16,19;218:24	interesting (1)
14;166:10;172:3,13,14,	14:14;124:18,19	36:2;39:7;54:5	informed (1)	172:9
18;173:23;174:9,10;	idling (7)	including (8)	31:17	interests (1)
176:17;179:18;180:5;	64:1;121:16;123:8;	23:6;31:13,16;35:18;	inherent (1)	151:6
181:21;187:9,9;	124:6;194:12,14; 232:10	50:6;64:9;65:23; 242:22	74:19	interface (11)
190:12;191:17,18,23; 193:25;198:20;201:8,	232:10 ifs (1)	incomplete (2)	inherently (1) 200:24	105:21;108:10,17, 23;109:22,23;111:16;
9;205:21;210:13;	228:18	206:16;219:1	initial (9)	112:13;115:15,24;
211:11,18,20,25;	ignore (1)	inconsistent (1)	12:14;38:16,18;52:5;	117:25
215:10,15;217:3,12;	180:2	211:2	60:23;93:19,23;	intermediary (1)
222:15;223:2;224:10,	illogical (1)	incorporate (1)	120:10;183:17	101:4
13;229:5;230:3,5,5,22;	191:18	106:9	initially (2)	internal (3)
231:15,22;232:4;	illustrative (1)	incorporated (1)	124:16,18	57:22;73:24;116:7
233:22;234:6;237:19,	18:4	201:2	initials (1)	internally (3)
19;242:8;243:19;	illustrious (1)	increase (9)	214:3	56:1;57:10;59:13

interpret (5) 16:17;31:5;125:20; 154:15,16 issued (2) interpretation (6) 11:7;13:20;16:13; 44:15;61:11;159:13 issues (12) interpreted (1) 12:5 interpreting (1) 90:20 it'd (7) intersection (4) 14:12;26:11;27:13, 23 230:16 intersections (1) it'll (10) 42:15 Interstate (1) 164:15 it's (318) intimate (1) 76:16 into (40) 14:17;18:10;26:17; 37:3;39:4,24;43:20; 64:22;67:5;68:4,13; 73:3,13,14;84:1;88:25; 98:17;105:13;106:11; 110:19,24;111:3; 112:4;114:3;124:18, 19,19;140:4;158:7; 168:21;183:12;185:10; 186:13;188:22;190:16; 201:2;202:19;206:10; 213:16:215:17 introduce (2) 75:25;159:23 introduced (1) 97:6 **Introduction** (2) 95:24;97:24 investigation (2) 127:18:198:2 involved (2) 185:25;214:19 involves (1) 78:9 isn't (12) 71:13;93:11;112:1; 133:23;144:2;155:10; 170:4;175:2;186:7; 197:19;201:14;236:25 iso (1) 225:20 isolate (2) 123:23:179:4 isopleth (5) 14:10;22:20;23:14; 26:14;28:11 isopleths (1) 13:3 issue (21) 8:16;16:2;17:17; 30:2;84:25;110:21; 162:20;171:1,4; 177:21,25;183:7,12;

188:20;191:8;193:22; 169:18:170:1.2.4; 198:19,19;201:12; 172:12;173:16;174:6; 210:8;214:18 175:14:176:4,6:178:7, 8,8;179:6;180:5,6,15; 140:3;202:8 181:10,22,25;182:4,16, 25;183:3;185:21,22, 9:12;22:2;31:5,16, 24;186:1,2,3,12,14,17; 19;57:15;170:5;173:8, 190:8;191:1;194:10; 9,17;216:6;239:19 195:1,12;196:8,10,21; 197:4,15,17,24;200:25; 26:18;31:2;115:11; 201:24;202:3,10,12; 169:6;181:3;198:24; 203:7,13,17;204:2; 206:8,11,13;207:6,21; 208:6,21;209:16,19; 57:18,19,20;110:25; 210:7,7,8;211:2,3,15, 15,15,22,22;212:23; 124:20,20;144:21; 160:2;207:22;210:5 213:1,5;214:12,14,16, 16;215:19;217:10; 6:3,4,16;10:11; 219:15;220:15;221:7, 14:10;15:6,8,21;16:19; 7,7;222:3,12,16;223:2; 18:17;20:2,19;26:15; 224:14,18;226:8; 27:11;29:18;30:3; 227:12;228:4,20,23; 32:13,14,17;33:21,22; 231:4,4,5;232:14,25, 37:17;39:13,16;42:16; 25;233:1,12;234:5; 43:12;46:5,7,24,25; 236:4;237:3,11,11; 49:13,22;51:6;52:2,7; 238:3;240:3;243:12,24 iterations (1) 53:13,13;54:17;55:17; 60:10,12,15,15;61:13; 187:21 63:16,24,25,25;64:21; J 66:11,16:67:17:68:11; 69:1:71:17,18:72:9: 73:1;75:14,16,17,18, jammed (1) 20;76:1,5,17,21,23; 179:24 78:10,10,14;80:20; Janssen (12) 81:1,13;82:14,16;83:8, 58:9,14,15,17;59:16; 8;84:16;85:2,21;86:21; 60:8,21;61:4,8,8,21,21 January (13) 87:18;88:21;89:11; 92:7,18;95:18,18,20; 8:6,11,12,19;28:4, 96:2,2,4,5,5,10;97:10, 14:29:7:74:7:93:7: 10;98:11,12;99:12,18; 153:3,4,4;224:21 100:23;102:4;103:2,3, **Jim** (1) 6,17,17;104:2,12,12; 239:25 106:4;107:10,16,17; Jison (3) 241:13;242:16;244:9 109:7;110:24,24; 111:9;112:3,10,16,22; John (2) 116:6;117:22,24; 49:24;102:8 118:2,17,25;119:17,18; jokes (1) 121:15;122:2,15,19,20; 188:1 123:2;124:4;125:3,20; Journal (3) 126:11,13;127:1,14,15, 127:19,21,21 16;128:21;129:7,11, judgment (10) 12;132:3,25;133:23; 9:6;11:9;15:10;23:1; 134:5;135:4;136:5; 84:2;90:9;91:6;111:7; 236:19;237:4 137:4,5,6,24;138:2,9; 139:1;140:3,7,22,22; judgments (4) 141:3,14;143:11; 31:18;35:21,24;86:1 144:1,5,10,11,13,15, July (2) 23;145:5,7,15;146:8; 123:17;205:9 147:4;148:15;149:11, jump (1) 12;151:25;155:11; 155:24 157:6,8,9,10,17;159:7, June (17) 8;160:21;161:5,7,8; 129:18,21;130:10; 162:6;164:8,8;166:6; 243:20;244:1,2,24;

245:9,15,19,24,25; 246:1.11.13.16.20 Κ KA (3) 108:6,18;109:12 Karen (1) 5:5 keep (4) 25:2;222:4;234:1; 235:21 keeping (1) 128:6 Kensington (3) 5:7,9,17 kept (1) 27:22 key (1) 22:22 kilometer (4) 19:25;20:11;94:11: 112:10 kilometers (11) 16:7;60:6,10,20; 61:24,25;62:3;75:5; 140:17,18,23 kind (23) 18:12;61:20;69:23; 116:20;132:23;134:4; 139:9;172:6;173:22, 23;184:5,19;186:3; 192:16;194:5;196:15; 198:3,25;211:13; 229:23;237:17;238:1; 243:8 kinds (1) 233:7 Kingdom (1) 137:7 knowledge (3) 30:24:48:5:94:2 known (2) 4:10;213:22 knows (1) 215:3 Krask (5) 208:23,25;209:2; 216:11;219:23 L LA (2) 179:23,23 labeled (1) 197:16 laid (1) 230:7 land (6) 16:7;18:12,12,20; 19:7;100:12 language (3) 198:3;217:25,25

lap(1)223:22 large (7) 23:7;38:3;126:19; 154:18;170:6;187:18; 221:9 larger (6) 15:22;16:6;17:5; 18:17;19:9;23:10 Larry (2) 5:11;236:7 Las (10) 163:4,23;170:7,13; 171:5;174:24;179:17, 19,20;180:2 last (42) 14:3;22:12;26:14; 28:10;29:16;32:25; 42:12;43:5,16;44:19; 58:1;96:5;111:14; 128:16,22;131:14; 140:3;148:12;150:19; 157:16;160:4;164:17, 23;167:20,24;168:13; 169:13;179:7;182:19, 21,25;183:1,3,11,13; 202:17;209:1;230:2; 231:12;239:7;241:6; 246:25 late (1) 93:8 later (2) 38:12;142:25 latest (2) 175:21;194:20 law (2) 85:20,21 Laver (1) 116:9 Layers (1) 116:8 lavs (1) 82:3 lead (1) 90:17 leading (3) 137:13;165:23,25 leads (1) 115:22 leaky (1) 167:16 learn (1) 147:21 learned (1) 238:15 least (4) 131:2;134:20; 176:10;242:7 leave (4) 38:13;72:20;154:10; 217:12 leaves (1) 55:16

leaving (1) 200:20 leeway (3) 17:15;39:14;119:11 left (10) 59:7;102:17;108:12; 114:21;161:24;200:21; 213:8,11:231:5:239:3 left-hand (3) 122:12:157:6:230:23 legal (2) 36:24;224:15 length (6) 17:12;40:7;108:18; 114:23;117:17;203:1 Lenner (4) 62:19;123:7;124:7, 14 less (48) 8:24;9:1,5,10;10:21, 24;11:3;51:21,22; 57:20;58:2,6;63:24,25; 69:4;83:12,18;84:10, 22,24;85:3;89:10,11; 90:14,24;91:9,21; 141:11;147:5;178:20; 179:2,20;180:1; 187:21;192:21;199:21; 204:19;208:6,7;219:8; 221:7;222:14,18; 223:8;229:8;232:3,4, 12 Let's (29) 7:19;11:11,12;28:8; 43:7;55:7,23;61:21; 71:17;144:13,22; 152:8;159:22;162:9; 180:24;190:20,22; 203:10;213:20;221:14; 222:4;226:23;227:25; 232:24;235:14;242:21; 243:15:245:13:247:5 Lettau (2) 113:23;117:2 Lettau's (1) 117:4 Letteau (1) 115:20 letters (1) 134:5 level (26) 30:19;37:17;62:1,15; 64:8;70:17,21;75:1,3, 25;76:8,17;78:13;82:5; 83:18;108:11;110:5, 24;148:17;172:23; 190:15,15,22;195:17; 217:11;229:7 levelled (1) 40:22 levels (39) 12:15;13:4,5,10,12; 26:5,7;27:9;28:13,13;

31:3:42:9:49:2:50:18; 51:12:73:4:78:19:80:4. 6;84:5,5;89:5,21; 93:11;124:6;126:5; 173:23;207:3,3,5; 216:21;218:4,12; 220:4;237:1;241:19, 22:242:1,3 Library (4) 50:2:103:10.18; 104:13 lieu (3) 131:5;134:17,24 LN(1) lifetime (1) 48:15 light (10) 14:15;42:9,18;87:5; 121:13;122:19;135:20; 136:2;177:19;184:24 likelihood (1) 205:25 likely (6) 167:22;168:3; 192:21;195:7,8;244:10 limit (1) 227:25 local (1) limitations (1) 206:20 limited (4) 21:24;87:24;200:13; 237:16 limiting (3) 40:19;73:10;78:13 Lindquist (2) 123:7;124:15 Lindquist's (2) 62:19;124:7 line (19) 63:12;70:20;84:3,5; 93:9:107:2:143:19; 152:23:154:6:156:24: 179:21:184:7.14; 187:5;188:21;192:23; 206:24;212:25;221:9 lined (1) 232:10 lines (5) 194:12,16;224:24, 24;225:21 list (21) Log(1) 48:4,14:49:5,17; 109:1 61:19;96:4;98:11,12; 102:16,18,20,23;103:1, 2;104:11;123:9.21; logic (3) 136:25;137:4;161:19, 25 listed (5) 61:11;92:13;96:2; long (32) 136:21;214:14 listening (1) 37:14 literature (12) 45:1;49:3;59:21;

60:18;76:24;110:11; 121:24:123:3:124:14: 126:19;128:1;179:1 little (25) 5:2,4;6:15,17;10:14; 20:8;45:24;63:16,25; 80:24;86:22;88:9; 91:22:93:8:119:11; 140:22;143:5;155:10; 164:20;186:20;187:21; 193:2;206:9;230:22; 245:13 108:24 loading (41) 8:20;22:3,11;23:4; 41:14;42:2;53:14;54:1, 21;56:24;60:17;62:9; 64:6;65:16;66:16,22; 67:19;68:1,17;72:24; 84:16;144:21;145:1,4, 9,11,18,25;146:5,9,15, 25;168:16;173:14; 177:25;178:1;225:14, 18;226:3,21;231:3 219:3 localized (2) 41:22,23 located (7) 4:8:23:5:94:3:101:2; 140:9:145:20:233:17 location (27) 66:19;92:7;112:23; 141:20;143:25;144:5; 163:13,14;167:23; 168:3;171:18;189:15; 190:18;192:8,11,16; 205:2,11,20;209:10; 218:16,17:219:9,25; 221:5:223:3:230:20 locations (25) 11:18,20;13:24;22:8; 26:4;39:9;41:1,4; 68:11;94:3,4;101:20; 154:19;157:22;169:21; 180:6;189:25;204:8; 216:8,20;218:11,18; 225:23;226:1;232:6 logarithm (1) 109:1 69:15;214:24;219:10 logical (1) 192:2 26:16;31:15;50:4; 74:12;76:15,17,25; 79:24;87:18;93:3; 95:18:110:10:127:17; 136:22,22;151:14;

152:5;162:17;164:16, 17;166:23;170:14,18; 194:9,16,17;204:15,16; 206:11;236:6;240:22; 246:6 longer (3) 136:22;190:14;204:6 Longitudinal (1) 237:12 look (67) 5:2;12:23,24;15:7; 16:10,10;18:3;19:22; 25:13;26:12;27:7,9; 28:11,12;29:25;33:5; 44:23;46:20;48:11; 57:25;58:12;61:19; 80:2;81:9;82:17;91:17; 92:12;93:13;96:16; 97:18;98:4;101:14; 104:22;107:13;122:11; 125:1,7,9,10;129:18; 133:25;139:3;140:5; 141:6;145:19,20,22; 151:15;161:17;162:25; 163:2,3,7,16;174:3; 180:7,8;181:3;196:23; 203:22;221:2;223:12; 225:20;235:21;242:9; 243:14;244:20 looked (10) 20:12:44:20:76:7; 92:23:107:2:112:6: 140:4;163:1;176:18; 195:13 looking (35) 16:20;17:5;20:10; 24:3,9;25:3;26:1;28:1; 30:16,21;50:9,12,14; 58:19;77:7;84:2;91:5, 7:105:23:111:14: 127:13;130:11,21; 133:12:143:7.20; 145:16;156:16;193:10; 203:17;206:13;215:5, 5;224:6;245:5 looks (3) 194:25;196:25; 197:17 loose (2) 99:18,20 Los (12) 163:4,8;164:16,17; 167:23;168:3;170:7, 25;171:5;172:7,7; 173:11 lost (2) 7:4;131:22 Lot (63) 4:9;8:13;9:13;20:4; 39:14;42:5;44:20; 53:21;54:4,5,21;59:25; 60:1,2,3;64:14,19; 67:4;68:12;110:23;

111:1:112:15:117:4, 19:119:1.6:134:4: 135:19:138:11:140:21, 23;155:17;170:5,16; 173:8;175:20;179:24; 181:1;184:24;185:13, 13,19;186:2,20;194:1, 6;195:22,23;202:1,12, 23;208:6;213:5,15; 220:4;221:14;223:9, 10;224:10;234:3; 238:15;239:4;242:21 lots (7) 20:5;42:1,3;54:14, 15;65:23;198:17 loud (1) 218:20 low (4) 74:4;110:7;159:8; 197:8 **lower** (22) 23:25;26:18;44:25; 62:18,18;69:3,3,25,25; 70:21;89:18,21;100:9; 125:4;180:4;191:11; 205:17,21;213:2,4; 220:7,10 lowered (1) 166:25 lowering (1) 158:14 lows (1)197:11 lunch (3) 118:2,4;119:16 luncheon (1) 119:21

## Μ

M's (1) 214:12 magnitude (1) 204:9 mail (1) 82:13 mails (1) 5:24 main (4) 9:11,12;74:20; 216:17 mainstream (1) 86:2 maintain (3) 98:19;236:5,7 major (14) 9:3;13:18;14:1,7; 25:19;26:8;93:2;94:8; 158:17,21;180:20,21; 192:7;232:11 majority (2) 180:15;181:18 makes (5)

59:16:126:18,19; 149:19:171:10 making (10) 30:12,12;65:6;74:13; 86:19;91:23;135:15; 155:1;172:19;177:11 malfunction (1) 79:16 Mall (64) 4:10;11:15,17,19,25; 12:15,19;13:1,4,9,13, 15,16;15:11,11;16:2,3, 19;17:3,3;20:4;22:2, 13;23:8;24:1;42:4,11; 44:1,8;46:11;48:24,25; 80:18,22,25;81:2;87:8; 88:13;89:4;93:1;100:3, 7,12,18,22;101:17,18; 102:3;175:24;176:4; 185:10;186:2,14,17; 189:13;194:6,11,13,15, 15,18;222:10;232:11; 234:21 many (32) 18:19;19:22;30:9; 47:18;70:3;88:3; 102:13;106:15;110:17; 115:17,22;132:19; 135:22;151:25,25; 162:25:163:6.8,9.10, 12,12;171:6,22;178:4; 197:24:201:4.4.4: 202:17;208:6;209:23 map(3)23:1;145:5;146:20 maps (2)22:20;23:14 March (1) 120:15 margin (11) 188:6.9.16.17: 191:19,22,24;201:1,3, 12,14 margins (1) 188:5 **mark** (8) 34:11;81:12;97:21, 21;143:2,14;152:8; 160:11 marked (16) 34:2,18:96:9:97:7: 98:1,4;103:22;104:6; 129:22;130:13;142:21; 143:17;151:4;152:12; 160:16;213:25 Marking (2) 99:7,9 marks (1) 218:23 Martin (1) 4:15 Maryland (6) 4:9;85:20,21;161:24;

210:1:211:8 Mass (3) 214:5,8,9 match (6) 18:19;45:2;69:21; 110:18;207:16,23 matched (2) 207:22:214:21 matching (2) 80:4,8 materials (1) 33:1 math (2) 45:12;221:11 mathematical (4) 43:24;227:22; 228:23;230:18 Mathematically (5) 29:17;30:2;84:1; 202:15;222:3 matrices (1) 95:7 matter (9) 4:3;15:11;36:18; 47:11;73:1;95:1; 107:24;178:21;186:16 matters (2) 5:21:7:20 max (12) 25:5:90:24:91:21; 124:20;158:24;167:21, 22;168:2,13;177:4: 196:7:201:9 maxima (1) 230:25 maximum (18) 62:1;74:3;75:3; 82:25;89:9,18;90:12; 91:1,8,18,20;121:19; 137:25;141:20;153:21; 221:5;223:6;225:23 maximums (2) 69:3;89:9 May (49) 4:12;5:22;7:7;8:1; 10:18;17:23;27:25; 35:7;66:3;73:22;81:22; 82:17;113:1;115:16; 118:13,15;127:11,14; 148:3;151:2;166:12, 12:177:4:178:4; 181:16;189:1;192:18; 195:18;214:18;216:3; 217:20;218:25,25; 219:1;225:18;235:20; 242:22;243:9,9;244:3, 4,5,21;245:3,5,6; 246:19,22;247:1 maybe (25) 14:15;17:23;61:6; 62:5;65:10;82:15; 92:15;116:15;118:3;

138:16,21;155:24;

158:6:178:3.21; 180:15;181:11;196:3, 23;197:2;208:12; 213:2;236:10,20; 239:10 McCrae (1) 125:15 **MDE (2)** 36:19;208:24 mean (82) 10:17;11:5,16;12:2; 13:8:15:6:18:15:19:18; 21:7;42:13;44:13;46:4, 20;47:17,19;50:15,21, 25;55:6;62:23;63:17; 68:22;77:9;78:10; 86:18;88:17;91:14; 103:5,18;108:14; 109:9;112:12,25; 114:5;122:23;127:10; 128:11;140:11;141:5; 145:23;154:7;155:16; 159:5,6,14;163:10; 165:5,22;170:4,5; 173:3;174:13;179:22; 181:18;183:17;185:9, 11;187:20;188:12; 189:1;190:19;194:17; 195:6,13;196:22; 197:18:198:18,19; 205:3;214:4;218:9; 219:12:222:12:224:11: 229:22;236:4,8,13,16; 243:5;244:7;246:5 meaning (1) 237:7 means (7) 4:15;46:23;100:16; 155:17:158:2:165:12: 224:12 meant (1) 12:3 measure (8) 79:9;117:13,16; 137:22;230:19;233:21. 22;237:1 measured (19) 90:10;158:18; 169:18;170:1,2; 181:12;185:20;189:11; 196:10,16;197:9,17; 202:7;207:3,5;216:21; 218:4;232:6,13 measurement (4) 30:5;215:5;237:17, 18 measurements (8) 172:14;173:19; 180:4,14;193:7;215:7; 219:13,14 measures (4) 89:18:164:21:165:1; 206:17

measuring (5) 50:9,22;161:6; 179:17.25 mechanism (1) 176:5 medical (2) 90:21;215:4 medium (2) 121:13;122:19 meet (3) 11:11;26:20;198:20 meeting (6) 26:19;148:23; 149:10,10,11;160:2 members (1) 239:24 memo (6) 120:15;129:19,20, 21;130:10;217:16 Memorial (1) 243:21 memos (2) 199:20;202:8 mental (1) 230:22 mention (1) 52:18 mentioned (21) 9:3,5;50:1;84:15; 88:23:91:23:103:4; 112:6,7,19:116:2; 137:4:183:22:189:2: 196:2;201:4;202:16; 203:4;219:18;228:13; 236:16 mentioning (1) 185:5 mentions (1) 47:20 meteorological (8) 69:21:128:17:129:6: 131:2,7;134:14,18; 207:24 meteorologist (2) 31:14;90:19 meteorologists (4) 31:4,12,14;185:25 Meteorology (1) 116:9 **meter (26)** 25:16;43:22;46:25; 56:20;61:6;63:12; 64:16;65:12;76:13; 90:14;92:14;93:25; 94:18;114:7,20;115:5; 145:3;146:3,4;148:14; 149:8;168:14;174:5; 181:7;202:18;210:15 meters (48) 52:25;56:12;60:14, 17,22;61:1,1,9;62:22; 64:3,25;65:8;66:20;

76:14,14;94:10,10;

110:2,4,17,18;114:6, 25;115:1,3,5,6;117:6,7, 25:138:20:140:9: 143:20;144:1,6,9,23; 145:6,10,21,24;146:14; 148:16;158:20;163:17, 20;167:1;170:3 method (47) 9:5,7;11:10;16:7,7; 19:3.5.20:20:10:22:24; 40:19;51:18;56:1;57:1, 2,9,16;59:18;69:12,12; 70:13;73:10;74:20; 78:13;115:20;117:4; 198:16,17,17;209:16, 18,22;210:1,5,12,14, 24,24;212:24;214:20; 215:11,22;216:14; 219:12;223:5;236:23; 237:8 methodologies (4) 85:11,18;86:4,7 methodology (10) 37:11;39:20,25;40:1; 86:15;103:17;107:1,7; 135:5;199:8 methods (7) 85:15,17;115:21,25; 189:6;212:2;213:23 Miaki (1) 105:9 Miaki's (1) 111:15 Michele (2) 5:9:17:25 micro- (1) 20:12 microgram (1) 25:16 Micrograms (42) 29:3;43:22;57:18,18, 19:73:6.7:90:13:92:5. 8,14,20;93:25;139:3; 141:8,12;148:13,19; 149:8;153:23;168:14; 174:5;180:11;181:7; 202:18;208:9,11,13,17; 210:15,20,24;221:13, 14,15,19;222:3,11; 231:4,5,25;233:2 mid-afternoon (1) 241:2 middle (13) 74:23;100:2;106:3; 110:13;114:24;115:10; 130:21;186:9;218:14; 232:11;233:13,18,22 midpoint (3) 112:22;115:5;233:14 midway (1) 101:20 might (19)7:7;9:21;10:8;13:3;

14:10:21:24:35:13; 87:1.16:179:20: 205:15;216:9;219:8; 226:8,15,16;239:25; 240:1;242:23 Mike (1) 4:25 miles (12) 80:18,21;81:5; 137:23;138:10,22,22; 179:9,13,14,20;180:1 **Mill (9)** 4:8;13:19;15:25; 22:6;25:9,25;26:4; 27:4;29:1 millimeter (2) 117:12,16 mind (7)11:15,18;116:14; 187:6,9;222:4;242:18 mind's (1) 243:7 mine (7) 34:12;75:17;129:22; 133:21;153:2,2;169:16 minimum (1) 179:8 minimums (1) 74:8 minor (1) 223:12 mins (1) 196:8 minus (8) 188:13,14;190:1,4,7, 23;201:15;204:13 minutes (17) 14:15;27:13;66:6; 87:25;88:3,6;124:17, 17,19,21;142:12;200:6, 8;223:17;239:2,3,7 missed (2) 14:3;167:24 missing (5) 79:10,11,16,18,21 misspoke (1) 14:23 mistake (2) 224:22,23 misunderstood (3) 62:5;64:12;69:7 mitigate (1) 186:7 mix (8) 18:19;50:23;62:1,3; 138:23;177:19;178:9, 11 mixed (1) 20:3 mixing (12) 60:2,3,4;62:6;64:8: 74:25;111:10;138:14; 175:10,25;186:4,15

mixture (1) 170:20 **MLM**(1) 120:24 **Mm-hmm (9)** 51:1;53:4;55:9;58:7; 86:24;189:8;225:22; 227:9:244:15 Mobil (1) 41:18 **MOBILE6 (16)** 38:20,25;41:2,5,8, 16;42:18;43:1,17; 44:14,18,22;45:1,21; 94:13,21 **MOBILE6.2** (1) 98:18 mode (2) 124:18,19 model (55) 9:8;12:15,24,24; 36:7;38:16;39:3,4; 41:21;42:3;43:23;46:2; 51:6,11,24;54:15,20; 55:4,19;56:1;57:10,22, 22;58:4;59:12,13; 73:21,23;84:2;89:9,9; 91:20;95:6;110:3; 129:16,16;134:15; 169:15:175:22,23,23; 176:19;185:5;190:16; 192:17;199:10;201:5; 205:4,8;206:15,17; 207:9;220:24;223:1; 232:20 modeled (23) 12:25:22:9,12,19; 41:23.24.24.25.25: 42:5,13,13;43:17;57:5; 83:2;101:15;141:11; 169:16;173:19;189:23; 190:2;191:21;225:4 modeler (1) 205:15 modeling (92) 8:8,24;12:14,19; 13:21,23;14:12,16; 16:13,17;20:14,16; 22:1,8;31:15;32:13; 34:14;35:18,19;36:2,3, 4,10,14,22;40:25; 42:14;44:14;45:12,13; 50:19,25;51:2,5,7; 54:18;60:1;64:19;65:3; 81:18,20;82:4;83:21; 84:15;88:16,17;89:10; 90:10;94:14;98:23; 99:2;109:24;120:13; 128:16;131:20,24; 135:21;136:23;139:2; 145:19;169:9,21,25; 173:9,17;176:18,19; 179:14;187:7;188:5,7,

10,15,17,18,20;192:7; 197:20:198:8.10: 201:6;202:6;204:21, 22:205:19:206:2: 207:4,24;213:17; 222:15;232:5;235:9 modelings (1) 98:23 modelling (2) 111:12:127:19 models (11) 30:24;38:21;44:12; 95:20;177:13,15; 179:8;204:5,8,16; 205:16 modern (2) 98:19,21 modifications (1) 41:18 modified (4) 41:6;95:16,19,19 modify (7) 41:8;65:19;66:23; 80:11;188:20;230:13, 14 molecular (9) 64:8;74:17,18;75:1, 23,23,24;76:15,17 molecules (1) 74:11 moment (7) 28:25:30:18:31:20: 77:15:95:3:150:23; 207:2 Monday (1) 222:11 monitor (48) 28:1;77:6,20;78:17, 20;79:12,14,18;80:6, 13,17,21;92:21,22,25; 130:23;138:8;167:1; 169:14,22;175:6,17; 176:17;190:3;191:24; 192:11;201:8;209:17, 24;212:25;213:18; 214:5,8,9,13;216:1,13, 14;217:8,14;218:1,14, 15;219:8;235:16,20; 236:13;238:1 monitored (6) 79:17:169:14,22; 189:25;190:25;191:22 monitoring (19) 93:2;127:21;148:10; 154:12;158:4,19; 169:23,24,24;171:5; 179:17;193:15;213:14; 216:18;218:5,11; 219:5,20;236:7 monitors (41) 50:13;77:6,9,10,16; 79:15;80:5;91:25;92:3; 93:4,7;94:3,7,8;140:8;

154:7,18,21;157:19; 158:12,16,18;164:4,6; 169:21;173:13;180:19; 181:8,20;190:20; 193:8;209:9,11,24; 212:1;213:22;235:10, 15;237:24;238:4,10 mono-domain (1) 138:20 Montgomery (4) 149:5,6,12;161:25 more (111) 6:2;9:10;20:8,12; 23:10;30:3;38:12; 42:10;48:8,24;52:19, 19;59:25;60:1,2,3,4,9, 10,12;62:2;69:1,11,13; 70:12,16,17;71:18; 74:15,18;75:5,5;80:20; 81:24;83:17;84:8;85:2, 2;91:9,21,22;94:11; 98:19,21;111:10,11; 118:8;119:6;120:25; 123:3;125:12,20; 126:2,13,23;131:18; 132:11,15,21;134:22; 140:6;142:3,5;147:4; 154:17,22;160:19; 166:16;169:25;172:24, 25;174:8;175:10,10, 16;176:5,6;177:18; 178:5,9,10,11;193:8, 12;195:7,8,18;196:8; 199:20;200:8;201:16; 204:6;205:20;206:9; 207:13,17;208:14,19; 214:17;218:11;220:17; 222:4;223:8;225:18; 230:15;231:4;235:12; 236:19,20;242:23; 244:17 morning (16) 4:20,23,25;5:8,11,14, 20;6:3;7:9,14,15,17; 92:23;118:23;120:6; 209:2 mortality (1) 237:22 most (35) 11:20;12:12;33:3; 53:6;73:4;83:10;84:4; 91:6;101:3,11;105:25; 106:5;131:9,13; 132:22;135:20;138:21; 139:6,7;140:7;153:1; 179:2;192:9;204:2; 206:17;208:6;211:8; 218:23;222:5;227:13; 236:13,14;237:5,5; 244:10 mostly (4) 22:18:74:6:99:4: 231:1

Mother's (4) 119:10,12,14;168:7 motion (1) 106:12 motor (2) 53:23;54:17 mountain (1) 126:18 **move (6)** 13:21:25:24:37:19; 142:9;143:5;179:18 moved (1) 110:22 **MOVES (16)** 38:20;41:5,8,13; 43:19;44:18,22,24; 45:3,23;95:24;96:17; 97:13,24;98:16,21 moving (7) 14:13;77:12;123:2, 25;124:17,22,23 **Mrs** (1) 220:13 much (51) 11:1;17:6;19:6,22, 23;20:1;26:21;48:8; 56:1,2;57:17;58:2,6; 59:19;60:12,12;65:4; 69:25;73:7;74:17;75:5; 80:3,20:83:16:118:8: 126:1,1,13:136:22; 138:24;140:19;155:18; 173:20:176:5.6; 178:20;179:23;180:1; 185:10;186:16;192:22; 204:19;210:3;211:15, 16,23;230:16;232:8; 238:15,16;247:4 multi (1) 223:7 multiple (4) 45:20;115:24; 189:16;204:1 multiplied (1) 109:12 multiply (2) 221:15,18 myself (2) 175:7;232:8 Ν NAAQS (5) 29:13;81:23;131:20; 135:16;152:10 NAAUS (1) 34:15 name (2) 4:14:103:4 narrow (1) 242:11 national (9)

88:18,19;131:1,1;

132:8;153:6;162:11; 183:19:198:25 nationally (1) 202:1 nationwide (4) 28:2;148:6,7,8 natural (1) 109:1 nature (2) 198:10:199:6 N-D-R-E-H-U-S (1) 127:17 near (45) 22:10;23:4;26:6,10, 20;58:1;66:24;92:21, next (9) 21,25;93:4,6,17;94:8,9; 99:10;140:10;148:18; 154:5,6,7,9,24;158:17, 19;159:15;162:11; 164:4,6,15;171:6; 175:6;177:12;179:4; 180:20;192:13;193:7, 12,21;201:19;204:25; 212:14;221:5;225:14; 231:1 nine (2) nearby (4) 89:19;101:12;192:9, 18 nearly (1) 213:4 near-tail (1) 207:7 necessarily (9) 6:4;8:25;145:14; 170:1;181:10;218:5; 225:4;236:13,14 necessary (1) 143:1 need (24) 33:13,23;45:1,2; 46:2;50:23;55:23; 77:19:79:23:111:19: 115:14;130:15;146:12; 150:23;154:22;174:15; 201:14;214:21;215:16; 219:11,15;230:10; 239:13;246:14 needed (2) 98:19;117:22 needing (1) 240:12 needs (1) 244:11 neighborhood (12) 8:18;11:15,16,19,21, 22;12:1,3,5,10;20:23; 100:20 network (13) 13:7,11,12;14:7; 153:19,21,25;154:2; 157:18,21;158:16,18; 193:15 networks (6)

13:14:14:1:15:14; 207:14,22;227:13; 154:17.23.25 231:18,20;237:14; neutral (2) 242:9 105:12;112:18 **NO2/NOX (1)** new (16) 120:24 48:9;49:25;81:14; Nobody (1) 94:5;99:1;102:2,5; 175:23 109:16:111:1:119:8: Nobody's (1) 134:3;153:17;154:12; 224:15 158:12,24:239:13 non (1) newer (4) 94:3 177:7,9:178:16,18 non- (1) **NEX (1)** 161:11 150:16 non-attainment (2) 149:18;161:8 non-classifiable (1) 4:12;6:12;64:10; 132:5;138:13;160:2; 161:14 175:14;232:11;247:5 non-default (1) night (4) 86:4 176:5,5,7;186:11 none (1) nights (1) 7:20 185:21 non-expert (1) nighttime (2) 85:22 73:5;185:23 Non-Modelers (4) 95:24;96:17;97:13, 222:3,11 24 nitrogen (5) non-preferred (1) 150:16;153:7; 86:4 155:18;156:11;237:12 non-profit (1) NO2 (154) 164:12 8:16;9:8,10;10:25; noon (1) 14:9,13;15:9;16:15; 222:8 25:13;27:6,11,12,14; north (5) 28:2;29:3,4,7;32:13; 19:17;22:5,23;26:2; 34:14;35:6,7,19;43:2; 100:17 northeast (2) 44:11,16,17;45:7,10, 15,16,24;50:22;51:3,7, 25:25:26:3 northeastern (1) 12;52:5,6,13;55:1,2,11, 12,13,14;56:2;57:18, 96:17 20;58:2,6,21;59:3,5,24; northern (2) 60:7.7:62:25:65:5: 22:13;54:15 67:5;68:25;69:14,20; north-south (1) 70:18,21;71:3,7,24; 144:6 northwest (6) 72:13,25;73:2,16,23; 19:16;25:25;26:3,15; 74:3;76:1;77:20;78:10, 10,14;80:6,10,14,15; 80:22;205:8 notes (4) 83:14,16;84:5;90:16, 35:3;204:1;211:24; 25;91:1;92:12;120:11, 13;121:19;123:14; 243:14 124:10,24;127:17,18, notice (4) 19:128:2,17,20:129:2, 157:3;160:2;195:23; 16;130:24;138:6; 246:24 148:10,17;149:1,4,14, noticed (1) 24;152:10;155:2; 177:17 156:23;157:19,21; novel (1) 158:12,13,16,17,20; 85:23 November (7) 161:2,6,16;162:11,12, 12:20;54:19;74:7; 15;166:21;167:21; 170:16;173:9,18; 84:23,24;101:10; 174:5;177:5,8,12,17; 224:21 178:6,17,21;180:24; nowhere (1) 182:3;183:19;193:18; 66:24 NOX (35) 201:6,25;205:8,12;

10:25;14:13;16:15; 25:13;35:5;42:18; 44:11;51:2,5,9;53:22; 55:5,7,16;58:2,6;59:4; 72:10,13,25;73:16; 75:3;120:11;124:10; 127:18;128:2;138:6; 175:11:177:3.7.17; 178:5,16,22;179:8 nuance (1) 66:12 number (79) 24:3;28:15;29:19; 30:4,7;39:7;50:5; 52:11;53:5;61:14,20; 64:2;81:4;82:7;83:3,4; 91:2,18;92:9,10,20; 96:16;97:11;101:21; 105:2,4,17,19,23; 107:24;120:3,5;121:2, 12;122:11,12,17,21; 123:13;127:11;136:25; 137:3;141:1,2,15; 147:17;156:17;157:10, 11,12,13;181:23;182:1, 16;184:9;188:8;201:5; 205:21;207:18;209:15, 17;210:16;216:14; 224:23;226:9,16; 227:8,24;228:25; 229:11:230:17:231:15; 232:12.12.13:236:15. 17:237:16:243:12 numbered (4) 96:13:133:17:134:4: 182:23 numbers (22) 9:22;27:22;28:25; 29:13;50:12;114:11; 121:21;134:5;139:8; 141:13;179:25;191:11; 202:6;205:5;218:10; 222:6,13;225:19; 229:24;230:7,9;233:7 numeral (2) 157:13;158:6 numerous (1) 217:6 **NWS (4)** 131:1,6,17;132:1 0 o'clock (1) 7:12 oath (3) 7:22;37:5,8 object (6) 17:8;42:21;90:1; 165:7;197:18;215:2 objected (2) 6:21;87:17 **Objection** (17)

10:1;29:14:30:22; 36:24;43:7;86:23; 87:10;90:5;151:13; 156:8;158:7;159:23; 160:8;174:22;234:22; 235:23;238:2 objections (5) 6:20;238:20;239:6, 21;247:4 objective (4) 16:13;79:13,14; 211:19 objectives (1) 190:9 observations (3) 220:10,12,19 observed (1) 204:18 obsolete (1) 98:18 obtain (3) 35:11;38:2;92:11 obtained (2) 78:19;80:13 obviously (4) 6:10;20:3;75:10; 236:8 occasional (3) 79:23,24;80:1 occur (5) 202:20,21;204:17; 207:9.10 occurred (5) 74:3,4,6;75:2;169:12 occurring (9) 56:21,23;62:7;75:5; 180:13;204:10;213:14; 222:6:230:25 occurs (1) 112:20 Oddny (1) 127:16 odds (3) 148:17;180:12; 191:11 off (7) 99:7,9;101:18; 200:21;205:10;206:8; 245:12 offering (1) 123:5 office (1) 30:21 Officer's (1) 31:21 Officers (1) 34:16 offices (1) 31:1 official (1) 12:7 often (3) 107:10;194:9;204:14

old (3) 69:20.20.20 older (2) 29:25:128:19 **OLM (40)** 9:5,7,8,15;11:10; 14:12,20,24;40:11,14; 51:6,6;55:25;57:1,2,12, 13,13,16;59:12,18; 64:11:65:24:66:23; 67:1,6;68:22,22;69:12, 12:70:7.8.13:71:2: 120:24;222:21,23; 223:4,5,7 on- (2) 184:6,13 once (10) 34:10;52:21;100:23; 157:19;185:14;190:12; 199:9;216:12;240:3; 246:13 one (173) 5:25;8:8,25;13:13; 15:12;16:2,10;19:8,23; 20:7;23:3;24:13,14,15, 19;26:11;30:12;31:10; 33:21;34:6;37:23;38:5, 18;40:3,10;45:16,23; 46:15,24,25;47:20; 51:13,15:56:7:66:20; 75:13:76:13:81:14,18, 20;82:3,6,23,24;87:9, 23:88:14,17,20:89:8, 23;91:1,4,7,8;92:3,12; 94:11;104:23;105:5,6, 7,8,14,17;106:1,10; 114:7,23:115:21; 116:3;125:22;126:17; 130:4;131:2,5,17; 132:11:135:9:136:25; 137:4;139:23;140:2,2, 6,7;144:23;145:9,25; 146:2,4,6,7,10;147:25; 148:24;150:20;151:25; 159:2,15;160:7,23; 162:13,14;163:16,16; 166:19;170:12,12; 171:21;173:14;180:7, 10;182:5;184:1; 187:16,17,22,23;189:1, 20;190:6;198:16; 199:21;201:3;202:8; 204:2;205:12;207:12, 14;209:13,15;210:12, 14,17;212:20;213:11; 214:4,14;216:1,6,14; 218:11;219:11,11; 220:5;221:14;222:2; 223:13;225:3,3,17; 226:1,3,15,20;227:20; 229:13,15,15,19; 231:12,19,20;235:19; 236:10,20;237:10;

239:25;240:19;242:1, 23:244:16 one- (2) 88:4;112:10 **One's** (1) 57:12 One-fifty-(1) 169:11 **One-fifty-six** (2) 168:24,25 one-hour (9) 34:14;35:5;88:5; 90:16;130:23;158:14; 167:21;201:25;231:24 ones (10) 41:24,24;47:14; 61:11;64:15;108:3; 140:3;154:8;225:18; 243:11 **One-seventy-five** (1) 29:2 one-step (3) 52:2,3,3 one-to- (1) 46:25 one-to-four (3) 46:22;112:11;115:23 one-to-one (1) 59:5 one-to-three (3) 46:22;112:10;115:23 on-line (3) 184:3,15,17 only (33) 9:22;27:13;41:10; 44:9;64:7;65:18;67:13; 71:9;79:3,23;82:22; 85:12,12;89:17;96:14; 97:18;111:15;121:16; 139:7.23:141:11; 146:2;151:25;159:18; 172:23;177:24;180:6; 187:18;189:22,23; 209:25;210:20;221:4 **On-Shore** (1) 116:8 onto (2)38:14;202:13 open (3) 175:14;222:11;245:4 opened (1) 234:20 operate (1) 4:6operated (2) 39:9;41:1 operation (1) 94:12 operations (2) 27:1:225:16 opine (2) 88:7;89:11 opining (1)

89:16 opinion (20) 10:21:15:4,6:87:6: 88:10,11;89:2,22; 90:12;184:19;192:5; 195:2;206:2,4;218:9; 219:7;231:21;235:3,5, 7 opponents (1) 239:14 opportunity (5) 17:10;48:11;90:6; 151:15;212:15 oppose (1) 85:9 opposed (3) 158:3;171:18;227:10 opposite (2) 186:12;234:5 opposition (5) 5:5;89:14;119:16; 189:3;220:4 option (3) 81:24;82:16,17 options (18) 9:8;35:4,7,14,18,23; 57:12;81:18,20,22; 82:4,21,21,24;84:13, 14;120:25;223:14 orange (1) 212:22 oranges (3) 137:24;138:2;139:1 order (16) 11:10;14:15;27:12, 14;35:13;38:8;39:16; 58:22;86:16;92:2; 119:10;208:17;218:3, 3;233:1;235:20 **Ordinance** (2) 4:5;134:4 ordinary (1) 35:10 organizations (1) 219:4 organizing (1) 168:5 original (11) 13:25;14:4;39:2,18; 72:11,12,16,17;87:16, 19:185:2 originally (1) 42:11 other's (1) 57:13 others (14) 8:17;10:8;46:15; 58:10;61:6,12;102:13; 107:3,4,9,10;110:11; 210:8:243:6 Otherwise (1) 198:24 ours (2)

21:24;60:3 out (65) 6:12;13:23;15:5; 16:5,11,14;17:6;18:20; 25:4;33:10;44:19; 48:12;55:8,11;57:8; 61:19;63:8,12,19,22; 64:3,18,23,25;65:7; 73:21;75:20,22;82:3; 87:5:96:8:102:17: 114:9;124:20;126:10; 130:3;141:3;144:22; 146:9,25;156:22; 160:14;169:9,12; 170:16;186:19;187:10; 202:18;204:1;211:12; 212:10;213:2,2;216:6; 217:17;218:1,20; 221:12;224:23;227:2; 230:7;244:1,22; 246:11,23 outcome (1) 116:22 outliers (2) 197:2;207:9 output (3) 36:4;73:23;95:6 outside (19) 28:6;37:24;56:12; 57:3:62:9,9:66:1,3; 68:3,11,22,23;70:7; 136:14:138:18:143:20: 144:9;145:3;223:4 over (58) 7:8;9:1,23;17:20; 20:20,21;21:20,21; 24:13;27:25,25;29:1; 39:17;59:7;75:19; 91:11;128:23;135:1,1, 1,2,9,9,11,12,12,12; 138:9,9,11;140:23; 141:16,17,23,23,23; 151:15;155:24;167:2, 3;170:2;172:5;174:3; 176:6;189:15;190:14; 198:22;199:17,18; 202:14;203:1;230:19, 21;235:16;236:6; 243:11,11;247:4 over-(1) 202:10 overall (10) 18:4;19:8;20:11; 23:25;27:2,3;38:6; 69:25;121:19;186:22 overlap (3) 146:7,8,14 overlapping (1) 57:15 over-predicting (1) 206:1 overrule (4) 29:15;30:25;43:7;

90:5 oversee (1) 31:3 oversight (1) 35:17 overstate (2) 191:13;207:12 overstatement (1) 71:18 overstating (1) 187:7 overtaken (1) 46:12 own (6) 37:11,15;106:12; 174:22;190:7;219:4 OZAH (1) 4:4 ozone (47) 40:19;51:9,11;56:2; 57:14,17,18;59:6,25; 60:4;71:3,6,10,12,23; 73:3,4,6,10,12,13,15; 74:4,7,11,20;75:1,24; 77:20;78:9,10,13,14, 19,22;79:9,17;80:4,9, 12;128:18;129:2; 138:17;171:10,10; 173:9;175:11 Р page (124) 11:11;19:20;23:24; 24:9,21;28:5,12,17; 31:22;32:15,17;33:25; 34:1,19,21,24;52:9,16, 74:21,22,23;81:9,10; 97:15,16,19:98:3,14, 15;100:1,2;101:10,23, 24;102:3;103:3,17; 105:23;106:3,8,10;

22;57:25;58:5,13;59:2; 91:17:94:23:96:2.3.19: 104:19,20,22,22,23,24; 107:1,13,14;108:4; 110:12;111:14,20; 112:14;113:7,22; 114:12,13,16,17,18; 116:9,25;120:14,16,18, 22:121:12.12:122:2.8. 11,12;123:10;128:10, 16,21,23,23;130:11,17; 133:8,11,12,15,19; 137:12,17;141:5,7,7; 157:4;160:14;168:12; 176:21;179:7;181:22; 182:22;194:25;195:1; 196:5,17;203:12; 212:7,14,14,20;213:11; 214:25;215:14;217:25; 220:3;230:23 pages (9)

103:9,16,24;104:2; 127:22,23;130:6; 133:22;152:1 paginated (1) 133:21 paired (5) 82:7,14;83:8;207:15, 19 pairing (1) 58:20 Panofsky (35) 46:13,13,17;48:22; 49:1,10,12,15,17,22; 102:4,7,9,15;103:9,25; 104:2,16,21;105:18; 106:24;107:4,8,14; 108:13;109:5;111:15; 113:8;114:4,5;115:21; 116:1;117:2,3,8 paper (4) 97:22;104:21; 111:15;113:22 papers (1) 168:5 paragraph (18) 52:16;58:1;75:9,10; 105:25;106:4,10; 130:21;157:16,17; 158:6;167:19,20; 176:22;179:7;206:11; 218:2,19 parallel (1) 140:18 Parcel (22) 4:9;11:17,25;12:15, 19;13:4;16:20;20:13; 22:13;42:11;44:2,8; 46:11;48:24,25;87:8; 88:13;89:4;90:13; 100:7,10,22 parentheses (1) 105:5 park (1) 186:9 parked (1) 117:6 parking (38) 20:4,5;42:1,3,5,7; 53:21;54:4,5,6,14,15, 21;64:14,19,20;65:23; 67:4;68:12;110:23; 111:1;113:24;117:4, 19,19;141:10;181:1; 184:24;185:13,13,19; 186:2,20;194:1,6; 221:14;226:22,24 part (24) 11:13;14:3;33:18; 40:4;49:10;54:21;76:8; 78:20,21;102:4; 117:19;123:25;131:14; 137:15;145:11;167:24; 183:1;188:18;212:13;

215:13:216:25:217:13; 237:14:240:25 participate (1) 37:25 particles (1) 237:22 particular (17) 6:20;16:20;30:16; 58:8;78:16;84:14; 109:17;124:2;126:9; 152:23;162:14;179:15; 189:11:217:8:218:4: 225:11;240:12 particularly (4) 48:1;78:12;206:19; 237:25 particulate (2) 43:19;178:21 parties (3) 4:18;5:22;37:24 parts (13) 92:4;148:13;149:7; 167:9,10,22;168:2,18; 171:25;174:4,4;181:9; 193:11 Party (1) 187:25 passed (5) 153:17;198:23; 199:11:212:10:218:1 passenger (1) 178:12 past(6)13:23;16:14;112:21; 146:25:176:1:205:9 Pat (1) 4:23 path(2)33:22,22 patience (1) 66:11 patient (1) 246:7 pattern (1) 61:23 **PDF** (1) 74:22 peak (7) 60:1;74:6;222:5,10, 15;228:19;231:24 peaks (1) 73:5 peer-reviewed (4) 49:13;164:7,8,10 pejorative (1) 159:12 pending (2) 134:7;174:20 Penn (1) 104:15 people (8) 89:13;176:19;186:6, 8;191:14;239:18;

242:21;246:8 per (30) 43:22;76:8,13;88:3; 90:14:92:4.14:93:25: 106:15,16:148:13,13; 149:7,8;167:9,10,22; 168:2,14,19;171:25; 174:5,5;179:9,20; 181:7;202:18;210:15; 219:14:237:14 percent (130) 9:6:10:24:11:9; 14:14,16,17;15:9;20:1; 27:6,11,12,14,16,18, 23;44:25,25;45:17,22; 52:10,11,24;53:5,11, 15,16,19,23;54:24; 55:3,4,10;57:7;58:3,6; 60:7,22,24;62:13,20, 24,25;63:10,18;64:1,7, 13,18;65:9,11,19,19; 66:17,23;68:9,11,13, 18;69:9;71:2,4,5,6,10, 13,13,18,22;72:3,5,8,8, 9,12,17,21,21;73:2,15, 25;84:12;85:6;88:21; 100:11;120:10;121:14, 15;123:1,3;124:18,20, 21,24;126:5;136:22; 141:13:158:20:169:1; 170:13,14;179:2.3; 188:6.9.13.14:189:21. 23;190:1;191:20; 193:8;201:15;202:13; 203:4;204:13;205:2, 17;210:7;211:20; 220:6,8,9,23,24;221:8, 20;222:6;226:19; 227:1;229:9 percentage (2) 71:24;73:20 percentile (19) 82:8,25;83:8;90:12; 95:9;148:12,20;194:5; 196:9,9,10;204:23; 207:4,10,11;208:3,10; 227:8;231:24 performance (1) 205:4 performed (1) 222:22 perhaps (8) 33:7;58:18;93:11; 143:13;162:14;171:23; 207:19;208:15 perimeter (4) 13:18;22:13;61:6; 145:8 perimeters (1) 146:4 period (9) 77:22;135:20,21; 170:2;179:19;190:14,

22:235:16:236:6 periods (6) 59:25:74:4:78:6; 79:24;194:9,17 peripheral (1) 165:13 permit (8) 12:8;35:11,16;36:12, 19,19;37:4,25 permits (1) 38:2 perpendicular (2) 140:20,20 person (2) 88:4:213:15 perspective (7) 8:20;38:6;148:15; 173:10,16;188:23; 205:1 pertain (2) 33:19:48:12 pertained (1) 101:17 pertains (1) 172:15 Peters (2) 61:17,22 petition (1) 4:4 petitioner (1) 4:6petroleum (1) 164:13 phonetic (7) 105:9;113:23; 163:24;171:6;215:6; 218:15:240:1 phrase (2) 168:13;196:13 pick (6) 38:16;77:24;172:8; 189:12;205:20;247:5 picked (1) 38:25 picking (2) 200:20;218:18 pictures (1) 54:20 piece (2) 48:14;240:12 pieces (1) 223:25 pilot (1) 140:3 piston (3) 126:1,21;127:6 pitcher (1) 167:16 place (3) 61:24;62:12;204:24 placed (2) 84:12;229:3 placement (1)

158:12 places (3) 159:16:173:20; 193:14 plan (4) 18:4;32:25,25; 142:22 planned (1) 154:1 plant (7) 59:24;60:23;61:25; 75:4;138:11;184:24; 186:6 plant's (1) 59:20 plants (4) 137:23;173:21; 202:2,5 plastic (1) 117:14 plausible (1) 230:19 Plaza (1) 4:9 please (13) 4:19;33:10;91:17; 98:17;103:22;107:19; 120:14;133:15;142:4; 219:4;223:24;227:18; 239:1 pleasure (1) 238:18 plenty (2) 166:16;219:14 plot(2)26:2;229:21 plots (4) 12:23,23;196:15; 221:3 plug(2)114:2;190:16 plume (3) 61:25;75:1,2 plumes (1) 60:5 plus (18) 13:9;25:3;61:11; 62:22;72:21;188:12, 14;190:1,4,7,23; 201:15;202:8;204:13; 207:12;221:22;226:21, 21 pm (4) 119:21;142:15; 223:20;247:8 PM2.5 (13) 8:9,14;41:12;43:3; 44:2,8;45:24;50:6,21; 191:5;210:15;236:8; 242:8 **PMs** (1) 236:19 pocket (1)

136:3 pocket's (1) 135:25 point (58) 26:19;29:18;30:15; 31:11;40:4;43:24; 46:24;48:2;60:8;76:2, 19,25;84:2;86:10,16; 87:1,2,17;88:19,23; 89:15:91:23,23:92:13; 112:8;117:21;122:23; 133:4;139:10;161:18; 171:20;172:8;187:20; 199:16,17;204:22; 210:2,10,21,22;211:10, 17;214:16,17;216:19; 217:2;219:18,23; 222:2,3;223:9;224:22, 23;229:5;241:24; 242:11;245:12;246:25 pointed (1) 169:9 pointing (3) 19:6;126:10;217:17 points (11) 26:11;37:16;42:15; 86:14;168:14;169:3; 172:19;213:2,3;222:2; 228:12 policy (1) 35:20 pollutants (14) 11:1:50:5,8:77:7.8; 111:11:148:24.25: 205:12;220:24;236:8; 237:2;242:1,3 Pollution (12) 31:21:34:15:87:8: 88:14;89:4;127:17; 165:1,12:180:23,24; 218:4,12 pool (7) 11:16;19:13;21:9,20; 23:13;101:16;225:1 poorly (1) 204:18 **Port (9)** 93:2;162:16,19; 166:23;170:14,18,20, 25;172:7 portion (6) 12:3,12;27:12;144:4; 213:11;216:23 Ports (4) 164:15,17,19,25 pose (1) 10:15 position (7) 91:15;105:20;142:1; 193:21;212:3;217:10; 232:9 positive (2) 128:19;209:21

possibilities (1) 230:9 possibility (1) 15:9 possible (6) 73:22:139:23: 181:12;226:8;246:8; 247:3 possibly (3) 48:12:172:1:191:7 potential (13) 13:16;60:1,3,4;65:4; 88:11;89:20;162:15; 189:4,5,23;190:24; 200:23 power (9) 59:24;60:23;61:25; 75:4;137:23;138:10; 173:21:202:2,5 **PowerPoint** (1) 96:19 ppb (4) 73:6;167:8;197:2,2 practical (1) 176:18 practice (1) 183:16 precedent (1) 115:12 precise (1) 219:13 precision (3) 219:12.12.14 predecessor (1) 98:23 predicting (2) 202:11:205:16 predictions (2) 177:12:191:20 pre-empt (1) 130:25 prefer (2) 107:22;211:21 preference (1) 119:25 prefers (1) 210:1 preliminary (2) 5:21;7:20 premature (1) 86:22 premise (1) 197:19 prepare (1) 119:10 prepared (3) 13:3;151:18,19 preparing (1) 88:16 prescribed (1) 85:15 presence (1) 171:10

present (5) 56:3:196:16:198:11: 206:23:241:25 presented (4) 37:15;39:19;135:18; 241:14 presenting (1) 196:24 pressed (2) 181:3:216:19 presume (5) 36:12:89:18:93:18, 22;154:23 pretty (8) 27:8;120:6;179:23; 192:12;200:6;211:23; 215:19;230:3 previous (3) 13:21;49:23;50:1 previously (9) 7:23;9:4,18;14:16; 16:1;40:7;84:15; 129:12;142:21 primarily (4) 80:24;162:19; 177:25;178:1 primary (9) 52:5;123:14;126:15; 150:16;152:10;171:4; 182:3;209:15;216:14 print (1) 73:21 printed (1) 6:12 printing (1) 155:23 print-out (1) 213:20 print-outs (1) 184:5 prior (8) 8:17;42:17,25;43:10; 44:10;75:5;112:20; 186:25 probably (22) 58:10;60:3,10,19; 71:18;75:4;81:2;84:10; 94:11;118:10;123:21; 147:1;176:8;180:1; 189:18;191:12;196:9; 201:10;240:24,25; 241:1:246:14 problem (8) 93:18,23,24;152:3; 162:16,21;167:13,15 problematic (1) 242:4 problems (3) 158:3;162:12;219:6 procedure (3) 57:21;131:11;132:13 procedures (1) 206:21

proceed (1) 8:1 process (18) 36:16;37:4,10,11,13, 18,18,24,25;38:7; 74:12;76:17;77:4;95:8; 158:23;159:2;189:3; 200:22 produce (4) 160:1;173:15; 178:20;186:4 produced (4) 31:8;128:2;164:9; 218:22 products (1) 187:18 professional (3) 31:7;90:9;231:21 proffer (3) 142:22,24;170:21 proffering (2) 165:9.10 program (4) 57:5;98:24;140:4; 198:25 programming (4) 94:20;95:4,8,13 progressive (1) 81:24 prohibit (1) 215:10 project (6) 22:14:38:3:39:1: 46:4:69:22:135:20 project's (1) 81:23 projections (1) 87:19 projector (2) 59:22:212:8 projects (1) 220:6 promulgating (1) 158:24 proper (3) 15:24;196:13;210:9 properties (1) 101:18 proportional (1) 105:12 proposal (1) 185:3 propose (1) 10:14 proposed (4) 185:12;195:3;206:3; 243:10 protecting (1) 137:13 Protection (2) 137:1;153:5 protective (1) 89:18

protocol (8) 35:18:36:4:190:9: 198:21,21;199:9; 216:25:217:7 proved (2) 166:5,7 provide (13) 6:1:52:19:68:9; 123:6;128:4,5;173:10; 184:10,11:188:23; 202:9;203:20;219:7 provided (12) 9:9:36:23:47:15: 103:5,15,16,21,25; 160:4;198:14;212:14; 241:19 provider (1) 36:7 provides (1) 124:8 providing (2) 189:16;239:14 proximity (5) 42:6;74:11,14,15,19 psychologically (1) 171:23 public (4) 4:2;137:13;246:22; 247:1 publication (1) 95:24 publicly (1) 92:18 published (6) 49:16,24,25;106:24; 116:8;216:8 publisher (1) 49:25 pull (2) 48:12;207:22 pulled (1) 50:13 pump (1) 59:24 pumps (1) 4:7 purportedly (1) 156:21 purpose (4) 129:15;157:11,14; 159:18 purposes (10) 9:11;11:23;19:10; 129:14;131:19;145:16; 209:19;211:14,14; 213:17 pursuant (1) 4:5 put (40) 28:1:43:24:53:15: 84:1;92:12;110:15,17; 112:18:116:15:117:17: 124:17;141:13;147:24;

3-2003				
150 0 10 12 151 11 12	146 4 10 177 04			
150:8,10,13;151:11,12;	146:4,10;177:24;	rate (6)	readers (1)	rebut (1)
156:22;158:7;161:18;	186:3;204:25;205:9;	15:13;62:17,18;	218:2	240:12
165:9;166:7;170:22;	221:6;225:16;226:19;	63:11;101:4;139:12	reading (16)	rebuttal (60)
175:6;180:18,20;	231:1,1;233:19,20,23	rates (2)	35:9;92:6,9;100:9;	7:21;8:4;11:3;17:10,
184:6,17;185:21;	queued (1)	41:3;51:5	128:21;148:12;157:1,	13;31:9;32:8,18;37:1;
186:20;188:22;202:23;	179:21	rather (10)	2,7,8;160:24;172:10;	39:12;40:4,5,8,9,9;
209:8;211:11,12;	queues (5)	40:3;57:19;125:2;	178:13;182:11;210:4;	41:8;42:17,25;45:15;
221:12;222:12,16;	42:14,16;53:12;54:9;	176:2;196:24;206:1;	211:1	46:9;48:22;50:6,15,17;
229:7	194:12	215:11;222:17;224:2;	readings (2)	52:22;56:6,8;57:25;
putting (4)	quick (6)	246:23	175:5;211:1	58:13;84:21;85:3,11,
150:2;159:20;			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
· · · ·	76:23;97:17;112:14;	ratio (49)	read-out (1)	18;87:6,15,20;88:11;
170:16;186:21	161:17;200:17;241:11	14:13;27:14,17,19;	190:15	89:1,22;91:18;94:13,
<b>PV</b> (1)	quicker (1)	46:23;52:4,7,10,13,25;	read-outs (1)	14;99:14;100:1,10,25;
120:24	112:14	53:11,13;54:1,8,25;	190:14	104:19;128:11,12;
	quickly (1)	55:3;58:2,6;59:3;	reads (1)	136:19;168:11;175:22;
Q	110:10	60:23;63:3,17;64:17,	218:2	186:24;194:21,22;
	quite (13)	24;65:1,2,8,11;68:14,	real (6)	220:1;224:6;240:4;
quadrant (2)	53:24;61:19;95:20;	18;70:12;72:21;	165:13;174:11;	241:24;242:14
23:25;24:1	112:10;154:13;165:18;	120:10,11,13,24;	202:15;205:7;222:12;	recall (40)
qualifications (1)	170:6;179:1;210:16;	121:14,18;124:10,18;	223:2	11:24;14:10,11;
229:1	213:5;224:10;228:3;	126:8,10;127:9;136:9;	realism (1)	18:21;22:17,20;49:12;
	240:17		202:19	
qualified (1)		137:21;140:1;141:9,		73:21;76:18;87:18,20,
88:18	quotation (1)	13;177:17	realistic (1)	22;95:25;96:1,21,24;
qualify (3)	199:19	rationale (1)	85:2	97:1;98:6;104:8;
18:6,7,12	quote (12)	174:9	reality (3)	109:14;115:14;123:21;
qualities (1)	35:3;74:16,17;94:17,	ratios (19)	173:17,18;223:11	124:16;125:19;126:13;
195:4	18,24,25;105:9,11;	16:15;53:3,8;73:24;	realize (4)	147:22,23;150:18;
quality (23)	199:23;203:9,20	108:3;121:1;125:24;	165:20;179:13;	153:16;163:1,13;
31:4;36:19;38:3;	quoted (1)	127:18;128:2;138:13,	213:18;228:25	166:21;167:2;178:12;
134:15;150:15;152:9;	204:15	17;140:5;145:17;	realized (1)	187:13;196:1;214:2;
153:6;154:14;157:20,	quotes (1)	148:16;178:12,25;	29:8	216:21;229:17;243:1
22;158:3;169:3;	188:19	179:1,3;226:17	really (26)	receive (2)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18,	188:19	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b>	<b>really (26)</b> 12:12,14;22:19;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10;		179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6	<b>really (26)</b> 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5;	188:19 <b>R</b>	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24;	<b>receive (2)</b> 5:23;6:23 <b>recent (17)</b> 30:3;70:16,17;83:10;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20	<b>R radius (1)</b>	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22;	<b>receive (2)</b> 5:23;6:23 <b>recent (17)</b> 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15,
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1)	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23;	<b>receive (2)</b> 5:23;6:23 <b>recent (17)</b> 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 <b>quantified (1)</b> 192:3	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b>	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2)	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 <b>quantified (1)</b> 192:3	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b>	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b> 229:6	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2)	<b>R</b> <b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b> 229:6 <b>raised (1)</b> 40:9	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b> 229:6 <b>raised (1)</b> 40:9 <b>ran (7)</b>	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2)	<b>R</b> <b>radius (1)</b> 94:18 <b>raise (1)</b> 229:6 <b>raised (1)</b> 40:9 <b>ran (7)</b> 23:25;114:5;117:1;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7,	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2)	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8,
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2)	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78)	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23,	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b>	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptors (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15;
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16,	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21; 154:8;155:4;156:5; 164:20;167:19;170:4;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9;	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21; 154:8;155:4;156:5; 164:20;167:19;170:4; 181:21;182:13;183:1,	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9; 205:6	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)	$\begin{array}{c} 179:1,3;226:17\\ \textbf{Raynor (4)}\\ 46:20;112:7;116:2,6\\ \textbf{R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)}\\ 46:21;116:2\\ \textbf{re (1)}\\ 161:15\\ \textbf{re-(1)}\\ 107:22\\ \textbf{reach (5)}\\ 25:11;48:16;159:12;\\ 174:15;179:8\\ \textbf{reaches (2)}\\ 75:2;100:12\\ \textbf{reaching (2)}\\ 112:20;173:5\\ \textbf{reacted (1)}\\ 10:18\\ \textbf{read (43)}\\ 31:16;74:16,16;\\ 98:17;100:2;105:8;\\ 122:12;132:4,4;\\ 147:20;151:1;153:21;\\ 154:8;155:4;156:5;\\ 164:20;167:19;170:4;\\ 181:21;182:13;183:1,\\ 14,21;195:21;196:6,8, \end{array}$	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9; 205:6 reasonably (2)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23; 101:1;109:25;110:3,	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)         218:2,3	$\begin{array}{c} 179:1,3;226:17\\ \textbf{Raynor (4)}\\ 46:20;112:7;116:2,6\\ \textbf{R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)}\\ 46:21;116:2\\ \textbf{re (1)}\\ 161:15\\ \textbf{re-(1)}\\ 107:22\\ \textbf{reach (5)}\\ 25:11;48:16;159:12;\\ 174:15;179:8\\ \textbf{reaches (2)}\\ 75:2;100:12\\ \textbf{reaching (2)}\\ 112:20;173:5\\ \textbf{reacted (1)}\\ 10:18\\ \textbf{read (43)}\\ 31:16;74:16,16;\\ 98:17;100:2;105:8;\\ 122:12;132:4,4;\\ 147:20;151:1;153:21;\\ 154:8;155:4;156:5;\\ 164:20;167:19;170:4;\\ 181:21;182:13;183:1,\\ 14,21;195:21;196:6,8,\\ 14,24;197:3,14;\\ \end{array}$	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9; 205:6 reasonably (2) 204:9;245:4	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16 recognizing (1)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23; 101:1;109:25;110:3, 20;112:21,22;115:6,8;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)         218:2,3         ranking (1)	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21; 154:8;155:4;156:5; 164:20;167:19;170:4; 181:21;182:13;183:1, 14,21;195:21;196:6,8, 14,24;197:3,14; 199:23;203:11;206:8,	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9; 205:6 reasonably (2) 204:9;245:4 reasons (3)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16 recognizing (1) 215:21
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23; 101:1;109:25;110:3, 20;112:21,22;115:6,8; 117:9,23,24;141:16;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)         218:2,3         ranking (1)         218:10	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21; 154:8;155:4;156:5; 164:20;167:19;170:4; 181:21;182:13;183:1, 14,21;195:21;196:6,8, 14,24;197:3,14; 199:23;203:11;206:8, 10;215:17;216:23;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,59; 205:6 reasonably (2) 204:9;245:4 reasons (3) 8:8;9:12;41:15	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16 recognizing (1) 215:21 recollect (1)
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23; 101:1;109:25;110:3, 20;112:21,22;115:6,8; 117:9,23,24;141:16; 142:24;143:20;144:2,	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)         218:2,3         ranking (1)         218:10         RAS (2)	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> $46:20;112:7;116:2,6$ <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> $46:21;116:2$ <b>re (1)</b> $161:15$ <b>re- (1)</b> $107:22$ <b>reach (5)</b> $25:11;48:16;159:12;$ $174:15;179:8$ <b>reaches (2)</b> $75:2;100:12$ <b>reaching (2)</b> $112:20;173:5$ <b>reacted (1)</b> $10:18$ <b>read (43)</b> $31:16;74:16,16;$ $98:17;100:2;105:8;$ $122:12;132:4,4;$ $147:20;151:1;153:21;$ $154:8;155:4;156:5;$ $164:20;167:19;170:4;$ $181:21;182:13;183:1,$ $14,21;195:21;196:6,8,$ $14,24;197:3,14;$ $199:23;203:11;206:8,$ $10;215:17;216:23;$ $218:6,13,18,20,20;$	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,5,9; 205:6 reasonably (2) 204:9;245:4 reasons (3) 8:8;9:12;41:15 reassess (1)	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16 recognizing (1) 215:21 recollect (1) 217:20
22;158:3;169:3; 181:19;182:2;183:18, 19;190:9;198:10; 215:4;218:6;219:2,5; 234:20 quantified (1) 192:3 quantify (2) 192:23;193:3 quartiles (2) 196:16;197:5 query (2) 184:4;218:22 querying (2) 184:4,6 questionable (2) 143:11;181:8 queue (78) 8:20;16:20,22,23,23, 25;17:3;22:3,11;41:12; 43:19;44:23,23;52:25; 53:1,14;54:1;56:12,24; 60:1,15,17,17;62:9,22; 64:1,6,21;65:16;66:16, 21,23;67:19;68:1,16; 72:24;84:16;88:6,21; 94:19;100:12,23; 101:1;109:25;110:3, 20;112:21,22;115:6,8; 117:9,23,24;141:16;	R         radius (1)         94:18         raise (1)         229:6         raised (1)         40:9         ran (7)         23:25;114:5;117:1;         132:20;135:8;140:13,         15         range (20)         60:23;70:5;90:13;         114:8,18;117:8;         124:23;169:10;179:3;         190:4;201:16;202:19;         203:4;208:15;230:17;         231:25;232:3,8;233:5,         14         ranges (3)         190:11;196:10;199:6         ranging (2)         114:6,20         rank (2)         218:2,3         ranking (1)         218:10	179:1,3;226:17 <b>Raynor (4)</b> 46:20;112:7;116:2,6 <b>R-A-Y-N-O-R (2)</b> 46:21;116:2 <b>re (1)</b> 161:15 <b>re- (1)</b> 107:22 <b>reach (5)</b> 25:11;48:16;159:12; 174:15;179:8 <b>reaches (2)</b> 75:2;100:12 <b>reaching (2)</b> 112:20;173:5 <b>reacted (1)</b> 10:18 <b>read (43)</b> 31:16;74:16,16; 98:17;100:2;105:8; 122:12;132:4,4; 147:20;151:1;153:21; 154:8;155:4;156:5; 164:20;167:19;170:4; 181:21;182:13;183:1, 14,21;195:21;196:6,8, 14,24;197:3,14; 199:23;203:11;206:8, 10;215:17;216:23;	really (26) 12:12,14;22:19; 24:24;38:19;39:15; 47:11;71:15;76:24; 94:21;139:10;141:22; 171:17;174:13;175:23; 177:20,23;178:7; 180:3;201:14;202:19; 208:20;224:10;234:15; 237:17;238:3 rearranged (5) 107:18;108:9;109:7, 9;113:12 rearranging (2) 109:14;113:11 reason (18) 8:16;9:3,22;11:13; 16:9;79:16;98:10,20; 143:21;154:11;162:17; 179:12;181:5;195:24; 202:20;213:18;230:22; 243:4 reasonable (8) 36:23;51:17;81:4; 143:24;195:2,59; 205:6 reasonably (2) 204:9;245:4 reasons (3) 8:8;9:12;41:15	receive (2) 5:23;6:23 recent (17) 30:3;70:16,17;83:10; 84:4;131:9,13;132:15, 22;135:20;153:1; 177:6;178:15;204:2; 218:24;222:5;227:13 recently (1) 93:4 receptor (3) 75:3;145:10,14 receptors (25) 11:19;12:25,25;13:8, 22;22:22;46:8;53:1; 64:10;66:18,21,22; 70:7;77:9,13;83:1; 94:18;95:7;115:4; 145:5,15,20,21;146:9; 147:5 recess (4) 66:7;119:21;142:15; 223:20 recognize (2) 210:7;212:3 recognized (2) 105:16;204:16 recognizing (1) 215:21 recollect (1)

15:18:76:20:79:10, 13:80:1:107:16 recommend (2) 188:23,24 recommendation (1) 4:17 recommendations (3) 134:1,12:206:14 recommended (5) 39:2:121:2.14; 147:25;206:6 recommending (1) 205:22 recommends (1) 188:20 reconnect (1) 33:23 reconstruct (1) 9:20 record (32) 4:19;9:20;10:13; 11:6;14:22;24:23; 32:24;33:7;37:21; 44:16,19;56:4;66:9; 85:8;86:8,20;98:17; 106:22;119:23;151:11; 165:8,9,11;166:16; 173:10;184:2;185:21; 206:10;207:20;215:17; 231:14:245:12 record's (1) 24:2 records (2) 79:11:211:2 Recross (4) 223:16,23;224:4; 234:13 rectangle (3) 64:21;144:8;147:4 rectangles (1) 196:12 red (4) 142:23,23;143:2,19 redirect (6) 14:25;200:12,13,15, 18;234:10 reduce (3) 128:19;129:1;165:12 reducing (2) 27:17;134:18 reduction (3) 167:22;168:2;177:5 refer (9) 31:20;54:19;56:18; 58:14,14;71:23;96:19; 108:24;212:19 reference (72) 32:12;33:1;46:14,15, 19;48:21;49:1,15;58:8; 62:19;95:23;96:6,11, 25;97:10;98:7;102:4, 13,16,18;103:1,2,5; 105:6;112:7;113:22;

116:5;122:11;123:8, 13.13.20:124:2.8.8: 126:9,12;127:14; 133:4.10:136:18.25: 137:3;173:3;177:16; 203:12,15;209:16,18, 21,24;210:1,5,12,14, 23;212:2,14,24; 213:23;214:16,17,20; 215:11,14,22;216:14; 235:15;236:12,23; 237:8;238:12 referenced (14) 31:22;32:17;46:18; 47:2;49:23;102:25; 122:18;123:20;125:16; 151:9;158:13;173:4; 182:5;184:9 references (28) 15:7;45:20;46:20; 47:3,8,12,18:48:9; 49:5;52:19;58:9,18; 59:1,17;60:12;61:13; 68:9;71:14;96:4,12; 102:16;107:5;111:22; 115:24;123:6,7;133:7; 180:16 referencing (6) 100:21;104:24,25; 122:3;151:16;152:6 referred (3) 153:22:202:8:228:5 referring (30) 13:14;25:8;32:9; 44:3;52:12,21;55:21; 58:5;62:8;64:20;67:20; 77:8;78:22;100:6; 101:15;108:15;124:2; 126:17;133:11;138:5, 22:148:7.8:149:2: 156:9:183:16:190:3. 17:198:20:222:24 refers (2) 71:23;188:17 reflect (3) 15:12;85:17;114:22 reflected (1) 84:13 reflection (1) 152:14 reflects (3) 143:19:152:5:189:12 reformulation (1) 113:20 regard (7) 159:7;164:15; 166:23;197:12;235:14, 15:242:8 regarding (4) 87:19:156:23; 241:15:242:1 regardless (1) 100:22

region (2) 31:13:70:7 regional (4) 30:21;31:1,12,13 regions (2) 31:13;148:22 Register (12) 133:23;151:9; 152:14;156:10;157:3, 7,9;160:2,20,22;161:5; 182:4 **Registergov** (1) 157:10 regular (1) 171:4 regulatory (2) 35:11;137:5 reiterate (2) 85:9;86:6 related (3) 94:21;112:23;241:22 relates (1) 109:23 relating (2) 32:13;148:22 relative (13) 68:21;93:24;121:24; 177:8;178:17;181:2; 185:20;209:21;211:21; 212:24;215:21;230:25; 236:17 released (1) 96:18 relevant (5) 48:2;179:21;180:3,5; 206:17 reliability (1) 199:4 reliable (3) 204:6,9,19 reliance (1) 122:1 relied (13) 9:17;47:6,13,21,22, 25;48:3,4;98:7;99:2; 102:19;162:10;210:25 relies (1) 171:21 rely (11) 52:9;85:14;99:3; 134:17:135:14,17; 171:22,23;173:2; 209:25;214:21 relying (6) 17:6;96:21;97:1; 160:8;190:16;237:19 remained (1) 185:4 remaining (10) 55:4,19,19:59:5,7, 10;72:8;82:21;202:23; 205:19 remember (15)

44:7:47:10:62:12; 80:3;98:5,9,11;115:15; 125:17;164:21;167:14; 214:3:219:19:240:17: 243:13 remind (3) 12:22;48:17;239:22 remote (3) 94:3;148:18;180:13 removed (1) 193:14 renewed (1) 86:22 reordering (1) 106:13repeat (2) 42:22;178:14 repeated (1) 41:16 repetitive (2) 17:17;240:14 report (180) 4:16;8:23,23;9:18, 24;10:21,22;11:4; 12:20;13:11,15,25; 14:4,11,23;15:5,7,13, 17;17:5;21:1,13,22; 22:7;23:22;24:16;28:4, 14;29:7;30:18,21; 31:23:32:1.3.4.7.8.18. 21;33:2;39:2,19,21,22; 41:8.16:42:8.17.20.25: 44:10:45:4,10,15:46:9, 13;47:2,9,11,12,21; 48:1,4,5,11,12,22;49:5; 50:6,15,17;52:22; 54:20,24;56:6,8;57:25; 58:13,15;59:15,16; 61:4,5,5;84:21,23;85:3, 5.6.11.19:86:10:87:6; 88:11;89:1,23,25; 91:18:92:17:94:13,14. 23;95:23;96:13;100:2, 10,25;101:10,22; 103:3;104:19,24; 106:9;107:13,15; 108:4,13;113:22; 119:7;122:2;123:11; 125:18,20;127:24,25; 128:5,10,11,12;136:18, 19.24;137:17;141:15; 147:17,19,20,24,25; 148:2,4,6;151:9,16; 152:5;162:9,10,14,22, 24,25;163:9;164:7; 166:20,24;168:11; 169:20,22,22;172:9,9; 173:3;175:22;186:24; 193:6;194:19,20,21,22; 195:10.23;196:14; 197:20,24;216:2; 219:5;220:1;224:7; 241:24;242:14

reported (3) 180:9.10:190:7 **REPORTER** (2) 245:11.14 reporting (4) 164:24;173:13; 181:14;219:1 reports (26) 8:7,13;17:12;23:12; 27:5;29:25;30:3;31:16; 49:23;50:1;59:23;76:7; 107:11:140:2:186:25; 187:7,11;195:14; 197:24;198:4;218:1,4, 22;219:9;224:21; 235:12 represent (3) 110:14;218:23;240:9 representative (7) 83:18;84:10;134:13; 189:17;218:5,18; 220:17 representativenss (1) 176:17 represented (2) 59:21;190:18 represents (1) 151:16 reproduced (1) 30:5 request (3) 9:17.19:217:8 requested (1) 103:15 require (2) 36:18;81:24 required (9) 35:13,16;59:23; 82:20;93:4;94:2;95:6, 13:102:10 requirement (7) 48:14:94:5:131:1: 134:18;200:14;201:1; 205:7 requirements (5) 85:19;158:12;183:7; 198:13;206:25 requires (1) 158:22 requiring (4) 93:6;198:17;233:8, 10 rescinded (1) 155:1 research (5) 126:14;140:4;164:9, 11;198:5 researched (1) 122:25 residence (1) 126:22 residential (1) 19:6

residents (3)	82:18	13,14;42:1;53
87:7;88:12;89:3	reviews (1)	54:2,6;64:10,
residual (2)	30:24	67:1;93:1;100
65:5;205:24	revised (2)	115:10;117:1
resources (1)	158:24;229:6	141:10;173:1
81:25	ridiculously (1)	21,22;181:5;1
respect (7)	187:24	221:4,6,12;22
35:21;50:22;78:12,	<b>Right</b> (186)	230:3,4
16;89:23,25;241:19	6:9,9,18,18;7:16,19;	rise (1)
respective (1)	8:1;17:1;18:1,18;23:1,	106:16
88:23	4;24:7;25:13;26:13,19;	Road (89)
<b>Respiratory</b> (1)	27:23;29:5;30:15;33:9;	4:8;12:4,9,11
237:13	34:19;36:1;37:10;	12,13,14;14:1
respond (4)	38:13;39:23;40:13,23;	16:10,14;18:7
8:21;10:12;86:16;	47:16;50:20;56:12,19;	19:1,15,17;20
241:21	62:11,14;63:4;64:4,10;	21:2,5,9,25;2
responded (1)	72:8;74:13;75:19;77:3,	24;25:6,8,14,
10:17	12,18;79:15;81:14,21,	42:1;53:18,20
response (1)	25;86:12;91:13;97:23;	64:10,15;65:2
86:17	98:14;99:19;103:23;	92:21,21,25;9
responses (1)	104:10,14,19;106:4;	17;94:3,9,10;
209:5	108:12;109:11;113:25;	115:10;117:1
responsive (1)	119:12,14,16,17;	123:14;126:1
40:6	120:20;123:16;126:7; 127:4,14;130:5,16,22;	140:22;141:1 7,24;159:15;1
rest (7) 14:5;67:1;127:16;	132:3;133:25;134:23;	170:3;171:2;1
149:7;181:4;185:20;	132.3,135.23,134.23, 138:13;139:2;142:3;	175:14;177:1
186:11	143:23;144:10,14,15,	180:13,22;18
restricted (1)	23;146:1;147:18;	186:2;218:15
40:13	152:2,10,13,16;153:8;	12;226:8,19,2
restricting (1)	154:25;159:9,11,21;	228:18;229:2
64:7	163:19,22;164:2,5;	230:3,4;232:1
rests (1)	165:17,19,24;166:6,11,	road's (1)
86:4	15;167:13;168:8,10,15,	154:6
result (11)	18;169:15,17;172:2,	roads (10)
69:25;70:21;85:18;	13;174:1;175:14;	23:6;137:23;1
87:8;88:13;89:4;	176:12;177:23;179:1,	158:17,19,21
114:13;116:1;199:22;	23;180:19;181:15,24;	221:6;226:14
205:16,17	182:6,18;183:10;	roadway (19)
results (15)	184:12;186:6;187:12;	13:6;14:7;25:
16:14;22:21;36:4;	188:9;189:1;190:19;	28:12;41:5,25
51:18;68:24;69:1;	191:3;192:15;193:4,	140:9,10,13,1
90:24;101:13;114:6;	12;198:22;200:3,11;	162:11;164:6
127:5;158:4;190:20;	203:2,14;212:21;	179:4;193:7,1
191:24;216:7;222:25	215:12,15,23;217:20,	roadways (17)
Resume (1)	24;220:15;221:22;	13:9,19;25:5,
119:23	222:14,14;223:14,16,	22;139:6;140
Resumed (1)	19,22;224:3,17;225:8,	163:6,8,9,10;
8:4	24;228:14;229:2;	221:4,13;232
resuming (1)	231:2,8;232:16,19;	<b>Rockville</b> (10)
7:21	233:18,24;234:9; 235:1;236:22;237:21;	78:20;79:5,5,
return (1) 99:11	238:13,18,23;240:5,7,	18;80:5,21;81 rolled (1)
review (6)	8,13,22;241:4,8;	131:15
30:19;31:2,19;36:20;	243:15,16;244:13;	rolling (1)
74:2;110:11	245:5,9;246:18;247:6	131:24
reviewed (9)	right-hand (1)	Roman (2)
35:17;49:3;76:9;	105:24	157:13;158:5
85:13;107:12;126:14;	ring (51)	room (3)
155:4;177:16;236:18	12:3,9,11;13:13;	4:13;33:16;16
reviewer (2)	16:14;18:7,9,10;19:1,	ROSENFELD
30:20,21	15,17;20:15,19;21:2,5,	5:8,9,10;8:1,3
reviewing (1)	9,25;22:9,13,23;25:8,	10:2,4,7,20;1

131:15	
olling (1)	
131:24	
Roman (2)	
157:13;158:5	
room (3)	
4:13;33:16;160:14	
ROSENFELD (245)	
5:8,9,10;8:1,3,5;	
10:2,4,7,20;14:6;15:3;	
Deposition Services, Inc.	-

16:23;17:1,18,21;18:2;
20:25;21:8,17;23:17,
19,20;24:4,6,8;28:10,
11,19,23,24;29:4,6,23;
30:6,10,14;31:6;32:2,4,
16,17,22,24;33:6,11,
17,25;34:3,5,8,12,20,
23;37:20,22;38:10;
39:13,16,19,22,24;
40:10,15,18,21,24;
41:17;42:24;43:9,12,
25;45:9,25;47:7,16,23;
48:17,20;49:9;50:12,
16;52:23;54:13;56:10;
57:24;61:3;63:1,3,5,19,
22;66:10,13;67:3;69:4;
70:25;72:3,7,15;73:18;
75:8,17;76:4;77:2,10,
12,15,18,21;79:1,3,7;
81:11,14,16;85:8;
86:19,24;87:3,4,22;
88:8;90:3,22;91:13,16;
95:2,10,22;96:7,12,15;
97:4,10,14,16,20;98:2;
99:13,17,21,24,25;
102:1,22;103:1,7,20,
24;104:18;106:7,22,
23;109:3,19;111:13;
113:1,4,5,13,21;118:1,
5,7,10,13,15,22;119:1,
4,9,20;120:1,3,5,8,17,
19,21;121:8;122:5,8,9,
15,16;125:14;127:4,7;
128:12,14;129:25;
130:2,5,8,9,18,20;
132:9;133:9,12,14,16,
19,25;134:9,23;135:3,
10,13;136:8;137:11;
139:19,25;141:22,25;
142:5,8,10,13,17,19;
143:4,13,18;144:25;
145:24;146:12;147:2,
8;203:23;221:25;
222:24;224:2;239:1,3,
16;240:7,24;241:12,
18;242:12,14,19;
245:10
Rosenfeld's (1)
168:5
roughly (2)
226:21,22
roughness (14)
108:8,18;110:16;
112:19;113:24;114:3,
6,8,16,19,23;117:12,
16,22
row (1)
212:21
rows (1)
213:7 Derrol (1)
Royal (1)
127:19
rule (18)

13,14;42:1;53:18,19;

67:1;93:1;100:11;

115:10;117:19,20;

21,22;181:5;186:2;

221:4,6,12;226:8,24;

4:8;12:4,9,11;13:11,

12,13,14;14:1;15:25;

16:10,14;18:7,9,10;

19:1,15,17;20:15,19; 21:2,5,9,25;22:6,9,13,

24;25:6,8,14,25;29:1;

42:1;53:18,20;54:2,6; 64:10,15;65:23;67:1;

92:21,21,25;93:1,4,6,

17;94:3,9,10;100:11;

123:14;126:16;127:18;

140:22;141:10;154:5,

115:10;117:19,20;

7,24;159:15;164:5;

175:14;177:12,13; 180:13,22;181:5;

12:226:8,19,24;

230:3,4;232:18

228:18:229:20,24;

23:6;137:23;141:10;

158:17,19,21;192:13;

28:12;41:5,25;138:10;

140:9.10.13.17.21;

162:11;164:6,20;

179:4;193:7,13,21

13:9,19;25:5,5;26:8,

163:6,8,9,10;192:7,18;

18;80:5,21;81:1;191:6

22;139:6;140:14;

221:4,13;232:11

78:20:79:5,5,9,12,

221:6;226:14,24

13:6;14:7;25:20;

170:3;171:2;173:19;

186:2;218:15;221:4,6,

54:2.6:64:10.15:65:23:

141:10;173:19;180:13,

86:10,14:150:13,14: 151:22,25;152:15; 155:1;156:11,22; 158:11,13;160:21; 161:5,19;174:14; 182:3;242:15 rules (2) 180:18;247:1 ruling (1) 87:2 run (20) 21:11,12;23:5;25:12; 34:5;36:7,11,11;51:21, 24;70:2;117:7;121:21; 131:9;132:17,19,20; 138:9;225:10,13 running (7) 41:2,15;93:8;121:17, 17;124:16;160:14 runs (7) 20:23;22:4;23:3; 41:19;70:3;94:20;95:5 runtime (1) 123:8 rural (42) 16:8,21;17:6,11; 18:11,12,23;19:2,7,11, 17,24;20:12,15;21:10, 21;22:15,19,21,22,25; 23:7,10,13,15:25:4,7; 46:6,10;48:23;94:3; 101:2,5,13,15;137:19; 140:7;184:23,25; 185:23;186:4;205:20 rush (2) 74:5;194:7 S S/S(1)113:24 S-2863 (1) 4:4 sacrificed (1) 119:10 safety (5) 201:1,3,12,15; 202:13 saga (1) 202:1 sake (2) 9:16;223:3 sakes (1) 119:14 Same (57) 9:25;11:11;17:17,23; 19:14,20;21:23;23:2; 26:8;42:16;44:13;46:7;

58:11,14;61:15,15; 67:21,23,25;68:5;

82:15;98:14;107:14; 109:5,7;115:22;116:1;

127:1;129:12;134:4;

135:1,12:137:9:139:9; 141:1,23;149:6; 165:18;182:7,23; 187:1;190:1;194:7; 195:8,12;206:8,10; 209:4;214:22;224:6; 226:14,15,20;227:21; 230:16:235:16:238:1 sample (1) 216:15 satisfy (1) 85:19 Saturday (6) 7:3,14,15,17;222:7; 228:19 save (2) 155:22;221:23 saving (1) 151:6 saying (50) 16:24;17:22;19:1; 26:1,10,12,23;47:10; 62:24;63:17;64:6; 70:11;76:21;98:25; 99:1;139:21;148:18; 155:4;158:3;162:11; 165:4;167:14;174:3,3, 10;178:8,8;180:6; 181:10;183:4;191:17, 18,18;193:7;204:25; 215:11,20:217:3,6,12, 13.15:223:2:231:22: 232:4,21;234:1,25; 236:14:242:8 scale (11) 17:5;19:9;20:13; 23:7;41:14;45:1,2,10; 112:12;143:24;146:20 scaled (4) 45:4,15,16,23 scale-up (1) 45:13 scaling (1) 188:24 scheduled (1) 241:7 schedules (1) 246:8 school (10) 8:18;11:16;19:10; 20:5;21:21;23:13; 101:16;163:24;171:6; 225:1 science (3) 85:24;215:4,4 scientific (8) 85:18,23;86:2,15; 195:2,5,9;198:3 scientists (2) 197:25;214:19 scope (14) 17:9,15;28:7;29:14; 36:25;39:11;87:10;

89:25:234:9.22.23; 235:24:238:2.4 scratch (1) 175:3 screen (1) 61:18 se (1) 88:3 search (1) 148:4 season (2) 78:4:213:12 seasons (1) 213:6 Seattle (1) 105:10 second (18) 4:12;9:3;33:21;43:6; 76:13;96:5;98:17; 120:22;124:25;130:10; 150:20;154:23;158:6; 171:15;201:18;215:13; 225:17;227:20 seconds (6) 76:2,5,6,9,11;127:2 Section (34) 4:5;34:24,25;35:1; 81:17,25;82:3;100:2; 133:14,18;134:1,10; 157:5,10,10,12,13; 158:5;180:3;182:15, 16,17,21,25;183:1,4,6; 203:7.8.14:204:2; 206:8,10,13 security (1) 37:17 Seeing (8) 7:20;49:12;69:24; 98:5,6;136:6;173:22, 22 seem (3) 195:24;197:15; 246:19 seems (8) 40:2;81:4;125:2; 165:13;170:8;193:12; 197:15;238:24 sees (1) 57:16 segments (4) 41:25:138:10; 141:10;177:13 select (5) 39:4;46:2;77:19; 78:3;246:23 selecting (1) 34:25 selection (4) 42:18;44:11;46:3; 77:5 seller (1) 104:11 sells (1)

177:24 sending (2) 116:14:246:23 sense (7) 138:4;192:9,24; 194:6;204:23;205:12; 236:15 sensitivity (4) 116:20;117:1,7; 229:23 sent (1) 5:25 sentence (21) 14:5;100:14;105:24; 111:14;120:23;128:16, 22;130:22;131:16,23; 132:3,4,5;134:13; 167:25;182:19,21; 183:1,3,4,11 sentences (1) 52:16 separate (2) 55:18;146:17 separately (2) 57:14;223:6 serves (1) 131:18 Service (3) 131:2;132:8;177:20 services (1) 162:16 servicing (4) 162:19;170:14,20; 171:2session (3) 4:12;5:22;247:5 set (27) 15:5;33:14,15;46:8; 60:9,14,16;69:21; 77:24;79:20;84:14; 87:5;108:20;110:16; 124:8;125:1;129:14, 15;158:12;177:16; 207:24;210:13;214:21; 219:15;236:21;237:6; 243:7 sets (6) 80:2;82:6;90:17; 194:10;197:9;238:13 setting (1) 138:19 settle (1) 236:10 Seventeen (1) 130:18 several (11) 8:8;35:4;80:21;81:5; 103:17;117:15;124:22; 140:14;173:4;185:21; 231:13 shape (1) 179:11 share (2)

33:8:34:12 she's (6) 32:8;49:4;87:11; 228:24;242:5;244:10 shed (1) 135:20 sheet (7) 151:7,10,12,16,17; 152:9;156:19 shift (1) 11:14 shifting (1) 226:13 short (4) 71:14,15;239:20; 241:11 Shorten (1) 120:2 shortly (1) 142:2 short-terms (1) 204:7 show (58) 12:23;13:4,10,12,18, 25;14:4;15:13;18:4; 26:14;28:22;29:17; 30:2;46:15;51:18,20; 58:9,11;59:22;60:12, 21;61:15,17,20;63:25; 68:25:69:13:70:4.5: 71:19;87:9;88:14,17, 17;89:5,7,8;97:5;98:3; 109:5;111:22;114:8, 11;123:7;133:2;139:2; 142:20;152:23;161:23; 162:22;168:12;173:20, 23;176:3;191:9; 208:14;230:17;236:5 showed (26) 13:5,6;14:1;16:12; 17:4;22:21;24:19;27:5; 46:22;47:1;71:20;76:9; 107:4;114:5,10;117:7, 8;121:11;131:13; 132:21;135:21;136:21; 141:15;162:14;208:9; 223:6 showing (31) 26:14;54:20;59:21; 61:22;91:8;92:1; 106:14;110:25;112:14, 17:115:1:117:3:131:8: 132:13;141:19;179:1; 196:6,7,8,10,25;197:2, 4,15;204:21,22;212:23, 23;216:20;225:25; 231:3 shown (28) 21:24;23:13;24:23; 25:14;30:2;42:11; 70:13;71:14;88:21; 104:20:107:1.14; 108:3,4;109:5;110:10;

111:20;113:7;124:7; 141:7;145:5;181:9,22; 192:2:213:3:215:14; 216:17:221:3 shows (21) 12:24;24:21;25:1; 28:25;53:16;73:23; 82:22;100:10;121:13; 124:14,15,23;126:19; 143:22;168:16;172:24, 25;174:8;212:22; 213:1;215:14 Shu (1) 61:21 S-H-U (1) 61:21 side (8) 105:24;119:17; 139:24;212:21;230:23; 231:2,3,5 signal (2) 105:11:112:17 significance (3) 192:8,10;218:12 significant (6) 54:16;57:15;60:20; 82:5;145:7;177:4 significantly (1) 237:15 signs (1) 42:15 Silver (1) 4:8SILVERMAN (137) 5:11,12,13;111:8; 119:9,15;147:10,11,14; 150:4,10,12,23:151:5, 12,18,19,21,24;152:4, 7,13,17,25;153:4,9,13; 155:9,17,22:156:3,7, 10,13,15,24;157:2,5,8, 13,16,25:158:5,11; 159:9,11,14,20,22; 160:1,6,10,17,21,25; 161:2,7,11,14,17,23; 162:2,4,6,8;165:13,17, 19,21,24;166:2,6,11, 14,18;167:10,11,18; 168:1,8,9,25;169:2,11; 170:2;171:1,14,16,20; 172:3,17,20;173:1,7; 174:1,13,23;176:11; 181:13;182:8,10; 184:21;185:9,15,19; 187:20;188:2,3;189:9; 193:5;194:22,24; 196:19,21;197:6,13,23; 199:14,19,24;200:1,4, 7,21;215:2;234:15,18, 19,25;235:4,13;236:2, 11;237:9;238:6,9; 239:6 Silverman's (2)

142:11:189:19 similar (13) 44:11:46:16:61:20, 23;102:14;126:13; 145:1,8,17;171:7; 205:5;208:16;209:6 simple (2) 43:12:106:1 simplest (1) 224:1 simplicity (1) 96:13 simplification (1) 108:19 simplify (1) 54:11 simply (4) 43:17;60:24;96:9; 175:25 single (11) 125:23,23,24;126:3, 4,5,11,13,20;127:3,10 sit (1) 122:24 site (41) 4:8;84:19;92:25,25; 142:22;148:9;151:8, 24;152:9;163:17,20; 170:7,7;171:18;172:8, 15,16,24;174:7,8,24; 175:13;183:23;185:11, 13:189:11:193:23: 204:18:208:15:209:15, 17,17,19;210:14,16; 212:17:216:18:218:5; 219:20,25;220:5 site- (1) 123:3 sites (22) 92:13,15,23:93:2; 137:18:140:13.15: 148:10:163:10,12,12, 13,14,15;167:21; 172:23;180:16;181:14; 183:23;193:12;212:16: 219:21 site-specific (4) 131:3,5,18;132:12 sitting (1) 47:18 situation (7) 36:17:72:24:141:1: 170:10;172:4;186:21; 205:7 situations (1) 8:21 six (17) 27:15;29:21;60:20, 22;83:4;122:11; 123:13;127:11;169:12; 182:16,17,21;183:1,4, 6;212:20;237:25 six-city (1)

237:23 slash (5) 155:15;156:5;158:2; 159:6:183:16 slice (1) 227:16 slight (2) 20:19:110:23 slope (10) 47:1;105:20;107:3; 110:20,23;111:1,5; 112:10,13;115:22 small (6) 6:17,17;27:1;139:7; 222:16:230:13 smaller (2) 152:3;230:17 **smog** (2) 75:25;76:23 smooth (1) 117:15 snag (1) 6:17 snuck (1) 201:24 so-called (1) 177:15 Society (1) 127:20 software (1) 94:16 solve (2) 108:8;110:17 solved (2) 107:21;113:12 solving (5) 107:24;108:9; 109:10,10,14 somebody (1) 128:6 somebody's (1) 184:18 someone (1) 48:8 someplace (1) 178:10 sometime (2) 132:24;204:10 sometimes (9) 79:15,15;124:24; 149:19;186:8,9;199:8; 215:20.20 somewhat (5) 17:14,16;69:3;82:14; 144:22 somewhere (5) 115:16;172:8; 204:10;232:3;233:13 Sonoma (3) 140:4,8,16 Sons (1) 49:24 soon (2)

150:11:247:2 sooner (2) 111:6,8 sorry (35) 6:16,16;12:6,9;14:3; 20:22;21:16;49:19; 51:4;65:15;80:15; 81:10,12:93:7:99:8; 121:12;126:24;128:24; 131:22;133:10;134:8; 136:7,7;151:17;153:4; 167:8,17:174:21; 176:21;196:21,21; 217:16,24;233:10; 246:4 sort (5) 59:7;117:13;147:4; 175:20;237:24 sorts (1) 237:1 sound (2) 234:2;246:12 sounds (2) 155:5;214:6 source (40) 26:20;41:22,23; 47:21;50:2;57:16;59:4, 17;60:16;62:10,10; 64:3,9,22;66:19,20,21, 21:68:23:70:7:73:1: 110:1.3;120:13;121:7; 138:14;144:24;145:11, 21,25;181:6,10,11; 185:19,24;223:4,4,6, 14;226:17 sources (35) 26:22,23;42:2,2; 45:2;46:18,19;48:21; 52:14;54:17,23;56:24, 25;57:6,14;59:19,20; 63:18;64:19;65:18,22; 66:25:67:25:101:12; 109:25;110:6;121:17; 138:6;145:6,25; 192:10;199:4;202:5; 223:7;224:18 source-specific (4) 121:1,5,9;123:4 south (16) 12:4,9;19:1,6;20:15, 22;21:2;25:13,23,23; 46:11:48:24:80:18.25: 100:11,20 southeast (1) 21:20 southern (9) 12:12;13:13;22:9,19; 42:5;54:2;117:18; 144:4.4 southwest (1) 23:25 sp (7) 105:9;113:23;

163:24;171:6;215:6; 218:15:240:1 space (2) 117:19;204:21 spaced (1) 13:1 speak (4) 11:5;200:1;208:25; 227:21 SPEAKER (37) 7:14;28:18,20; 109:18;112:25;118:18, 19,20,21;120:4;121:7; 125:8;130:17;136:4,7; 137:10;143:7,11; 144:12;146:22;167:17; 184:13;200:8,9; 201:23;202:4;203:10; 214:6,24;221:23,24; 245:8,16,20,22,24; 246:13 speaking (3) 83:11;90:19;124:3 speaks (1) 9:20 special (7) 4:5;11:23;18:5; 26:13,16;144:9;164:21 specialists (1) 31:4 specific (14) 20:9:31:8:50:9: 52:19,19;84:19;94:22; 123:4.22:164:21: 190:18;204:8,17; 206:14 specifically (6) 18:16,22;31:17; 43:23:98:6:217:7 specify (2) 36:10;115:25 speculate (1) 10:8 speculation (2) 10:1;30:22 speculative (2) 155:10;235:23 speech (1) 237:16 speed (9) 78:16;111:23;112:2, 9;124:1,4,11;125:17,21 speeds (4) 111:17;124:6; 179:10,19 spent (1) 113:3 spoke (1) 209:2 spoken (1) 221:25 spot (6) 169:19;186:10,11,

13:205:1:225:12 spots (1) 186:7 Spring (1) 4:9 stable (1) 185:22 stack (2) 52:11;53:3 stacked (2) 59:19,20 stage (136) 15:12;24:14,15; 30:16,17;38:8,8;40:1,1, 11,12,18,21;41:22,22; 55:21,21,24,25;56:6,7, 7,7,11,22;59:11;62:5; 67:10,11,13,14,14,14, 15,18,19,23,23;68:24, 25;69:2,4,8,12,19,19, 19,25;70:4,4,11,21; 71:1,9,20,20;72:23; 73:9,19;77:3;78:1,2,7, 7,9,10,12,25;79:1,4; 82:11,14,23,24;83:5,7, 7;84:13,22,22;85:10, 10;87:9,23;88:14,20; 89:5,8,23,23,24;91:1,5, 7;95:4,11,13;121:19; 128:16;129:12;131:8, 8,12,13,15;132:13,13, 21:133:3:134:21.22: 135:8,15,24;136:10,11, 12,14;138:1,17;139:3; 141:6;154:24;199:10; 207:15,16;208:1,5,8, 16;225:13;226:4; 229:6,19;230:15;246:9 stages (1) 91:5 stalled (1) 194:17 stand (7) 45:12;107:21,22; 195:20;211:17;214:1,3 standard (67) 8:9,13,15;14:18; 15:10;25:5;26:6,19; 27:25;35:5,6,7;44:5,5; 49:11;51:21,23;85:15, 17;88:18,19;89:8,10, 12;90:14;93:25; 130:24;149:4,6,9,10, 11;153:17;154:9; 158:13,14;162:23; 166:21,25;167:5,5,23; 168:4;180:17;181:7; 182:3;202:14;205:10, 11;209:16;210:20,23; 211:3.5.9.16.20.21; 213:9;216:12;223:13; 236:18,21,22,24;237:3, 5

standards (25) 13:24:14:9:26:21: 88:5,5;89:17;90:17,20; 148:23,24,25;153:6; 154:20;155:6.8; 156:11,23;183:20; 195:16;201:2;214:19; 236:22;237:20;238:13; 241:17 stands (3) 34:15;75:20,22 stars (1) 197:2 start (11) 33:25;34:20;55:23; 108:12;112:20;117:20; 128:15;154:1;202:12; 229:11;241:3 started (4) 27:21;154:1;180:18; 187:10 starting (4) 59:3;62:13;93:7; 131:25 starts (6) 55:12,12,14;58:13; 105:25;117:23 **State (21)** 31:2,3;35:17;37:18; 92:3;102:9;104:15; 156:25;157:17;158:14; 180:8.11:195:4: 198:13,16,25;207:19; 211:18;213:16;218:24; 219:3 stated (10) 41:11:101:1.9; 121:23:125:19:200:25: 202:24;217:5;222:17, 22 statement (7) 90:8:91:3:100:6; 101:17;149:3;181:2; 195:21 statements (3) 11:7;73:22;208:24 states (19) 93:6;96:16;97:13; 137:1;148:11;150:15; 153:22;161:20;162:15; 169:6;181:6,9,11,11; 209:23;211:7,8; 218:25;230:1 station (31) 4:7;16:16,23;22:10; 23:5;26:24;42:1;44:23, 23;94:12;141:12; 163:25;164:1;177:24; 181:1,5;185:3,17; 186:3:191:10:195:3. 13.16:206:3:225:16: 226:19:231:3:232:10, 19,22,23

station's (1) 132:24 stations (5) 12:13:180:10: 192:20;236:5,5 statistical (2) 87:18:190:13 status (1) 211:23 statutory (1) 183:7 stav (2) 27:16;65:19 staying (1) 27:18 stays (1) 55:15 step (4) 38:16;40:3;66:3; 131:15 steps (5) 38:18;46:2;165:3; 201:5,13 stick (2) 228:11;235:19 still (10) 7:22;9:17;10:23; 60:22;66:11;77:4; 157:23;202:10;211:17; 227:7 stirs (1) 76:1 **Stop (6)** 5:12,15;42:15; 134:19;171:14;174:10 stopped (2) 136:1:219:22 stopping (1) 27:13 store (1) 95:7 storm (1) 185:25 stormwater (2) 185:16,17 story (1) 192:18 straight (4) 51:14;65:24;67:1; 223:5 strange (1) 176:2 stress (1) 111:17 stretch (2) 140:17,22 stretched (1) 33:16 stricken (1) 86:7 strictly (1) 66:23 strike (2)

199:20:242:15 strong (1) 84:5 strongly (1) 126:11 stuck (1) 37:12 studied (3) 48:15;95:17;125:18 studies (20) 61:12;117:13; 123:21,23;124:22; 125:22;126:6,20; 136:20;158:19;169:25; 177:6;178:15;179:4,4; 210:25;236:18,25; 237:23;238:11 study (25) 52:9;76:8;102:4; 117:14;123:14,19,22; 125:15,20;126:10; 140:8,17;167:20; 169:23,24,24;172:4,5, 5;175:3;176:14: 179:15,19;230:23; 237:12 study's (1) 171:13 stuff (1) 118:22 sub (1) 108:24 sub- (1) 104:7 subject (4) 4:8;171:18;172:16; 184:18 submit (1) 219:4 submitted (2) 9:18:243:12 subparagraph (1) 105:14 substance (1) 151:8 substantial (2) 90:9;213:18 substantially (3) 26:18;84:6;193:14 substituted (1) 113:11 subtle (1) 76:22 subtract (2) 27:8;29:20 suddenly (1) 184:23 sufficient (2) 153:19;216:16 suggest (2) 93:19;159:14 suggested (1) 9:14

suggesting (7) 159:16:165:4:172:3: 196:24;201:8,10; 208:20 suggestion (2) 9:17;178:2 suggestions (2) 211:12:243:25 suggests (2) 93:24;162:12 sui (1) 172:4 Sullivan (40) 5:18;7:20,22,24;8:6; 14:19;23:21;30:15; 33:8;34:9;66:14;85:16; 86:16;87:5;88:10;98:3; 104:3;113:5;120:9; 122:9;126:24;130:12; 142:20;143:19;147:15; 150:21;151:2;153:9; 160:7;166:8;184:6; 200:20;215:3;217:17; 220:22;227:18;232:17; 238:14;241:16,18 Sullivan's (4) 85:11;87:23;96:12; 195:1 sum (2) 82:7,14 summarize (1) 202:24 Summary (3) 58:17;151:21;212:2 summer (1) 43:16 summing (1) 95:5 Sunday (2) 222:7,11 superimposed (1) 243:9 supervision (1) 198:18 supplementing (1) 94:6 supplied (1) 191:20 supply (2) 99:19;191:21 supported (1) 164:13 Suppose (4) 184:23;191:8; 207:12;242:4 supposed (2) 85:22,25 sure (31) 12:7;55:6;64:8; 74:13:86:19:110:23; 118:3;137:20;144:10; 150:7,24:151:15: 153:12;154:20;155:14;

160:12;162:2;163:3; 165:5.14:172:18: 183:2;187:9;193:25; 198:1;216:4;224:10, 12;231:13;242:8,19 surely (2) 26:15;169:18 surface (20) 102:2,6;108:8,18; 109:16:110:16:111:1, 25;112:15,19;113:24; 114:3,6,8,16,19,23; 117:15,21;186:4 surfaces (1) 16:3 surprised (4) 79:21;150:20; 162:20;166:7 surrebuttal (8) 86:18;99:15;150:9; 239:14;240:6,7; 242:13:246:24 surrounding (2) 16:21;185:13 suspense (1) 106:18 sustain (1) 37:2 sustained (1) 174:22 sworn (1) 7:23 symptoms (1) 237:13 system (2) 154:12;198:24 Т Table (6)

81:20;82:3;83:6,8; 141:19:213:10 tables (1) 23:13 tagged (1) 6:21 tailpipe (33) 52:6;53:11;55:3,8, 11;56:14,19,21;57:3,8; 62:7,8,21,21,24;63:2,7, 8.20:64:18:66:15.17: 67:20;68:4,17;70:8; 95:5;138:18;145:9,12; 222:24;233:8,11 talk (16) 17:10,11;52:15;58:2; 59:3;70:6;139:18; 148:16;195:22;200:22; 223:9,10,18;238:4; 243:6.15 talked (9) 65:7,8;72:16;137:3; 146:2;148:5;193:20;

209:20:230:1 talking (57) 14:15;23:7;38:21; 43:10;44:6;53:2;56:5, 5,7,16;58:24;59:1,2,6; 64:24;67:14;74:18; 75:6;78:25;93:1;97:8, 12,18;110:21;126:7,9; 137:20;138:6,7,13,16, 21;141:6;144:8; 146:18;149:7;152:23; 154:2,5;164:4,6;169:4; 173:8;176:15,18; 177:23;188:4;190:12; 209:8;216:11;224:7, 18;226:24;227:19; 232:16,17;239:18 talks (1) 183:5 tangential (1) 175:20 Target (2) 42:6;190:9 tarp (1) 117:14 Tea (1) 187:25 tear (1) 186:19 technical (2) 31:16:206:16 technically (2) 27:25:31:18 telling (1) 109:15 tells (3) 172:10;181:22;231:6 temporal (1) 197:16 tend (1) 207:11 tended (1) 191:4 tens (3) 76:1,5;137:22 tenth (2) 198:22,23 tenths (1) 76:5 term (14) 56:6;107:25;110:17; 153:16;155:15,21; 156:4;158:1,10;159:5; 188:9;207:18;224:9,15 terms (26) 14:23;43:24;44:16; 74:9;106:14;107:16, 17,21,21,24;108:5,9, 14;109:8,9,14;130:24; 171:18,25;191:22; 200:22;201:15;218:10, 11;230:8;241:16 terrain (1)

111:18 territory (1) 135:12 test (3) 70:6;116:20;117:1 tested (5) 68:20,23;70:8; 115:20:178:14 testified (26) 17:13:20:11:73:13; 94:16;102:12;113:6, 10,12;120:9;122:9; 134:25;135:3,5; 136:20;153:10;173:12; 202:25;206:5;209:1; 215:7;217:6;230:12; 231:21;240:15,21; 242:5 testify (5) 37:8;113:19;142:25; 153:24;222:22 testimony (29) 16:1,19;26:7;40:4,5; 42:9;43:4;45:11,14; 63:10;76:19;86:8; 87:11,20,21;89:17,19; 100:4;124:5;148:5; 149:12;176:8;216:7; 240:9,14,17;241:7,15; 242:9 testing (4) 22:18;59:19;205:4; 223:1 textbook (8) 102:7;103:6;104:3,4; 105:22;112:25;113:1,4 thankfully (1) 5:23 Thanks (1) 207:1 that'd (5) 145:21;156:7; 186:21;206:12;212:8 that'll (1) 34:11 That's (223) 10:25;12:4,21;13:17; 15:4,20;17:2;19:8; 20:7;21:4;25:17;29:10; 34:16,25;38:18;39:8; 40:16:43:14:44:22; 45:16;46:15;47:1,2,19; 50:7;51:6,16;52:15; 53:6;56:9;57:5,21,21; 58:8,22;59:8;62:11,16; 63:1,12,19,22;64:2,10; 66:18,19,25;67:10; 68:20,21;69:23,23; 71:6,8;72:7;73:9,24; 74:16,17;75:4;76:20; 78:11;80:16,19,23; 81:1,25;82:9;83:22; 86:3;87:25;89:18;

90:11,25;91:22;93:10, 14:94:5:96:13:97:24: 100:13,21;102:7,12; 105:18:106:3:108:9: 109:5,13;110:3,21,25; 111:20;112:11;113:9, 12;114:1;116:5;117:3; 118:11,11:121:4; 122:7;123:8;124:7,17; 125:1,15;129:4;130:1; 131:15;133:3;135:4, 18;136:14,16;137:20, 21,21;138:8,23;143:24, 25;145:10;146:10,22; 147:5;148:18;149:2, 16;154:5,13;155:10; 159:18;165:8,16; 166:4;168:17;169:12; 171:20;172:23,25; 173:23,24;174:2,9; 178:7,7,10;180:3; 181:1,9;182:9,20; 184:3,3;185:3,7,8,8; 186:3,4,19;188:8,9,15; 192:2;193:7,22; 194:10;196:12;198:8, 13,14,19,23;199:10,24; 201:2,3,9,16,17;202:7; 203:7;205:3,10,20; 207:10:212:17.23; 213:10,10;214:24; 216:16;217:2,9; 218:18:219:14,15,16; 220:20;221:22;222:6, 12;225:9,12,14;226:5, 11;227:10,23;228:11, 15;230:25;231:1; 233:3,6;234:23;236:3, 23;241:6,8 theorem (1) 106:19 theories (2) 105:25;106:5 there'd (3) 127:12;143:25; 226:13 There's (111) 8:13;9:13;16:16,17; 27:24;30:2;34:24; 36:20;44:21;46:15; 48:3,13;55:7;57:12,17, 20;58:17;59:14;60:19; 61:19;64:7;66:24;67:2, 4;69:10,18;71:4,11,12; 73:14;76:22;81:17; 89:16,19;92:3,13; 93:18,23,24;98:16; 99:1,5;105:24,25; 108:5;110:12,20,23; 111:4,22;112:6,16; 119:6;120:10,22; 123:13;124:15;127:2; 130:22;136:2;138:22;

141:17:146:7:151:13; 154:12:155:17:156:7: 159:17;161:19;163:16; 165:10:166:16:168:13: 170:6,19;173:13; 174:20;177:16;178:2, 9;180:21;181:13,13; 189:3:192:13:194:16; 195:22;196:23;199:12, 19:200:14:201:4; 202:1,12,20;203:25; 205:18;206:9;209:11; 212:20,25;213:3; 214:3;220:3;225:23; 236:9,12;239:10,12; 240:11;247:6 thereafter (1) 142:2 therefore (3) 70:20;172:1;174:6 thermostat (2) 125:1;201:19 thesis (2) 105:10,15 they'll (6) 39:9;190:10;209:25; 210:6,11;216:15 they're (41) 26:23;54:16;60:6; 67:1:74:13:93:1.8.8.20. 22,23;94:6,8;98:25; 99:1:123:5:138:7: 145:5;161:20;164:12, 21,23;166:9;170:23; 187:4;196:6,7;197:1; 198:14;202:6;210:2; 211:4,8;215:5,5; 220:16;230:18;239:19, 23;242:2;246:19 they've (6) 94:4;109:13;126:20; 165:4,11:220:16 thing's (1) 99:20 third (11) 8:16;75:10;88:5; 106:4;115:1;176:21; 208:7;210:12,17; 213:10;218:2 thirds (3) 210:6,11,17 Thirty (1) 216:16 Thirty-five (1) 28:18 Thirty-three (1) 81:11 this'll (1) 34:13 thoroughgoing (1) 193:16 thoroughly (1) 120:6

though (8) 46:5;53:15;101:10; 126:15;140:15;176:13; 179:22;196:22 thought (16) 34:7;38:23;53:25; 62:16;64:13,16;65:9, 12;67:22;69:8;147:24; 150:4;152:1;165:14; 196:4:224:21 threatened (1) 149:20 three (113) 16:7;19:25;30:17; 31:13;38:8;40:1,12,21; 41:22;51:14,15,19; 52:1;55:22;56:7;59:23; 60:6;62:2;67:11,15,18, 19,23;68:24;69:2,4,8, 19,25;70:5,11,21;71:9, 21;72:23;73:10;75:4; 78:2,7,10;81:19,21; 83:5,7,7,10;84:4,8,13, 22;85:10;89:8,24;91:5, 17;95:11,14;98:16; 110:4,8;118:18,21; 123:21;124:24;127:22; 128:16;129:1,5,7,13, 13,13,15,16;131:8,9, 12,13,13;132:13,21,22; 134:20,21,22;135:15; 136:11,15,20;138:1,17; 139:3;141:6;157:19; 158:23;163:1;164:4,6; 169:21;191:24;207:16; 208:4,5,5,8;209:11,12, 19:210:16:216:13; 219:21;230:15;244:17 three-(1) 20:10 three-kilometer (2) 18:17,21 three-year (8) 83:9,11;130:24; 131:10,19,24;135:9; 172:5 throughout (8) 15:22;54:18;65:3; 69:21;72:25;90:11; 91:25;100:18 thrown (1) 134:5 thus (1) 105:13 tied (2) 210:24;237:4 tier (16) 24:13;34:25;51:13, 14,14,14,15,17,19,20; 52:1:56:5:81:18,18; 82:23;84:21 tiers (1) 81:21

time-averaged (1) 204:6 times (21) 24:23:30:9:60:4: 94:11:95:19:109:12; 112:15;115:17;134:20; 173:4;184:9;202:17; 207:19;213:3;216:15; 217:6,18;221:15,18,18; 231:13 Tiny (2) 60:7,7 title (4) 116:6;126:15; 127:20;204:3 titled (1) 34:25 TM (1) 209:25 today (13) 5:3;6:1,3,4,19;7:21; 83:17;170:22;173:12; 181:14;186:23;203:5; 222:22 Todd (1) 31:13 to-four (1) 112:11 together (5) 112:18:141:13; 190:21;222:16;228:17 told (4) 113:16:118:12; 208:24:209:4 tolerance (2) 190:4.8 tomorrow (3) 244:14;246:20;247:3 took (2)82:10:107:21 tool (3) 98:24;238:12,13 top (7) 111:4;114:17; 148:19;157:6;168:12; 212:14;215:14 topic (3) 115:15;136:21;202:1 total (9) 138:5;141:8;171:7; 221:8;224:19;225:3,4; 226:10.17 totally (2) 117:15;172:12 totals (1) 225:9 touch (1) 87:15 touches (2) 40:5:61:25 toward (8) 19:16;21:9;22:5,6; 25:24,24,25;100:11

towards (1) 140:21 town (1) 244:1 toxicologist (1) 90:20 track (3) 7:4:128:6:131:22 tracked (1) 165:3 tractable (1) 60:11 traditional (2) 177:10:178:19 traffic (13) 42:9,10;170:8;194:9; 220:4,6,23;222:6; 229:6,20;230:9,13; 239:19 training (4) 31:8,11;96:17;97:13 trajectories (1) 100:15 trajectory (2) 100:17,19 transcript (1) 240:10 transfer (5) 111:6,8;112:9; 116:15,18 transition (5) 48:23;101:2;112:20; 117:9,22 transport (1) 137:22 transportation (1) 96:18 travel (5) 27:24;54:6;75:5,6; 100:18 traveled (1) 193:13 traveling (2) 100:10,22 treat (2) 21:5,21 treated (9) 17:3;21:2,11,12,18; 23:2;68:7;145:2,6 treatment (8) 41:5:46:7:59:12: 67:22,25;68:4;111:15; 211:3 treatments (2) 9:10;199:9 tree (2) 186:1,21 trees (4) 151:6;184:24;186:6, 20trend (9) 83:14;84:2,5;191:9, 10;192:20,21,23;

227:15 trends (5) 197:16,16;234:25; 235:17:236:6 tribal (1) 219:3 tried (2) 135:20;236:9 truck (1) 233:9 trucks (7) 53:14:162:19; 170:13,14,15;171:2; 233:11 True (9) 97:1;125:12;137:10; 165:14,15;206:2,4; 231:15;236:25 truest (2) 236:15,17 truly (1) 242:13 truth (1) 37:12 try (9) 6:2;11:10,11;30:1; 33:5;155:25;166:7; 191:4;224:2 trying (19) 17:21;18:22;22:2,17; 27:20;43:12;53:10; 66:12:89:21:139:17. 20:173:10.23:174:11: 187:10:191:18:202:9: 232:20;246:11 Tuesday (1) 140:3 tunnel (16) 123:21,22,22; 124:22;125:20,22,24; 126:6,10;127:5,11,18, 18:128:2:179:3.6 Tunnels (4) 123:15;125:23,24; 126:4 **Turbulence** (7) 49:17,20;104:7,9; 111:9;112:2;175:10 turbulent (4) 111:17,23;112:8,12 turn (12) 23:24;81:8;99:21; 100:1;101:22;120:14; 123:10;133:4;139:16; 208:22;215:25;238:19 Turning (2) 220:1;222:21 Twenty (2) 123:2;239:2 Twenty-nine (1) 32:1 twice (2) 115:8;246:14

two (138) 23:3:30:16:38:8.24: 40:1,12,18:41:22; 44:21:50:8:51:14.18. 20;55:21,24,25;56:5,7, 8,11,22;57:12;59:11; 60:6;62:2,5;67:10,13, 14,23,25;68:25;69:12, 19,19;70:4;71:1,20,20; 73:19;74:11;75:4;77:3; 78:1,7,9,12;79:1,4; 81:18:82:11,14:84:22, 22;85:10;86:7;89:5,8, 24;95:5,5;104:22; 105:1,2,4,6,19;106:13; 107:24;108:3,15; 110:4,8,16;115:13; 118:20;121:20;126:18; 131:8,15;132:13,20; 133:3;134:21;135:8, 24;136:10,12;138:3; 146:3,8;157:11,13; 162:13;163:5,6,13,14, 15;168:11;169:3,20; 170:3;185:24;190:20, 23;191:24;197:10; 201:11,13;202:8; 204:8,15;207:15; 208:1,16;209:17; 210:6.11.17:213:7; 214:12;220:3;222:2; 225:13.18.20.23:226:1. 4:229:6:232:24: 236:20;239:17,18,23; 246:18,25 Two-fifty-five (3) 24:4,6,7 two-page (2) 156:18;213:20 Two-Way (1) 127:17 Tyler (2) 120:15;129:21 type (3) 11:19;218:16;235:19 types (3) 23:3;31:8;138:3 typical (5) 38:2;75:4;129:14; 193:12;204:14 typically (2) 74:5;124:23 U ultimate (1) 51:8 ultra-conservative (1) 187:17 unable (1) 181:19

unbelievable (1)

179:18

unbiased (1) 131:19 uncertain (2) 230:2;232:5 uncertainty (26) 159:17;189:5,24; 190:11,15,24;199:3,5; 200:9,21,23,23;201:13, 16,17;203:8,18;204:3; 206:15,17,21;207:2,5; 229:23,25;230:2 unclassifiable (19) 149:22;152:20; 153:11,14;154:12; 155:2,13,15;156:4,5; 158:2;159:6;161:3,21; 162:1,2;174:14; 183:12,16 unclear (2) 164:8;175:4 under (40) 7:22;14:13;15:12; 22:24;25:7;34:24;35:3, 10;37:5,8;56:22;71:2; 73:19;81:25;82:3; 84:21;85:20,21;87:9, 22,22;104:8;105:2,5, 14,23:106:4,10: 111:18;116:21;117:21; 120:22;121:19;126:18; 134:12;135:24;175:19; 198:23:223:13:246:25 undergoing (1) 193:16 undermine (1) 174:11 under-predicting (1) 206:1 underreported (1) 93:11 understood (5) 63:9:66:15:165:21; 178:2,3 Unfortunately (3) 134:3;194:8;203:13 unfounded (1) 85:24 **UNIDENTIFIED (37)** 7:14;28:18,20; 109:18;112:25;118:18, 19,20,21;120:4;121:7; 125:8;130:17;136:4,7; 137:10;143:7,11; 144:12;146:22;167:17; 184:13;200:8,9; 201:23;202:4;203:10; 214:6,24;221:23,24; 245:8,16,20,22,24; 246:13 United (14) 96:16;97:13;137:1,6; 148:11:150:15:153:21;

162:15;169:6;181:6,9,

23:237:20

112:17;178:14

24:18

218:6

112:22

185:4,18

186:15

243:8

10,11:230:1 units (7) 55:7,16,20;59:7,10; 72:16.18 upper (3) University (12) 13:19;15:25;16:11; up-to-date (1) 19:16;20:3;22:5;25:9, 24;26:4;27:4;54:6; upward (2)105:10 unless (5) urban (56) 11:9;33:21;56:15; 162:6;241:10 unlike (1) 186:4 unlikely (2) 174:6;231:23 unnecessary (1) 13:22 **Unpublished** (2) 105:10,15 unquote (1) 159:6 unstable (1) urban-(1) 112:15 unusual (1) urban/rural (2) 197:25 unwieldy (1) urban-type (1) 70:4 up (70) use (80) 6:13;14:11,25;16:1, 7;19:15,25;25:24,25; 26:17;33:14,15;38:8; 40:3,11;41:3,11,14; 45:2,5,10,23;47:17; 48:8;52:4,10,12;58:4; 59:9;60:17;71:16;73:7; 76:1;77:4;87:20;95:8; 107:23:110:9.20.22: 114:7;117:20;140:23, 24;142:1;147:10; 159:2:177:18:186:17: 188:24;197:1;200:20; 201:24;203:10,22; 207:6,23;210:18; 211:5;222:11;223:14; 225:4,6;226:3;228:15; 229:9;232:10;239:20; 242:18;247:5 update (1) 42:8 updated (7) used (78) 15:17;128:17,17,17; 129:2;132:14;219:3 upon (42) 13:20;15:19;16:3; 17:6;22:1;24:23;60:18; 62:19;74:2;76:19;78:2; 86:3;89:10,11;91:5,24, 25;96:21;97:1;98:7; 99:2,3;102:19;124:22; 125:21:126:11:134:17: 135:18;193:10;198:8,

25;212:13;214:22; 12,14,14;131:7;134:14, 215:13:232:4:236:21. 21.21:135:7:140:16: 179:2:192:2.23; 207:15,18;209:9,19; 110:9:136:9:148:19 210:18;215:11;217:11; 223:7;224:1,9;236:9; 237:18,24,25;238:4,11 useful (1) 238:24 uses (6) 15:19,21,23;16:3,21; 18:20;51:12;98:22; 154:11:183:15:238:12 17:4,11:18:6,8,9,11,23; 19:24;20:1,2,18,23; using (41) 21:2,10,12,12,18,21; 13:22;20:18;33:14; 22:15,17,22,24;23:8,9, 43:17;46:4,7;53:5,23; 57:11;59:5;64:1,11; 12;25:2,7;46:5,8,12; 68:22,22;69:9;78:4; 48:24;100:3,8,11,23; 101:2,5,12,15;115:11; 84:8;87:17;98:9;99:3; 117:23;137:18,19; 114:16;121:10,24; 154:18;184:22,25; 128:19;129:10,13; 185:22,24;186:3,7; 139:4.6:177:13; 207:21;208:2,15; 210:13;211:6,20; 214:20;216:20,20; 217:6;219:19;227:7 usually (14) 10:3;84:18;94:9; 108:18;139:23;157:6; 165:22;190:8;191:13; 9:6;11:9,10;15:21, 197:4;205:18,24; 24;16:7,12;18:12,13; 214:14:243:7 19:8:22:15:33:14.23: UV (1) 34:10:35:14.22:36:13; 195:4 38:17;55:4,18;57:13, V 16;58:21;60:11,13; 66:23;69:21;77:6;79:8; 94:20,22;95:8,11; vagaries (1) 177:15 98:20;99:4;100:12; validating (1) 102:9;121:18,22; 129:5,9,15:131:1,5,17, 173:6 25;132:8;135:5;172:6; value (17) 186:25;187:2;191:12; 83:1:90:12:108:6: 194:3;195:24;196:15; 110:18;112:19;114:2; 198:11;201:6;206:19, 117:22;130:23;170:2; 23;207:8;208:1;210:5, 190:7.8:202:14; 9,19;211:7,7,17,21; 208:10;217:7;222:5; 212:3,8;213:15,18; 227:13;231:24 217:8;219:20,24; values (13) 223:4,5;237:1;238:11; 95:9;113:11;114:8; 129:16:173:15,18; 191:12.14:196:11: 199:21;216:2;218:25; 23:7;24:17,18;39:25; 43:1;49:1;54:8;56:6; 219:1 59:10;60:8,21,25;61:1, variability (2) 4,8;69:12;70:12,14; 207:2,5 71:3,7,10;79:5;82:17, variable (1) 25;83:9,15,19,25;84:7; 70:14 86:15;94:13,16,24; variables (1) 95:4;98:18;99:4; 110:16 102:12,14;106:13; variation (2) 107:7,8;115:7,17; 116:21;225:2 120:12;121:15,16,24; variations (1) 123:23;127:10;129:1, 132:19

varies (2) 109:18.21 various (11) 31:12;41:15;42:15; 115:21;137:23;173:9; 199:8;202:5;212:22; 218:10;232:6 vary (1) 109:20 Vegas (10) 163:4,23;170:7,13; 171:6;174:24;179:17, 19,20;180:3 vegetation (1) 186:7 vehicle (5) 14:14;54:17;124:10, 22;179:10 vehicles (33) 14:13;39:7;41:1; 44:24,24;45:22;53:23; 115:4;121:14,17; 122:20,20;123:1,2,14, 24,25;124:1,23; 125:17;126:16;162:18; 164:18;177:7,9,19,19; 178:9,11,12,16,18; 179:8 Veirs (9) 4:8:13:19:15:25; 22:6;25:9,25;26:4; 27:4:29:1 velocity (2) 105:11.12 Venn (1) 147:2 verboten (1) 170:23 verifiability (1) 184:20 verifiable (1) 184:16 versa (1) 110:18 version (3) 6:24;25:1;203:16 versions (1) 204:1 versus (9) 17:11;41:8;46:6; 56:2:135:21:191:6; 193:11;213:13;217:18 vertical (1) 105:11 viability (1) 199:3 vice (1) 110:18 vicinity (3) 11:17;64:15;146:9 **View (7)** 5:17;23:4;30:16; 112:8;210:10;211:17;

231:22 views (1) 205:3 violate (2) 195:4,16 violated (1) 153:6 violation (2) 28:3;180:12 violations (4) 13:17,25;14:5;16:18 visiting (1) 89:13 visitors (3) 87:7;88:13;89:3 Volume (2) 116:9;127:22 voting (1) 119:16

## W

wade (1) 119:6 waiting (1) 134:10 Wales (3) 137:7,14,16 walk (5) 38:6:107:19:113:13. 16:189:13 wall (16) 111:4;174:24;175:2, 4,6,7,15,15,22,23,24, 24;176:4,6,7,13 walls (4) 175:9,9,21;176:19 wants (4) 90:5:93:16:119:15: 198:14 warm (2)125:2:186:4 Washington (2) 105:10;218:14 wasn't (4) 140:15;174:24; 177:21;217:3 wasted (2) 118:24;119:3 watch (1) 33:10 watched (1) 144:19 watching (1) 201:22 water (1) 126:18 way (39) 18:23;19:7;33:12; 36:11,11;43:23;56:18; 57:11;67:15;71:15,19; 77:4;112:21;117:25;

21;209:25;210:23,25,

120:4;133:18,21;

134:4;145:22;147:6;	week (3)	wide (1)	21;176:10;182:2,6,13,
154:15;181:25;192:25;	209:1;222:13;245:4	114:8	16,19,22,25;183:5,11,
193:2,23;200:24;	weekday (1)	widely (1)	15,25;184:11;189:8;
202:3,7;207:12;	222:15	32:14	190:3,6,17;191:1,4;
208:14,19;210:8,9;	weekend (1)	width (3)	192:1,6,16;193:2;
212:19;223:13,13;	7:8	66:20;144:1,24	196:20,22;197:22;
226:7;229:18;230:19	weekly (1)	Wiley (1)	199:23;201:25;202:5,
ways (6)	222:5	49:24	23;203:2,13,16,20,25;
36:8;71:20;135:22;	weeks (1)	wind (8)	204:5;214:14,18,25;
171:22;190:1;208:18	243:12	78:15,16;102:5,10;	215:13,19;221:19,21;
we'd (4)	weight (2)		222:2;228:7;230:25;
		111:16;112:1,20;	
17:12;71:19;191:6;	210:11,11	175:19	231:8;233:18,21;
197:3	weighted (2)	wins (1)	235:3;236:4;237:8;
we'll (19)	139:8;141:14	119:13	238:17;242:16
6:19;9:8;19:20;66:5;	weighting (2)	winter (1)	witness's (1)
71:19;99:19;119:17,	210:11,12	73:5	39:18
18;142:1;166:7;200:1,	welcome (1)	wire (1)	witnesses (6)
16;207:17;208:7;	238:17	17:25	37:7,8;99:15;239:15,
229:11,22;241:9;	well- (1)	wires (2)	17,23
243:11;244:22	186:14	33:10,16	won't (7)
we're (89)	weren't (1)	wish (1)	38:2,5,5;176:3;
14:11,15;16:5,6;	140:8	168:4	180:15;195:18;245:18
17:6;20:18;26:14;	west (4)	withdraw (2)	wooded (1)
33:14;46:4,7;47:18;	21:7,9;100:19;	234:8;242:15	19:7
51:2;52:12;53:2,5,19,	163:17	within (40)	word (3)
23;56:5,5,7,15;63:17;	Westfield (3)	12:15,19;39:11;	154:11;184:1;194:3
64:1,5,7,10,20;67:14;	4:10;184:23;186:16	56:21;62:7,21;63:10,	wording (1)
71:11,12;72:23,25;	what's (22)	11;64:15;65:12,15,15;	104:8
74:17;75:6;84:15;	18:5;27:2;63:19,22;	78:6;81:18,21;82:24;	words (5)
88:22;93:1;99:10;	98:3;104:3;114:13;	86:1,5;87:8;88:13;	41:7;71:22;112:16;
106:14;109:10,10;	124:7;148:11;157:12;	89:3;94:9,18;100:7;	178:15;187:10
110:21;111:10,12;	173:7,17;174:12;	105:4,6;108:25;115:9;	work (7)
121:23;126:7;137:20;	182:1,24;202:7,16;	120:25;145:6,10,21;	28:12;79:15;139:5;
138:6,13,16,16,19,21;	213:1;216:9;217:21;	158:19,23;159:1;	168:7;215:20,21;245:7
139:4;144:8;149:7,10;	230:23;238:18	164:22;166:20;204:10,	workable (1)
162:1;164:4,6;169:4;	Wheaton (8)	14;205:2	198:24
173:7,14;176:14;	4:9,10;81:2;93:1;	without (2)	worker (1)
177:23;179:14;180:2,	172:11;181:2;189:13;	50:19;126:12	89:13
2;192:6,7,9;198:1;	234:21	Witness (162)	workers (3)
204:22,25;210:19;	whenever (2)	7:23;10:16;17:2;	87:7;88:12;89:3
212:16;222:4;223:13;	132:25;232:25	20:22;21:16;28:22;	working (6)
225:25;226:23;228:17,	whereas (1)	29:17,24;31:1;32:5,10,	31:11;77:4;131:10;
19;230:14;234:12;	189:5	12;33:3,9,18;37:6,9,16;	141:2;157:18;158:15
241:20;242:15;245:5;	Whereupon (5)	41:10;43:16;45:20;	works (5)
246:10.24	66:7;119:21;142:15;	48:17;49:6,8;54:3,5,8,	244:6;245:16,17,24;
we've (24)	223:20;247:8	11;56:9;57:10;60:14;	246:1
11:6;17:19;22:1;	wherever (1)	63:14,16,21,24;64:5,	world (1)
24:22;26:1;37:1;51:13;	189:12	17;65:2,15,18,22;66:1;	205:7
57:11;99:3;113:3;	whichever (1)	69:2,6,10,15,17;70:16,	worry (2)
120:12;137:3,4;146:2;	119:24	19,23;72:1,5,9,12;	172:11;198:1
173:19;175:20;184:4;	white (1)	73:17;74:22,25;75:16,	worse (3)
193:20;224:9,10;	136:2	20,22;76:7,11,13,22;	169:4;180:25;234:21
229:10;238:21;244:17;	Whoa (2)	77:19;79:5;90:8,16;	worst (2)
246:7	14:21,21	95:4,18;96:11;97:6;	181:10,11
Weather (2)	whole (20)	101:24;102:24;103:4;	worth (2)
131:2;132:8	19:25;78:5;88:22;	104:7,12,15;106:6;	129:13;172:10
web (6)	97:22;103:11,12,14,19,	109:1;111:9;120:18,	wouldn't (10)
148:9;151:8,24;	20;135:23;144:2;	20;130:19;132:7;	79:21;121:22;136:5;
152:9;212:7,13	149:24;151:6;155:1;	133:13,15,17,21;134:2,	169:18;175:6;202:15;
	160:1;172:5;180:7;	7;139:23;142:7;144:8,	221:17;230:4;232:7;
Wednesday $(2)$			
243:23,24	185:5;189:22;234:3	13,16,18,21;146:1,7,	237:24
Wednesdays (3)	Wholesale (1)	16,20,24;147:4;	wrap (2)
243:16,17,18	4:3	166:10;167:8;174:18,	142:1;239:20

write (2) 4:16;73:22 writing (1) 184:18 written (3) 95:21;205:10;237:3 wrong (5) 69:16;99:1,5;137:15; 224:15 wrote (1) 104:16 Y

## year (31) 21:11;43:5;44:19; 78:5,20,21;79:9,12,14, 22;82:8;83:22;92:12; 129:15;131:2,5;132:6; 148:12;159:3;169:13; 176:8;187:10;189:16; 196:1;202:9,17;213:3; 216:16;219:14;230:2; 232:24 years (51) 77:24;79:19;82:13; 83:10,13,15;84:4,9; 94:5;95:17;99:3; 128:18;129:1,5,8,13, 16;131:1,6,7,9,9,14,15, 18;132:11,16,20,22; 133:1;134:13,21,21,22; 135:8;157:20;158:23; 164:17,23;170:3; 189:16;191:24,24; 195:14;197:10;208:4, 4,5;232:17,21;235:16 years' (1) 129:13 Yep (1) 19:21 York (1) 49:25 you'd (18) 23:24;26:18;27:24; 28:1;33:20;61:18; 84:10;98:4;140:24; 161:6;163:16;188:22; 202:14;204:24;205:6, 25;210:17;214:21 you'll (2) 25:14;174:4 You're (147) 7:22;9:5;10:25; 13:14;15:8;16:11,11, 24;17:5;18:15,16;19:1, 16;20:2,6;23:6;25:8, 15;26:4,19,20;27:17; 29:21,24;30:11;35:9; 37:3;38:21;40:2,6; 41:2,2;43:10;46:23; 50:9,12,22;51:8;52:21; 53:7,8,8,17;55:10,21;

,25;45:17,
:25;73:6,7,
:6;119:18;
21;144:5;
1;237:14;
7:1
1
5;79:17;
, <b>.</b> .,
7
/
4:7
+:/
5 25 70.1
5,25;78:1,
:15;128:18;
1;130:11;
16;152:10;
64:23;
19;215:1
2;120:15;
:23;164:23
0;23:11,
39:1;41:25
9,24;77:25;
23,25;84:7,
5;96:18;
3:19;129:7;
:22;152:14;
13,22;
4;187:10;
22;227:8;
,,_,
12,12;
3:21;28:4,
25;45:8,10
5:5;92:2,12
8:11;
8.11, 1,22;
19;158:16;
:13;193:20
10;228:7
3:11;
16;22:7;
5;30:17;
5:5; 8:1 19; :13 10; 3:1 ,16;

	1			
32:3,4;39:22;41:7,16;	44:25;45:22;124:16,	247:8	565 (1)	7/31/13 (1)
42:8;45:4;93:7,7;	17;158:20;162:18;	40 (47)	217:25	18:4
			<b>565-A</b> (1)	7:00 (1)
132:25;154:1;192:20;	179:14;193:7;210:7;	52:25;56:12,20;60:9,		
205:9	211:20;219:13;245:6	10,11,13,17,22;61:1,6,	216:1	7:11
20th (4)	30,000 (1)	9;62:22;63:12;64:3,16,	567 (5)	7:30 (1)
152:25;153:4;	171:2	25;65:8,12;66:19;76:9,	34:13,16,17;81:13;	6:3
238:22;239:16	300 (1)	11,14,14;94:10,18;	122:2	70 (2)
21 (1)	61:1	99:3;143:20;144:1,9,	568 (4)	139:3;232:7
244:2	<b>30-fold (1)</b>	23;145:6,10,21,24;	97:23,23,25;98:4	71 (1)
210 (1)	44:21	146:14;148:16;179:9,	569 (2)	133:22
202:14	310 (1)	13;181:7;188:14;	104:1,5	710 (1)
220 (2)	196:5	201:15;202:13;203:4;	56-A (1)	164:15
127:22,24	311 (2)	204:13;205:2,17	28:16	73 (3)
225 (2)	196:21;197:1	40- (3)	57 (1)	139:3;201:23;208:9
127:22,24	32 (2)	145:2;146:2,3	221:7	74 (1)
22nd (1)	94:23;216:17	407 (1)	570 (3)	125:3
241:3	32,000 (1)	120:15	152:8,11;156:18	75 (23)
230 (4)	162:18	40-meter (5)	<b>571 (3)</b>	55:4,16,20;57:7;
18:3,22;25:22;	<b>33 (3)</b>	53:9;143:22;144:5,5;	160:13,15;182:9	59:7,10;72:8,21;90:13;
142:21		145:17		110:3;115:5,8,9;
	81:9;94:23;128:23		572 (2)	
230-A (2)	3-3(1)	4-1 (1)	213:21,24	148:18;169:10;197:2;
143:14,16	197:16	176:21	58 (3)	201:8;231:25;232:8,
24 (3)	33rd (1)	43 (2)	121:12;122:2,11	22,25;233:2,15
23:24;24:9,21	4:2	221:6,13	586 (1)	75th (1)
25 (48)	34 (4)	45 (1)	98:15	196:10
52:10,10,24;53:5,11,	24:9;128:10,21,23	179:20	59 (2)	76 (1)
15,19,23;54:24;55:3,	342 (2)	46.95 (1)	123:10;137:18	141:8
10;62:13,20,23,23,25;	147:16;176:24	226:9	<b>59-G-2.06</b> (1)	77 (2)
63:10,17;64:1,7,13,18;	35 (17)	466 (3)	4:6	92:4;232:4
65:9,11,19,19;66:17,	28:5;101:24;102:3;	52:22;96:10;220:2	5th (1)	
23;71:13,18;72:21;	103:3;104:19,20,24;	47 (5)	243:19	8
120:10,12;121:14,14,	106:8;107:13;108:4;	116:9;138:8;221:22;		
15,23;122:1,10,15,19,	109:5;110:12;112:14;	226:21,24	6	8,100 (3)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20;	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16;	226:21,24		12:25;13:8,22
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12;	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12		6 (9)	12:25;13:8,22 <b>8.3.1.2 (2)</b>
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20;	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b>	226:21,24 5	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12;	12:25;13:8,22 <b>8.3.1.2 (2)</b> 133:14;134:1
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12;	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17	226:21,24 5 5 (30)	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25;	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24;	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1	12:25;13:8,22 <b>8.3.1.2 (2)</b> 133:14;134:1 <b>8.7 (2)</b> 210:15,17
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25;	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18,	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 <b>60 (1)</b>	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18,	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b>	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25;	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18,	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 <b>60 (1)</b>	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18,	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 <b>60 (1)</b> 221:7	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b>	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b>	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25;
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b>	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 <b>60 (1)</b> 221:7 <b>60s (1)</b> 171:25 <b>62 (1)</b> 221:14	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b>	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 <b>50 (36)</b>	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b>	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 <b>50 (36)</b> 20:1;68:9,11,13,18;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b> 133:5	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b>	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5 (30)</b> 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 <b>50 (36)</b> 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b> 133:5 <b>28th (4)</b>	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22;	<b>6 (9)</b> 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 <b>60 (1)</b> 221:7 <b>60s (1)</b> 171:25 <b>62 (1)</b> 221:14 <b>631 (1)</b> 4:9 <b>65 (2)</b> 226:22,25	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b> 133:5 <b>28th (4)</b> 129:21;130:10;	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b>	226:21,24 <b>5</b> <b>5</b> (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 <b>50</b> (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b> 133:5 <b>28th (4)</b> 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17,	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16,	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24;	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23;	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11;
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1)	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 <b>25th (1)</b> 196:9 <b>26 (2)</b> 4:11;101:10 <b>26th (1)</b> 243:21 <b>27 (4)</b> 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 <b>285 (1)</b> 133:5 <b>28th (4)</b> 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 <b>29 (7)</b> 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24;	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1)	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b>	226:21,24         5         5 (30)         98:14,15;113:24;         117:11,16;120:14,18,         22,23;121:1,6,10,18,         23;136:9;137:25;         138:5,7,18,20,21;         139:2,6,9;140:9,25;         141:4,11,14;245:15         50 (36)         20:1;68:9,11,13,18;         69:9;71:9,13,17,22;         72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22;         73:2,15,25;84:12;         95:16;104:22;117:17,         17;136:22;158:19;         188:6,8,13;189:21,23;         190:1,22,23;191:20         50-50 (1)         101:19         50-city (1)         172:4	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21 3	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 129:24 <b>391-A (3)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1)	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21 3 3 (3)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>4.2 (3)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1) 196:9	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24 7	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5 87 (1)
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21 3 3 (3) 100:1,2;137:12	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>4.2 (3)</b> 81:17,25;82:3	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1) 196:9 514 (1)	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24 7 7 (8)	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5 87 (1) 233:14
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21 3 3 (3) 100:1,2;137:12 3.3 (1)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>4.2 (3)</b> 81:17,25;82:3 <b>4:12 (1)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1) 196:9 514 (1) 116:9	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24 7 7 (8) 33:25;34:1,21,24;	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5 87 (1) 233:14 88 (1)
$\begin{array}{r} 15,23;122:1,10,15,19,\\ 25;123:1;124:20;\\ 126:5;139:7;141:12;\\ 179:2\\ \textbf{25th (1)}\\ 196:9\\ \textbf{26 (2)}\\ 4:11;101:10\\ \textbf{26th (1)}\\ 243:21\\ \textbf{27 (4)}\\ 58:13,14;74:22;\\ 144:6\\ \textbf{285 (1)}\\ 133:5\\ \textbf{28th (4)}\\ 129:21;130:10;\\ 243:22,23\\ \textbf{29 (7)}\\ 31:22;32:17;52:9,16,\\ 22;245:6;246:19\\ \textbf{29th (5)}\\ 129:19;244:3,4,5,21\\ \hline \textbf{3}\\ \textbf{3 (3)}\\ 100:1,2;137:12\\ \textbf{3.3 (1)}\\ 34:24\\ \end{array}$	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,23 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19 108:6,19	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1) 196:9 514 (1) 116:9 55-page (1)	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24 7 7 (8) 33:25;34:1,21,24; 57:25;59:3;117:8;	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5 87 (1) 233:14 88 (1) 61:21
15,23;122:1,10,15,19, 25;123:1;124:20; 126:5;139:7;141:12; 179:2 25th (1) 196:9 26 (2) 4:11;101:10 26th (1) 243:21 27 (4) 58:13,14;74:22; 144:6 285 (1) 133:5 28th (4) 129:21;130:10; 243:22,23 29 (7) 31:22;32:17;52:9,16, 22;245:6;246:19 29th (5) 129:19;244:3,4,5,21 3 3 (3) 100:1,2;137:12 3.3 (1)	109:5;110:12;112:14; 114:14,18;128:16; 141:12 <b>36 (3)</b> 113:22;114:15,17 <b>38 (5)</b> 114:12,13;116:25; 117:1,8 <b>3-8 (1)</b> 197:1 <b>39 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>3-9 (1)</b> 179:7 <b>391 (1)</b> 129:18,25;130:13 <b>3rd (4)</b> 205:9;244:24; 245:20,21 <b>4</b> <b>4 (2)</b> 108:6,19 <b>4.2 (3)</b> 81:17,25;82:3 <b>4:12 (1)</b>	226:21,24 5 5 (30) 98:14,15;113:24; 117:11,16;120:14,18, 22,23;121:1,6,10,18, 23;136:9;137:25; 138:5,7,18,20,21; 139:2,6,9;140:9,25; 141:4,11,14;245:15 50 (36) 20:1;68:9,11,13,18; 69:9;71:9,13,17,22; 72:3,5,7,9,14,17,22; 73:2,15,25;84:12; 95:16;104:22;117:17, 17;136:22;158:19; 188:6,8,13;189:21,23; 190:1,22,23;191:20 50-50 (1) 101:19 50-city (1) 172:4 50th (1) 196:9 514 (1) 116:9	6 (9) 41:18;139:4,11,12; 140:1,7;141:9;245:25; 246:1 60 (1) 221:7 60s (1) 171:25 62 (1) 221:14 631 (1) 4:9 65 (2) 226:22,25 66 (1) 32:11 68 (1) 227:10 68244 (3) 133:12,16,20 6th (2) 245:19,24 7 7 (8) 33:25;34:1,21,24;	12:25;13:8,22 8.3.1.2 (2) 133:14;134:1 8.7 (2) 210:15,17 8.8 (1) 213:13 80 (9) 163:20;166:21,25; 167:2,3,3,6,22;168:2 80s (1) 171:25 82 (1) 197:2 82.97 (1) 169:1 822 (4) 173:13;181:13,17,20 83 (8) 148:13;208:11; 227:8,13;228:4,6,7,11 85 (2) 29:20;137:19 86 (4) 60:8,21;61:21;228:5 87 (1) 233:14 88 (1)

<u>S-2863</u>
183:23 8th (2)
<u>5:22;118:14</u> <b>9</b>
9 (8)
24:9,12;210:20; 221:15;246:11,13,16,
20 9.1 (7)
203:17,22,24;204:2, 2,3;206:10 <b>9.2 (1)</b>
206:13 9.8 (1)
210:18 <b>9:30 (1</b> )
4:13 90 (5)
24:18,21;25:3;29:19, 24 <b>98 (2)</b>
24:19,23 98th (16)
82:8,25;83:8;90:12; 95:9;148:12,20;194:5;
204:23;207:3,10,11; 208:2,10;227:7;231:24