

OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY

-----X
: PETITION OF COSTCO WHOLESALE : Case No. S-2863
CORPORATION : OZAH No. 13-12
: :
-----X

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on
May 1, 2014, commencing at 9:42 a.m., at the Stella B.
Warner Council Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rita
Davidson Memorial Hearing Room, Rockville, Maryland 20850
before:

Martin L. Grossman
Hearing Examiner

A P P E A R A N C E S

On Behalf of the Petitioner:

Patricia Harris, Esq.
Michael Goecke, Esq.

On Behalf of Kensington Heights Civic Association (KHCA):

Michele Rosenfeld, Esq.
Lerch Early & Brewer
3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Karen Cordry, Esq.

On Behalf of Stop Costco Gas Coalition (SCGC):

Larry Silverman, Esq.
Abigail Adelman

Also Present:

Erich Brann, Costco Representative
Davis Sullivan, Expert Witness

C O N T E N T S

Witnesses:	Direct	Cross	Redirect	Recross
David Sullivan				
By Mr. Goecke:	12	--	--	--
By Ms. Rosenfeld:	--	97	--	--

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Cordry.
2 MR. ROSENFELD: Good morning. Michele Rosenfeld
3 for Kensington Heights.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Dr. Cole.
5 MR. COLE: Dr. Henry Cole.
6 MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman for Stop Costco
7 Gas Coalition.
8 MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas
9 Coalition.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman. Is your husband okay?
11 He looked a little bit out of sorts after the last hearing?
12 Doing okay?
13 MS. ADELMAN: He's fine.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Let's proceed to
15 some preliminary matters. Since our last session on April
16 29, I'm happy to say there are no new exhibits. I think
17 that's the first time I could say that --
18 MS. CORDRY: I think you're right.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- or very, it's been a long time
20 at least since then. All right. The witness scheduled for
21 today is Mr. Sullivan's direct and cross on applicant's
22 rebuttal, and surrebuttal if the parties are prepared to go
23 forward in that fashion if time permits. We can also
24 discuss applicant's objections to exhibits.
25 Mr. Goecke, have you --

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the 31st day of the public
3 hearing in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Board
4 of Appeals No. S-2863, petition for a special exception
5 pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 59-G-2.06 to allow
6 petitioner to construct and operate an automobile filling
7 station which would include 16 pumps. Subject site is
8 located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silver Spring, Maryland,
9 Lot N-631, Wheaton Plaza, Parcel 10, also known as Westfield
10 Wheaton Mall, and is zoned C-2.
11 The hearing was begun on April 26th, 2013, and the
12 next session will be May 8, 2014, here in the second floor
13 hearing room of the COB at 9:30 a.m. My name is Martin
14 Grossman. I'm the Hearing Examiner which means I take
15 evidence and write a report and recommendation to the Board
16 of Appeals which will make the decision in this case. Will
17 the parties identify themselves, please?
18 MR. BRANN: Good morning. Erich Brann with
19 Costco.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: You look familiar.
21 MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris on behalf
22 of Costco.
23 MR. GOECKE: Good morning. Mike Goecke for
24 Costco.
25 MS. CORDRY: Karen Cordry for Kensington Heights.

1 MR. GOECKE: I have not called down that list yet.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
3 MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman, at the risk of
4 shattering your joy about no more exhibits, I think it was
5 on April 11th, I put in a preliminary pedestrian crash data
6 report, and that is now a finalized one. We won't get to
7 that today, but I just want to distribute it now so that
8 just by some miracle if we got to my testimony on March 8th
9 -- this only came out yesterday, so I --
10 MS. ROSENFELD: May 8.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean May 8.
12 MS. CORDRY: May 8th, so I'm distributing it as
13 soon as we can. We would actually introduce it --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15 MS. CORDRY: -- whenever I come in, but I'll --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: We can --
17 MS. CORDRY: It could --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: We can, you want me to mark it as
19 an exhibit?
20 MS. CORDRY: You can at this point. It would
21 probably be 512A, perhaps, if you'd want to do it that way.
22 512 was the original exhibit. Probably when I introduce it,
23 we'll try to get it done in color because there are some,
24 some of the numbers that are, for the 2014 that show up in
25 red on this one.

Page 6

1 MR. GROSSMAN: So that was March 6, 2014 briefing
2 by the County -- oh, that's right, we didn't -- received the
3 hearing report of February 11, 2014 by Montgomery County
4 Police Department regarding pedestrian crash data?
5 MS. CORDRY: Correct. Correct.
6 THE COURT: And this is, what is the difference?
7 MS. CORDRY: This is the next month, so this one
8 now actually is finalized for the year 2013, and it starts
9 2014.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
11 MS. CORDRY: This is the, the one before that was
12 still preliminary for 2013.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Does that make a difference?
14 MS. CORDRY: It adds 29 more accidents. It gives
15 you a finalized number. I don't yet have from them whether
16 or not they have updated the parking lot subset of this. It
17 was going to be a County stat report done at the end of
18 April, and I checked yesterday, and they said that it's
19 actually been pushed back to June, so I'll attempt to find
20 out if they do have any more data on parking lots, in
21 particular, but this is the overall pedestrian safety data.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
23 MS. HARRIS: Ms. Cordry, can you send in
24 electronically so we--
25 MS. CORDRY: Sure.

Page 7

1 MS. HARRIS: -- can see the red --
2 MS. CORDRY: Sure.
3 MS. HARRIS: -- since that indicates that those
4 are still preliminary numbers?
5 MS. CORDRY: Right. I will tell, right now, it's
6 just the ones for 2014, but I will get the electronic
7 printout that shows it actually in red.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
9 MS. CORDRY: So I just wanted to give this to you
10 preliminarily so you could start the countdown of things.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This is two pages,
12 right?
13 MS. CORDRY: Yes.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: So, all right, so this is Exhibit
15 512A, and on the exhibit list, let's say updated, so this is
16 through December of 2013?
17 MS. CORDRY: It goes through December and actually
18 starts into 2014. So it's final through December of 2013.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 MS. CORDRY: And preliminary for 2014. And the
21 other part, last time, I said I would provide you a
22 corrected version of the background exhibit, or that,
23 difference between the 312 and the 300, so I have that as
24 well, which I think can just be substituted for the --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.

Page 8

1 MS. CORDRY: The background exhibit I did where
2 the, I had written down inadvertently 312 instead of 300,
3 and I said I would correct that.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay.
5 MS. CORDRY: Okay. Yes, I don't know if you want
6 to correct it, or if you're going to correct your version,
7 or just substitute it.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: What was the number of that
9 exhibit?
10 MS. CORDRY: 554.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: 554. Okay. Hold on a second.
12 MS. CORDRY: Instead of having your handwritten
13 scribbles on it, it's, it would be the clean version of it.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15 MS. CORDRY: And last but not least, as I was
16 looking at --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, before you get to that, hand me
18 whatever you're, so I can -- it's not yet 10 o'clock, so my
19 brain is not ready to receive multiple things
20 simultaneously. All right. So this is 554, we'll say, A,
21 corrected version. 554.
22 By the way, regarding the objections, I note that
23 Ms. Rosenfeld pointed out that you had objected to one of
24 your own exhibits, and she teased you about it, I think, but
25 I think it was very fair-minded of you --

Page 9

1 MR. GOECKE: It was very fair?
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Fair-minded of you.
3 MR. GOECKE: I'm trying to be consistent.
4 MS. CORDRY: And the last thing here we'll do --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
6 MS. CORDRY: -- on the passenger analysis, we did
7 553. I was going over it again after I left and I realized
8 one number had been omitted back on the entrance, morning,
9 peak hour count, the actual count had been, there was just a
10 blank there as opposed to the number, so I filled that
11 number in there. It's the 1565 number there on the top
12 right-hand corner -- I'm sorry -- top left-hand corner.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Now, you've thrown all my
14 calculations off --
15 MS. CORDRY: I know that.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- for the entire year.
17 MS. CORDRY: Exactly.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So this'll be 553A?
19 MS. CORDRY: Yes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Corrected version.
21 MS. CORDRY: Yes, but haven't spent much time on
22 that intersection so it escaped my notice that that number
23 had not gotten provided.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: 553. I suspect that nobody else
25 would have caught it but you, Ms. Cordry, so --

Page 10

1 MS. CORDRY: Yes, I try to correct everything
2 before it gets --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: The reason I'm actually attaching a
4 new exhibit number, the A, is people testified regarding the
5 other thing --
6 MS. CORDRY: Sure.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- so we want to make sure --
8 MS. CORDRY: Sure.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the record is clear as to the,
10 you know, when testified about the previous --
11 MS. CORDRY: Right.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- version.
13 MS. CORDRY: Then they don't have to subtract
14 another 12 off the numbers that I have.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay. All right. Are
16 there any other preliminary matters?
17 MR. SILVERMAN: I have a very small point. I
18 don't think --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I always indulge you, Mr.
20 Silverman.
21 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you, sir. The, yesterday,
22 the Supreme Court decided the interstate air pollution case,
23 and Justice Ginsburg, who was, wrote the majority opinion,
24 quoted something from the New Testament, which I think is
25 relevant to dispersion of coefficients.

Page 11

1 MR. GROSSMAN: But I'll -- well, hold on one
2 second. First of all, I wasn't aware. My basement was
3 flooded last night, so I didn't get a chance to look up all
4 the Supreme Court stuff.
5 MS. CORDRY: As with the rest of ours.
6 MR. GOECKE: Mine too.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: So what did they decide exactly?
8 MR. SILVERMAN: They decided that the EPA had a
9 lot of discretion and tried to curb interstate air
10 pollution, and they didn't have to use any particular
11 formula because they had, they were not bound by that so
12 that they could stop the big power plants in Ohio from
13 polluting the air around us.
14 But in defending the decision, which I think was 6
15 to 3, she quote the bible, and it said -- and I just want to
16 read this for the record of stuff --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Yes.
18 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Very small.
20 MR. SILVERMAN: Very small. "The wind bloweth
21 where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof but
22 canst not tell whence it cometh and whither and goeth."
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I see. Well, Dr. Cole disagrees
24 with you. He's, he testified at great length that he could
25 tell, he could tell about these turbulent consequences.

Page 12

1 DR. COLE: No, I agree with that statement. Is
2 that the Old Testament?
3 MR. SILVERMAN: That's the New Testament.
4 DR. COLE: I see.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
6 MR. SILVERMAN: Ginsburg quoted it.
7 MS. ADELMAN: You don't know the New Testament.
8 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, I do. I know the --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Any other preliminary matters? All
10 right. Then I think we're, it's time for Mr. Sullivan to
11 retake the stand.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry that you have to follow
14 the bible in this, Mr. Sullivan.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: I try.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: And let me remind you, Mr.
17 Sullivan, you are still under oath.
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right. So this is
20 Mr. Sullivan's direct testimony on rebuttal.
21 MR. GOECKE: Thank you, Mr. Grossman.
22 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION
23 MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to start
24 talking to you today about the rebuttal report you prepared,
25 which is Exhibit 466. And I believe you've got a copy of

Page 13

1 that on the screen here.
2 Would you like a hard copy, Mr. Grossman, or can
3 you see that okay?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: The rebuttal report? I have it
5 with me.
6 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: I did have it with me. Hold on.
8 Here it is. Thank you. That's Exhibit 466?
9 MR. GOECKE: 466, that's correct.
10 Mr. Sullivan, why did you prepare this report?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: This report was prepared to clarify
12 some of the statements that Dr. Cole had made during his
13 direct testimony, and to also show the results of applying
14 the ozone limiting method, which we'll refer to today as
15 OLM, as Dr. Cole requested be considered to apply this kind
16 of methodology. And it also responded to some, some past
17 requests by the opposition that we show, based upon urban
18 dispersion coefficients concentration maps inside the mall
19 area, the southern mall area, which, which we did. So that
20 was, that was the, the, in a big picture, the general
21 objectives of this particular report.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me just interrupt for one
23 second regarding the OLM. My recollection of Dr. Cole's
24 testimony is that he referred, he didn't refer to it as OLM,
25 I don't think; I think he referred to it as tiered approach

Page 14

1 to analyzing it. That's my recollection. Does anybody have
2 a different recollection? Is that, a statement in Dr.
3 Cole's testimony where he actually refers to it as the ozone
4 limiting method?
5 MS. CORDRY: There's nothing --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: The reason, I just bring it up,
7 just so that everybody understands what we're talking about,
8 and that's correct, Dr. Cole, that we're talking about what
9 you referred to as tiered approach to analyzing conversion
10 of NO to NO2?
11 DR. COLE: In EPA's terminology, there are two
12 tier-three models that they recommend with many conditions
13 and restrictions. One of them is the --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, I didn't want you to get
15 into it --
16 DR. COLE: Okay.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: -- testimony or anything. I just
18 want to make sure I understand what you're referring to when
19 you testified on December 5 and 6 --
20 DR. COLE: Yes, just --
21 MS. ADELMAN: Oh, Mr. Grossman, I think he's
22 making a legitimate point about tier 3, and I don't think it
23 would take him long.
24 DR. COLE: You asked --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: No, no, I don't want -- he's going

Page 15

1 to have an opportunity to get back on the stand and make any
2 legitimate points he wants in surrebuttal --
3 DR. COLE: I don't know, I don't --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on, Dr. Cole. Hold on. My
5 interruption was just so I made sure that we're talking
6 about the same thing. When you talk about ozone limiting
7 method, OLM, I, my recollection is that the first time I saw
8 that term was in connection with the discussion after he had
9 testified in, and after the rebuttal report, Mr. Sullivan's
10 rebuttal report was filed, and that in the December 5 and
11 December 6 testimony, that the actual term hadn't been used.
12 And I'm, that's why I'm raising it to see if I'm incorrect
13 about that. I know the, and I just want to make sure that
14 we're talking about the same thing in terms of the
15 methodology that Dr. Cole had discussed to which this
16 rebuttal report is, in part, addressed. Let me see.
17 MR. SILVERMAN: I think that's incorrect, Mr.
18 Grossman. I'm looking for the citation right now. But he
19 did refer to the ozone limited method at one point in his
20 testimony.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So let's, actually, I'm
22 going to look at the index here to see if the term,
23 limiting, is in here, or limited. Limited, 130, and
24 limiting, maybe that is right, 2820. Let's see. Yes,
25 actually, I, well, I developed something called the ozone

Page 16

1 limiting method. Okay. I stand corrected.
2 DR. COLE: Well --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. It's not necessary for you
4 to, you're going to get an opportunity to testify again if
5 you're called in surrebuttal. I just wanted to make sure I
6 understood correctly what the record had as far as ozone
7 limiting method, and that's correct, he did reference it.
8 All right. I'm sorry for the interruption. Go ahead --
9 MR. SULLIVAN: No problem.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- Mr. Sullivan.
11 MR. GOECKE: But just to be clear, Mr. Sullivan,
12 you applied the ozone limiting method in your analysis as
13 set forth in your rebuttal report?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: I did.
15 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And what were the ultimate
16 conclusions of your modeling for the rebuttal report?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, well the overall conclusions
18 were, in particular, with respect to the ozone limiting
19 method, if we go to that level of detail in model NO2
20 instead of analects in a very conservative way --
21 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.
22 MR. SULLIVAN: -- that we found that the
23 concentrations, as expected, were much lower, and in fact,
24 much more consistent with what's being measured around the
25 country. The values we are showing on the very conservative

Page 17

1 screen were way above typical levels measured near major
2 roadways.
3 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. The values you were
5 showing were above their --
6 MR. SULLIVAN: They --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Could you repeat that?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: The concentrations we've showed,
9 for example, in our, in my August 2013 report, we were
10 showing, as I recall, in the order of 160 microgram peak
11 concentrations. The actual 98th percentile values being
12 measured --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: 90th or 98th?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: 98th, being measured near major
15 highways are lower than that. And so it, it certainly
16 points out the fact -- and we said we were being very
17 conservative -- the measured data clearly supports that,
18 that fact. Relatively local data, as well as, as more
19 distant data round the country, show that the levels near,
20 even highways, and major highways, are generally in the
21 order of 98th percentile, in the order of 85 to 90
22 micrograms per cubic meter. Nothing like 160, unless you go
23 to extreme cases, which we will describe later in my, in my
24 testimony.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: And that's for NO2?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: NO2, one hour, 98th percentile --
 2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
 3 MR. SULLIVAN: -- concentrations.
 4 MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Did you, again to say
 5 98th, because I thought I heard you say 90th again?
 6 MR. SULLIVAN: 98th.
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: He did and he corrected. That's
 8 why I asked him. He corrected it.
 9 MS. CORDRY: Well, but I, again, I thought I heard
 10 him just now say 90th again. Are you saying 98th?
 11 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I said 90, I, I certainly
 12 thought I said 98th. If I didn't, I should have.
 13 MR. GOECKE: So it's your testimony that there are
 14 real-world samples being taken that show levels higher than
 15 what you've modeled here?
 16 MS. ADELMAN: Objection. Objection. Leading
 17 question.
 18 MR. GROSSMAN: Sustained.
 19 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And just to clarify again
 20 -- let me back up a step. You testified that the levels for
 21 NO2, in your rebuttal report, are lower. Lower than what?
 22 MR. SULLIVAN: Lower than we, we previously showed
 23 them. They're more conservatively modeling NOX.
 24 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
 25 MR. SULLIVAN: It's just in the higher percent

1 NO2, the current modeling, which is more, or accurate, less
 2 conservative, is showing numbers, the most refined numbers,
 3 stage 3, of 120 micrograms per cubic meter, which still
 4 contain a fair degree of conservatism in overstatement.
 5 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And specifically, what
 6 conservatism did you reduce in the rebuttal report compared
 7 to your earlier reports?
 8 MR. SULLIVAN: For the, the main one is that
 9 before, we were assuming that all NOX is NO2, but it's not.
 10 I mean, in this, this time, we assumed, still
 11 conservatively, that the idling emissions were at 25 percent
 12 NO2, and that the, when you use that same ratio for the, for
 13 the ring road and other roadways, which is, is clearly
 14 overstated, because actually running roadways, the ratio is
 15 more on the order of .05 to .10. I showed references in my
 16 data disc and I described in my report that clearly show
 17 that traveling cars emit much less NO2 in the ratio than
 18 with models.
 19 So my point is that the 25 percent that we're
 20 using is, is conservative, but closer for idling cars. The
 21 cars that are actually in movement, the ratio of NO2
 22 analects is much, much lower. It's typically 5 to 10
 23 percent in the literature. So that assumption would affect
 24 the ring road modeling as well as all other roadways. We're
 25 containing a lot of conservatism, which is why the 120 I'm

1 showing, the 121 I'm showing now, that's still high compared
 2 to measured data at major highways. I mean, it's an
 3 overstatement, but we're, we've applied the ozone limiting
 4 method in a conservative fashion to try to respond to the
 5 questions that were raised. It doesn't change my
 6 conclusions from before. The modeling I did initially of
 7 NOX was extremely conservative, and the modeling I've done
 8 now confirms that fact.
 9 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And when you say the model
 10 levels are high compared to measured data, what are you
 11 referring to specifically?
 12 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, for example, I'll
 13 give you examples. If we look at I-95, which we all know is
 14 a pretty busy highway, congested traffic happens there a
 15 lot, the Virginia DEQ has a monitor in Richmond near --
 16 MR. GROSSMAN: What does DEQ stand for?
 17 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. Department of
 18 Environmental Quality.
 19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
 20 MR. SULLIVAN: The state of Virginia's air quality
 21 agency, regulatory agency, they have a monitor near I-95 in
 22 Richmond. The 2013 98th percentile value was 86 micrograms
 23 per cubic meter.
 24 Another example would be in Las Vegas, as I, as I
 25 showed in the CRC report I referenced. Las Vegas has a

1 monitor for NO2 that is approximately 100 feet from a major
 2 highway. They have measured 92 micrograms per cubic meter.
 3 And perhaps the most telling of all, if anyone has
 4 been to Los Angeles, is I-710. Interstate 710 services the
 5 Port of Long Beach, California, a major port for many Asian,
 6 Asian imports to the United States. That road has 190,000
 7 cars and trucks a day, 32,000 of which are heavy-duty diesel
 8 trucks servicing the port primarily. That monitor is
 9 located almost right next to the roadway, it's 15 meters
 10 from the highway, and it's downwind of the flow. That
 11 measured, measured, the most recent year, 153 as its 98th
 12 percentile.
 13 So my point, primary point in this report is, if
 14 extreme examples like that in L.A., with lots of ozone,
 15 adverse meteorology, and some of the highest congestion in
 16 the country, are showing, next to the highway, 156, how
 17 could, how could anyone argue that the ring road and cars at
 18 a gas station are going to be higher than that? My, my
 19 point is, logic would say it has to be much, much lower than
 20 that. A more recent modeling does confirm that fact.
 21 MS. ADELMAN: Just a question. Was it 153 or 156?
 22 I heard both numbers.
 23 MR. SULLIVAN: 156 was the one, the one, the most,
 24 the second year; the more recent year is 153.
 25 MR. GOECKE: And if I can, Mr. Grossman, I'd like

Page 22

1 to hand out copies of what's been marked as the HE Exhibit
2 342. Here's one for Mr. Sullivan and one for you.
3 And Mr. Sullivan, is this the study that you were
4 just testifying about?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, it is.
6 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: This is a copy of an exhibit that's
8 already in the record, you said?
9 MR. GOECKE: That's correct.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit?
11 MR. GOECKE: 342.
12 If I could direct your attention, Mr. Sullivan, to
13 the executive summary that's labeled as ES-1. It's about 15
14 pages into the document.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
16 MR. GOECKE: And if you could just briefly read to
17 yourself the second paragraph on that page.
18 MR. SULLIVAN: What page are we on?
19 MR. GOECKE: We're on ES-1. It's the executive
20 summary. It's about 15 pages into the document.
21 MR. SULLIVAN: I see. Okay.
22 MR. GOECKE: Have you had a chance to look that
23 over, Mr. Sullivan?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I have.
25 MR. GOECKE: And in your opinion, the model

Page 23

1 emissions that you come up with for the proposed cluster of
2 gas station, how would they compare to the levels that are
3 being measured in Las Vegas and at the Port of Los Angeles?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: I didn't quantify the, the
5 difference, but it's much more than an order of magnitude
6 difference, more than a factor of 10, much more than a
7 factor of 10, lower emissions in the ring road and the
8 associated gasoline station operations as compared to I-710
9 in L.A.
10 MR. GOECKE: Are you aware of any study or report
11 discussing measured levels of one-hour NO2 concentrations
12 that, where the levels exceeded the EPA max?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: I've not seen any.
14 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.
15 MS. ADELMAN: Was that NOX or NO2?
16 MR. GOECKE: NO2.
17 DR. COLE: Can you repeat that question? I didn't
18 quite understand it.
19 MR. GOECKE: I don't remember exactly what I said,
20 but I asked Mr. Sullivan whether he was aware of any studies
21 or reports that found actual measure levels of one-hour NO2
22 that exceeded the EPA max?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: And to clarify my response, I was
24 referring to 98th percentile data point, but I don't recall
25 seeing any studies or measured data sets that show a

Page 24

1 violation of that level.
2 MR. GOECKE: Thanks.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: And just, when Dr. Cole was asked
4 how he understood you arrived at 98th percentile, as I
5 recall, he described the process in which you took all of
6 the hours, you looked at all of the hours, hourly
7 measurements over a multi-year period, and then you picked
8 the 98th percentile hour, and that, I think, was the 175th
9 or 174th hour, or something. Was that an accurate statement
10 of how you arrive at 98th percentile in your -- how did you
11 arrive at that?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, in terms, if you're modeling
13 NOX, the model isn't designed to output the 98th percentile
14 of the maximum one-hour value. And as Dr. Cole and I both
15 recognized, we used the 98, used the 98th percentile of all
16 the hourly values as a, a basis to get a comparison. And my
17 point was, because we were modeling NOX, that we were
18 grossly overstating what the concentrations were for any
19 distribution. But clearly, it's a different distribution
20 than using the 98th percentile of the one-hour given
21 maximum.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that still doesn't explain to
23 me, I guess, my -- it may explain to you, but not to me
24 -- what that, you did. What was the process you used to
25 arrive at a 98th percentile?

Page 25

1 MR. SULLIVAN: In the, in the previous report
2 modeling NOX, as Dr. Cole indicated, he took the 175th
3 value, 175th highest rank hour each year and then averaged
4 the five years of those numbers, each receptor, to estimate
5 98th percentile.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: And why was it the 175th hour?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, if you take 8760 hours per
8 year and multiply it times, you know, 2 percent, .02, you
9 get 175.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Now, why is the
11 98th percentile significant? Why not the 97th percentile or
12 the 99th percentile?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: What EPA is trying to do is, and
14 over time, is get away from the concept that you can only
15 exceed a number, you can, once a year or some extreme like
16 that, because the details of the model distribution tend to
17 be very unreliable. So they're going to some selected
18 arbitrarily percentile, whether it be the 98th or the 95th
19 or the 97th, they're avoiding those extremes in detail.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21 MR. SULLIVAN: But the 98th is, I would, in my
22 judgment, is, is it's just trying to balance those issues
23 and saying, well, 98 avoids a lot of detail, and it's still
24 a pretty high number.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: And that's the EPA guideline amount

Page 26

1 that you, quantity that is 98th percentile of what EPA
2 guidelines suggest you use?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: The AERMOD model, if you're
4 modeling NOX, allows you to do any, the same, any, any
5 number up to the 999 highest each year. If you're modeling
6 NO2, the standard output to the, the 98th percentile with
7 maximum one-hour guides.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Why will a standard output do that?
9 I mean, what, who, why is 98th percentile the figure
10 selected? Where does that, who decided that 98th percentile
11 would be the figure selected is my question?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: That was decided by EPA.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 MR. SULLIVAN: New standard.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
16 MR. GOECKE: So is it fair to characterize that as
17 the policy determination, or is there, is it a scientific or
18 mathematical determination?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: It was a, it was a regulatory
20 decision that EPA made.
21 MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan, were there any other
22 factors or changes in your rebuttal report that caused the
23 levels of one-hour NO2 to decline, or to be lower than your
24 prior report?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: Background levels have dropped over

Page 27

1 the years, and we did update the background. That, that,
2 that changed. We, we did model, in last August, the gas
3 queue considering the fact that the maximum queue wasn't at
4 the gas station every hour they are open, based on sales
5 data. That was carried through here. So those, those
6 factors are, I could attest to, but the main, the main
7 issues were we, we refined how we, how we treated NO2 versus
8 NOX; that was the most, I'd say, significant change.
9 MR. GOECKE: Did you retain any conservative
10 assumptions in your rebuttal report?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, yes, we did.
12 MR. GOECKE: And what were they?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, one, one, one example would
14 be that the, we're using, assuming 25 percent ratio for,
15 we're using a 25 percent NO2 versus NOX for idling vehicles
16 at the gas station. That, that still contains conservatism.
17 Actually, if you look at the, the raw studies that support
18 that number, 20 percent would have been probably more
19 applicable. We used 25 percent for that.
20 For the ring road and the other roadways, we
21 retained the 25 percent. As I mentioned, most of the
22 studies that I referenced are showing that free-flowing
23 cars, the NO2 level is more like 5 to 10 percent. Most of
24 them are in the range of 5, 8 percent, so it's, it's an
25 overstatement probably five-fold on the ring road and other

Page 28

1 roadways.
2 So there's, there's issues like that -- and
3 frankly, our number is still conservative because the, we're
4 using background data for NO2, for example, up to 2012. The
5 trend is dropping for NO2, as most are, and this, that's an
6 overstatement as well. If you add those all up, my
7 expectation is that by, that the numbers are probably at
8 least 20 micrograms too high and probably a lot more than
9 that in reality.
10 MR. GOECKE: That, the what is 20 micrograms too
11 high? Your model numbers?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: If we say it's 121, I would be, I'd
13 be very surprised if the, if the actual numbers, if they
14 were ever between measured, which I'm not advocating, would
15 be, would be, would approach 100 micrograms per cubic meter
16 as 98th percentile value.
17 MR. GOECKE: And why do you think there is that 20
18 microgram difference between what you've modeled and what
19 you anticipate there to be in reality?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the issues of the, the NO2
21 and NOX ratios, the trend in, the trend line going down,
22 those factors are part of that discussion, but also,
23 considering measured concentrations. The directly measured
24 concentrations at much busier locations shows that if you're
25 not getting high values like that next to I-95, why would

Page 29

1 you expect that that kind of values near a gas station? It
2 just doesn't, to me, make sense.
3 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.
4 MR. SULLIVAN: So my judgment, my judgment is, if
5 it was to be measured, which there's no indication that it
6 should be, the numbers would probably be in the order of 80
7 micrograms less as 98th percentile, just, just any objective
8 review of the available measured data that exists today for
9 NO2.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I have a question where you're
11 saying the trend is that it's the one-hour NO2 background is
12 going down. As I recall in Dr. Cole's testimony, in his
13 cross-examination by Mr. Goecke, the question was asked
14 about exactly that, that the Arlington monitor was showing a
15 decrease over the three- or five-year period of NO2
16 background, but then I had noticed in the course of that,
17 that the Beltsville monitoring station, the opposite trend
18 appeared to be shown; that is, that the measurement, the
19 background measurements were higher for recent times than
20 lower. So is there evidence of this trend other than those
21 two stations that back up what your statement is?
22 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that when you're
23 referring to Beltsville versus Rockville, are you referring
24 to PM 2.5?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it was actually Beltsville

Page 30

1 versus Arlington in that examination, and I think the
2 discussion was about NO2.
3 Am I incorrect, Mr. Goecke? That's my
4 recollection of that. Well, we could look back at the
5 transcript of December 6th, pages 72 to 86.
6 MR. SULLIVAN: My recollection is that the
7 Arlington was, but it was the most representative location
8 for a suburban Maryland location in Wheaton, in that there
9 was insufficient data available from Beltsville or Rockville
10 to serve as an alternative.
11 MR. GOECKE: But putting aside the local
12 monitoring levels, to answer Mr. Grossman's question, are
13 there, is there any other evidence or sampling out there
14 that's showing a trend of, a downward trend of NO2 and NO2
15 levels?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. And actually, the trend is
17 dropping as it, as it should, because as the fleet turns
18 over of vehicles, that newer cars have better controls, and
19 that trucks, especially, have better controls, and the
20 numbers are going to drop based upon that fleet turnover.
21 But I show the trend for Arlington on page 24 of my rebuttal
22 report.
23 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Let's go there.
24 MR. SULLIVAN: So as you can see for Arlington
25 -- I mean, Mr. Grossman, a trend like this is not going to

Page 31

1 be a straight line; it's going to have bumps and wiggles in
2 it.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
4 MR. SULLIVAN: And there'll be times, even if a
5 trend is generally going down, you may have a year when it
6 goes up; that's not unexpected in the, in the random nature
7 of things. But the trend line going, is clearly going down,
8 including the most recent three-year period, in the year of
9 2011 to 2013. So this is happening here, it's happening in
10 other states, it's happening nationally due to the fleet,
11 primarily due to the fleet turnover of vehicles, cars and
12 trucks.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Now, as I recall, we were looking
14 at a particular exhibit.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan, what page are you
16 looking at in your report?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: Page 24 of my February 14th
18 rebuttal report. In fact, the most recent year, 2013, 98
19 percentile value from Arlington was 81 micrograms per cubic
20 meter.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit 404F is what I had noted
22 that the readings in the Beltsville monitor increased over
23 that same period. That's actually pages 86 to 100 of the
24 December 6th transcript. Do we have 404F handy?
25 MS. HARRIS: I'm not sure. I'm looking.

Page 32

1 MR. GROSSMAN: You have it in there, right?
2 MS. HARRIS: Let me look over here.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we do have it in there if
4 you --
5 MS. HARRIS: Is there a method to the madness of
6 this question?
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. There, in, they're
8 chronologically the latest on top, so I was, just take a
9 look and see what the -- let's see. It's probably in file
10 folder 6 -- no, it would be on top, I think -- file folder 6
11 or 7 probably.
12 MS. HARRIS: Is this it?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. It's a good thing you're
14 agile. All right. Here's 404E, so F can't be too far away.
15 404F.
16 MS. CORDRY: I'm looking at the transcript. It is
17 referring to there. It's going to be page 96.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: So -- I'm not sure whether it was
19 actually listed out or it's just looking at the particular
20 pictures.
21 MS. CORDRY: I think it, I think you were looking
22 at the pictures. It looks like on page 99, you're talking
23 about looking at the photographs in --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
25 MS. CORDRY: -- 404F, the Beltsville monitor, and

Page 33

1 it has, I think, some values on each picture.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: But I can't see on the particular
3 pictures that are in here, I can't see the label of which
4 -- oh, it does say -- Alexandria, all right, let me see if I
5 found the Beltsville. There's Arlington. Beltsville. I
6 don't know. This one also shows a decline on the picture
7 that I'm seeing, so maybe I was, maybe I was just incorrect
8 in my observation because it does show a decline from 80
9 micrograms per cubic meter in the 2008 to 73 in 2013.
10 MS. CORDRY: I think what you were saying was that
11 in 2012, it was 67 and then went back up in 2013 --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I see. Yes.
13 MS. CORDRY: -- to 73.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: That's, I see that. Right. So it
15 was, yes, in 2012, on that photograph, it says it was 67.68
16 micrograms per cubic meter, and then it went down to, it
17 went up to 73.32 in 2013. So I just wondered, having seen
18 that observation I made at the time, I wondered whether
19 there was more consistent data to show whether there truly
20 is a trend down in NO2 observed concentrations.
21 MR. SULLIVAN: And Mr. Grossman, if we were to
22 look at each monitor in the Metropolitan Area and look at
23 the trend line over the last 10 years, there's going to be
24 bouncing up and down, and sometimes some'll go up and
25 some'll go down a lot, but the trend lines, I would expect,

Page 34

1 are, are all going down for NO2. And the logic is that the
2 newer vehicles, especially the trucks, have a lot lower NOX
3 and NO2 emissions, so logic would say, over time, is those,
4 old trucks come off the road and newer trucks come on the
5 road, they're at, the expectation would be that the NO2
6 would drop because of that. Most of the NOX is being
7 emitted from automobiles.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: No, I understood the logic; I just,
9 I was a little concerned when I was reading that testimony
10 that, as to whether or not, in fact, there was a showing and
11 trend in the data as opposed to the logic of it. But okay,
12 go ahead. I interrupted you.

13 MR. GOECKE: And I'll just go down, Mr. Grossman,
14 on page 92 of that transcript, at lines 16 to 18, Dr. Cole
15 testified, well, it's my opinion on the evidence that's been
16 provided in this case, and in my opinion, there's some
17 evidence that regional levels are dropping.

18 You testified a moment ago about air monitoring,
19 Mr. Sullivan. In your opinion, do you think air monitoring
20 is a good idea, or is required for this site if the gas
21 station were to be built, to make sure that the emission
22 levels are below the EPA max?

23 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't think it would be
24 appropriate.

25 MR. GOECKE: And why is that?

Page 35

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, several reasons. The, the
2 first reason is, especially looking at the, my latest
3 rebuttal report which provides, you know, more realism, less
4 conservatism, none of the model values are approaching any
5 standard. There'd be no reason to have a concern in putting
6 a monitor here.

7 The second reason would be that, you know, and I
8 don't, I don't think there's any monitors, by industry, in
9 the State of Maryland that are required for anybody, I think
10 Costco would be the first one.

11 MR. GOECKE: Are --

12 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the only one, I won't say it
13 wasn't every, now, right at this point in time, I don't
14 believe anybody in the state is required to monitor air
15 pollution for their steel mill, power plant, whatever, it's
16 not required.

17 MR. GOECKE: Are you aware of any industrial or
18 any use facility that's required to monitor their emissions?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: There are no industrial facilities
20 in the State of Maryland that are required to monitor
21 ambient air quality.

22 MR. GOECKE: And what have you done to investigate
23 that issue?

24 MR. SULLIVAN: I contacted the Maryland Department
25 of the Environment to ask them.

Page 36

1 MR. GOECKE: Who'd you talk to there?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: I talked to the manager of the air
3 monitoring programs, David Krask.

4 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And what is Mr. Krask's role
5 at the Maryland Department of the Environment?

6 MS. ROSENFELD: Could you spell that last name?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: K-R-A-S-K.

8 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Krask is responsible for
10 Maryland's air quality monitoring network operations.

11 MR. GOECKE: And what did you ask Mr. Krask about?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: I asked if he could provide me a
13 listing of facilities in the State of Maryland that are
14 required to conduct ambient air monitoring programs.

15 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And after speaking with Mr.
16 Krask, what is your opinion about whether or not Maryland
17 requires any facilities to monitor emissions?

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm going to stop you there.
19 Of course, nobody's objected, but it is clearly a hearsay
20 issue here, assuming you're offering his recollection of
21 what Mr. Krask said as, to prove the truth of what's
22 asserted by Mr. Krask; that is, that there are no -- if I
23 understood his testimony correctly -- that there are no
24 requirements for monitoring within the State of Maryland. I
25 assume that's the reason you were --

Page 37

1 MR. GOECKE: I haven't asked him specifically what
2 Mr. Krask has said. I'm just asking him his --

3 MR. GROSSMAN: No, you asked him what --

4 MR. GOECKE: -- his opinion.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- how, what opinion he reached as
6 a result of talking or listening to Mr. Krask, so it's a
7 thinly-veiled hearsay thing --

8 MR. GOECKE: I'm --

9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- if you're --

10 MR. GOECKE: I'm respecting the bounds of hearsay.
11 I'm trying to delicately walk around it.

12 MR. GROSSMAN: So the, and although nobody
13 objected, I just raise the issue --

14 MR. SILVERMAN: We object.

15 MS. CORDRY: Mr. Silverman.

16 MR. GOECKE: -- all right, a belated objection
17 pops forth from Mr. Silverman, you know, as to the truth of
18 what's asserted therein. Now, it may be, you know, I have
19 indicia of reliability, at least it has, there's the ability
20 to confirm it, so I'm going to allow it in, subject to
21 striking it later after the opposition has had an
22 opportunity to further investigate that; that is, to talk to
23 Mr. Krask and see if this is correct.

24 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.

25 THE COURT: And therefore, I think that under our

Page 38

1 administrative evidence requirements, that that particular
2 hearsay would be allowable under those circumstances.
3 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
4 MR. GOECKE: You may answer the question. So did
5 you arrive at an opinion, or you can more directly say, what
6 did Mr. Krask tell you?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Krask told me that there was no
8 facility in the State of Maryland that was required to
9 conduct monitoring at this point at time.
10 MR. GOECKE: Let's move along to your selection of
11 the monitoring sites that you used to calculate the
12 background levels in this case. Are you familiar with Ms.
13 Cordry's submissions or testimony in this case criticizing
14 the monitoring selections that you used in your reports?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I am.
16 MR. GOECKE: And do you have any response to her
17 criticisms?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: I didn't agree. More specifically,
19 a lot of Ms., Ms. Cordry's criticism related to the fact
20 that we didn't use the highest, the air be monitored at the
21 highest concentrations in the Metropolitan Area, but we used
22 ones that were lower than the highest. And my, my response
23 was, well, we put together a modeling protocol, and in the
24 monitoring protocol, we had, we had discussions, and we
25 identified locations that would be representative of a

Page 39

1 suburban location such as Wheaton, Maryland. That doesn't
2 mean we go to the middle of Washington, D.C. to pick a
3 monitor, and it doesn't mean they go to a location in
4 Alexandria that has special issues going on to get a
5 monitor. Our goal was to be conservatively representing a
6 suburban location such as Wheaton, which was very different
7 than the thrust of her, her report that I reviewed
8 previously. That was one point. Let me see what else I
9 had.
10 MR. GOECKE: And did you discuss which monitoring
11 locations to use with Dr. Cole or any members of the
12 opposition in your protocol meetings?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: We, we did discuss the monitors
14 that we, monitoring sites that we intended to use,
15 Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington.
16 MR. GOECKE: Did Ms. Cordry participate in those
17 meetings?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: No.
19 MR. GOECKE: So in terms of Ms. Cordry's argument
20 that you should have used Washington, D.C. to you, to
21 establish NO2 background levels, specifically, how do you
22 respond to that?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, if my objective was to be
24 representative of the core central business district, I
25 would have used a site that represented that type of

Page 40

1 location, but this gas station was located in suburban
2 Maryland, so I identified a more suburban location. The
3 goal is to be representative; the goal is not to identify
4 the most highest model concentration as possible.
5 MR. GOECKE: And what about Alexandria, Virginia?
6 Why was that location not appropriate for NO2?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, that, that was a good
8 location if you are affected by a, a major bus depot, which
9 was the Dash, Alexandria Dash facility. Maintenance is
10 right, very close to that location. It also has a, a major
11 rail, rail line very close to that location. And it's right
12 next to where the monitor is, and it pretty much near the
13 same building as where they park buses that will, I presume,
14 warm up in the morning. So that particular location tells
15 us nothing about the background levels at Wheaton that don't
16 have a rail, major rail line, don't have a major bus diesel
17 motor, a diesel bus facility, or school busses idling right
18 next to it, which was a reason why that particular location,
19 the Colvin Street location in Alexandria, had such elevated
20 values. And the goal is not to pick the highest one; the
21 goal is to be representative.
22 MR. GOECKE: And does that apply to PM2.5 as well?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: It applies to all pollutants.
24 MR. GOECKE: Why did you select the monitors that
25 you did for PM2.5?

Page 41

1 MR. SULLIVAN: We, we selected Beltsville and
2 Rockville because they were the, the closest suburban
3 locations with PM2.5 data available.
4 MR. GOECKE: The next thing I'd like to talk about
5 is the discussion we've had about urban versus rural
6 characteristics of the mall site. Were you here when Dr.
7 Cole testified about this issue?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I was.
9 MR. GOECKE: And do you recall what his
10 characterization was of how the air at the mall site itself
11 should be treated?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: I recall Dr. Cole saying two
13 things. One, one, he did say that the conditions with the
14 mall area were urban when they were --
15 MR. GOECKE: Which conditions?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: The land use conditions would be
17 classified as urban. But in fairness, he also said that, in
18 his judgment, that there was transition going on between
19 rural and urban, and that using 50 percent urban and 50
20 percent rural was how he elected to do his calculations that
21 he showed during his testimony.
22 MR. GOECKE: And do you agree with that 50/50
23 breakdown of the air characteristics?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: I do not.
25 MR. GOECKE: Why not?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: I agree in principle. Dr. Cole is
2 correct that when, when air flows from one land use to
3 another, there is a transition zone. It takes time for the
4 air to adjust. Air adjusts next to the ground very closely,
5 and it takes more time for it to adjust to higher, higher
6 enough levels above the ground.

7 In a case of, of this gas station, we have a
8 situation where the, the urban area begins at the start of
9 the parking, the paved area near the ring road. We have
10 approximately 60 to 70 feet of travel before the air would
11 even get to the start of the queue. And 70 feet of, 60, 65,
12 50, or 40, 30 of feet of travel, you get, the air will
13 adjust to the level of concern with modeling at 1.5 meters
14 above the ground, which is five feet. The sources are all
15 low-level sources.

16 The, the typical rules of thumb early on in a, in
17 a transition zone like that, it's usually about a one- to
18 three-, one- to four-foot ratio, which means if we go four
19 feet in, in traverse, the adjustment goes up approximately a
20 foot. We would be way, way, way past the point of
21 transition up to 1.5 meters by the time the start of the
22 queue was encountered. By midpoint in the queue, at the end
23 of the queue, it would be, it would be way past that
24 particular value.

25 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.

1 MR. SULLIVAN: So it's going to be, it's going to
2 be urban modeling by the time it gets to the, to the queue
3 area.

4 MR. GOECKE: And does your report address the air
5 characteristics at the mall site?

6 MR. SULLIVAN: I had sections in the report that
7 discuss this issue and provided some calculations and
8 references to support what I've just said.

9 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. Can you show us the slide
10 that does the calculations or that shows the work in which
11 you calculated why the air would be treated as urban?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: I can find the page, yes.

13 MR. GOECKE: It may be on page 35.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Page 35? May I get up, Mr.
15 Grossman, to --

16 MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly.

17 MR. SULLIVAN: -- explain?

18 MR. GROSSMAN: You want to use my vaunted laser
19 pointer?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: What we're talking about here is,
21 this, this area that we're referring to is around the
22 neighborhood, is what the air will experience when it's
23 coming from the south, the point that Dr. Cole was making,
24 the flow from the south would be a transition zone. We, we
25 agree with that statement, there is a transition zone.

1 But what happens is that it encounters the paved
2 surface right where this parking area is. It has to
3 traverse, I'm showing 50 feet of travel, prior to it
4 reaching the starting point for this queue. The issue is
5 that the, the queue itself is being the model that .75 meter
6 height, meaning the emissions are being contained within
7 the, within a, within a mark another five feet above the
8 ground. The receptors are at five feet, so that what we
9 care about here, and the main issue is, what's going on at
10 five feet. Well, the transition zone, if I go 50 feet, I'll
11 use the one-to-four ratio, it's gone up four feet; we only
12 need to go five. So the transition's going to be met
13 somewhere mid ring road for the emissions we have here.

14 The other point is, the reference I used is for
15 what's called neutral conditions, but we've already shown
16 that the monitoring done at the mall, that this mall is, is
17 what creates the unstable environment. An unstable
18 environment will tend to have a faster signal than normal.

19 So my, my point is, I, I agree in principle with
20 Dr. Cole's statement, but in practice, for this application,
21 this, the air that's, that we're worried about in here is
22 where the queue is located, and on the ring road. This,
23 these emissions are affected by urban air quality, urban
24 dispersion characteristics, not rural.

25 MR. GOECKE: And remind us, why is it important

1 whether you treat the air having urban or rural
2 characteristics?

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Urban characteristics have greater
4 degree of dispersions than due rural due to the heating of
5 the sources. In this case here, it's from the heating of
6 the fact it's asphalt, creates a warmer surface. Also, you
7 can, during urban, you can be affected by buildings and
8 structures that tend to produce more, more mixing as
9 compared to a, a moral rural area. So based upon the
10 literature, and I've showed several, and there's more, the
11 transition would have occurred prior to the time when this,
12 the, the gas queue would have been encountered.

13 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And based on those urban
14 dispersion characteristics, how will that affect emission
15 levels at, I'd say the Stephen Knolls School, the nearest
16 home, or the pool?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think you mean, you said
18 emissions earlier, you mean air concentration?

19 MR. GOECKE: Air concentration levels, thank you.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the, the urban treatment will
21 provide lower, lower concentrations than the rural treatment
22 will.

23 MS. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman --

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

25 MS. ADELMAN: -- may I ask a question? Are you on

Page 46

1 page 35, Mr. Sullivan?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that I am.
3 MS. ADELMAN: Because my copy says 70 feet of
4 travel rather than 50 feet of travel over the asphalt ring
5 road.
6 MS. CORDRY: Yes, so does mine.
7 MR. SILVERMAN: That's what mine says too.
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. We're going to have to
9 measure, I could measure -- I don't know why this version
10 is, is different. I mean, I could bring up a different, I
11 don't know why this says 50 and your said 70. It could be
12 confirmed with a, with a Google Earth or by going to the
13 site, but it's, on the order, it's more than, still more
14 than 50 feet if you go up and measure Google Earth.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, is it 50 or more?
16 MS. ADELMAN: Which number --
17 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm saying it's 50 or more. We --
18 MS. ADELMAN: My question is which number are you
19 using?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I guess --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Let's save that kind of questioning
22 for cross-examination.
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, I, Mr. Goecke, I
24 could confirm that the version I have is the exact same
25 version submitted, and it may be this, this was modified at

Page 47

1 some point by a more accurate measurement. I don't know.
2 MR. GOECKE: Would it make a difference if there
3 were 70 feet and not 50 feet?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Not at all. But my, the actual, my
5 hard copy version does say 50, so it was, it was modified.
6 MR. GOECKE: So why wouldn't it make a difference
7 if it were 70 feet and not 50 feet?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the conversion's going to
9 occur much closer than 50 feet so it wouldn't matter. I
10 mean, if it's 50 or 70 feet, the main point is the
11 conversion will equilibrate much closer than, than 50 feet,
12 so it wouldn't make any difference.
13 MR. GOECKE: So --
14 DR. COLE: Conversion of what?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: The equilibration of the, of the
16 wind and turbulence from a rural to an urban setting would,
17 would occur well within 50 feet.
18 MR. GOECKE: So if it's longer than 50 feet, it
19 has more time to convert from rural to urban dispersion
20 characteristics?
21 MR. SULLIVAN: It would have more time, correct.
22 The front would be higher above the ground.
23 MR. GOECKE: Turning to the time it takes for NO
24 to convert to NO₂, do you remember Dr. Cole's testimony
25 about how long it takes?

Page 48

1 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe he said seconds to tens
2 of seconds.
3 MR. GOECKE: And do you agree with that testimony?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, it depends. I mean, it
5 depends on context. If we're talking about a, a well-
6 ventilated, well-mixed smog chamber in the laboratory, I
7 believe he's correct; if we're talking about the atmosphere,
8 and the gas queue and the atmosphere turbulence, it's not
9 correct.
10 MR. GOECKE: And why is there a difference between
11 the rate at which NO converts to NO₂ in a chamber as opposed
12 to in the atmosphere?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: The smog chamber, they have fans
14 that are running that are mixing the air up, to a large
15 extent, so they can measure conversion rates. In the
16 atmosphere, we don't have the fans; we have turbulence and
17 atmospheric diffusion, and these processes take much more
18 time to completely mix to the molecular level. The ozone
19 that's outside the plan would be with the NO that's inside
20 the plan. It takes, takes time, takes lots of time. So
21 it's, he's, he's not incorrect in a sense that the reaction
22 is fast, but in order for the reaction to happen, there has
23 to be contact to the molecular level. That takes a lot of
24 time. Atmospheric turbulence is not mixing things molecular
25 right away; atmospheric turbulence is moving chunks around

Page 49

1 of, of exhaust gas, in this case, and it's, it's spreading
2 it around, but it's not mixing it to the molecular level
3 until it gets into really fine-scale turbulence and, and
4 actually, atmospheric diffusion, which is an extremely slow
5 process. So that's why the literature shows, you know,
6 kilometers of travel, not a lot of conversions taking place.
7 MR. GOECKE: And talk about that, and make sure
8 that conversion process with the, what is actually required
9 to transform NO to NO₂? How does that process work?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: They, there are several mechanisms.
11 You know, NO₂ can do some conversions of very high levels of
12 NO, but the primary mechanism is NO, NO and ozone reacting
13 to form NO₂. That's the primary, primary reaction. But
14 again, that reaction can only take place if there is
15 intimate contact with the molecules, at the molecular level.
16 That, that's the key issue.
17 MR. GOECKE: Which leads us to the OLM. Tell us
18 what OLM is generally.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: The ozone limited method, limiting
20 method is a, a procedure that's acknowledged in the, in our
21 community, to be very conservative, in this --
22 MR. GOECKE: In which community?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: In the modeling community, it's
24 conservative treatments that attempts to -- well, it does,
25 it allows the conversion of NO to NO₂ by have, by first

1 inputting what the initial ratio from the point of release
 2 is in a stack, or the exhaust pipe in this case, what is the
 3 initial ratio of NO₂ to NO_x, and then it allows conversion
 4 of the remaining NO on a one-to-one basis with how much
 5 ozone is in the air.

6 It assumes that there's complete mixing right
 7 away, which we all know doesn't happen, which makes it a
 8 conservative procedure; assumes it's completely mixed in
 9 the, there's contact between the ozone and the plume right
 10 away, and it, what converts does convert. But if there's
 11 less ozone than NO, it can't convert it all, and so we'll,
 12 you'll only convert what's available in the atmosphere at
 13 that point in time.

14 MR. GOECKE: Okay. When would a modeler apply the
 15 OLM method?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: In the past, it hasn't been
 17 required a lot because the, the standard was an annual
 18 standard for NO₂, but generally, it was pretty, it was
 19 relatively easy to meet. 2010, when they, they brought in
 20 the one-hour standard, the OLM became more necessary, as did
 21 many other refinements because what was found in the
 22 modeling community is that modeling, were using conservative
 23 assumptions, was producing concentrations that far exceeded
 24 what you could make. So there was way too much conservatism
 25 with the one-hour NO, NO₂. And the ozone limiting method

1 option into the AERMOD dispersion model. So in that
 2 context, they, they've accepted it as a tier 3 approach.

3 MR. GOECKE: Are there any peer review articles
 4 that discuss using OLM?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, there are.

6 MR. GOECKE: And have you cited any of them in
 7 your rebuttal report?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: I, I certainly cited a lot of
 9 literature regarding ratios to use in the OLM and so forth,
 10 and I cited Fox, a Fox, Mr. Fox memo, which describes the
 11 OLM method. Not published, but it was an EPA memorandum.

12 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And what was the
 13 significance of that memo? Why did you refer to that in
 14 your report?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: EPA produced that memo because of
 16 the outcry from, from industry, industry --

17 MS. ROSENFELD: Could you identify the memo by
 18 date or is it an exhibit so I know what he's talking about?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Fox 2011, I believe it was.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: And identify Mr. Fox too. I think
 21 we have previously identified him, but just --

22 MR. SULLIVAN: It's my reference, it's in
 23 reference here. I'm referring to a memorandum dated March
 24 1st, 2011, Tyler Fox, leader, air quality modeling group, to
 25 regional air division directors, entitled, additional

1 helped to some degree, and it helps more if you're talking
 2 about a power plant stack, but for a, a location like a gas
 3 queue, would be, where you have receptors inside the source,
 4 yeah, it doesn't help. It's, it helps to some degree but
 5 not a lot.

6 MR. GOECKE: And when might a modeler apply OLM
 7 then?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, it's a tier process that Dr.
 9 Cole and I both discussed. I mean, you, we started with
 10 tier 1, assuming it's 100 percent NO, NO₂ simplicity -- good
 11 thing when you can do it. But this case here, you know, we
 12 had more and more discussion, we went to stage 2, now we're
 13 going to stage 3. You go to the higher level of resolution
 14 as necessary, and in this case, we concluded, based upon Dr.
 15 Cole's points and testimony, that we'll, well, we'll go,
 16 we'll apply the OLM.

17 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: We didn't really think it was
 19 necessary, but just for completeness, we, we ran it.

20 MR. GOECKE: And in your opinion, is the OLM
 21 commonly accepted in the air modeling community?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: With the reservations that I've
 23 given, but yes, it is acceptable.

24 MR. GOECKE: And what do you base that opinion on?

25 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, EPA certainly has put that

1 clarification regarding application of Appendix W modeling
 2 guidance for the one-hour NO₂ national ambient air quality
 3 standard.

4 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.

5 MR. SILVERMAN: What is that? My recollection is
 6 that is an exhibit, actual recollection.

7 MR. GOECKE: I think it is, Mr. Silverman. It's
 8 also listed on page 21 of the rebuttal report for a full
 9 citation.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm sorry, what is Mr. Fox's
 11 position?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: He is the -- let me get the exact
 13 title here -- Mr. Fox is the leader of the air quality
 14 modeling group, U.S. EPA, office air quality planning
 15 standards.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

17 MR. GOECKE: And Mr. Sullivan, how did you apply
 18 the OLM method in your rebuttal report?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: In our rebuttal report, we needed
 20 to deal with a situation where there were receptors inside
 21 the source. We have a gas queue, we have receptors inside
 22 the gas queue and adjacent to the gas queue where it would
 23 not be feasible to have complete mixing to the molecular
 24 level between the outside ozone and the NO₂ from the source
 25 itself. So what we, what we did is we applied the, the

Page 54

1 method and we set a, a boundary of 40 meters based upon the
2 period of reviewed literature, 40 meters outside the gas
3 queue where we would very, very conservatively allow the OLM
4 to begin. We, we write references to justify that, and, and
5 also, it's, it's certainly, it's only 10, basically, it's 10
6 dilutions away from the gas queue itself, which is very
7 little compared to getting down to molecular contact.
8 So we, we, in my judgment, it'd be, it'd be a
9 kilometer or more before you'd actually have that kind of
10 contact. We conservatively set it at 40 based upon the
11 literature as a way of being able to apply the method to
12 this particular application.
13 MR. GOECKE: 40 what?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: 40 meters.
15 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And when you say you cited
16 to references to support that, what references are you
17 referring to?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Appendix B of my rebuttal report
19 where I believe we provided the, all, for the references.
20 For example, I, as referenced in the Janssen et al. 1986,
21 that's one, one reference.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: This is at page 21, references.
23 MR. SULLIVAN: I was referring to page 27,
24 Appendix B of the --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 55

1 MR. SULLIVAN: -- I called it out, but let me see.
2 Was page 21 the references.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: List is Jenson, the, or Janssen.
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Janssen 86, that would be, that
5 would be one of the, an example referenced, environment
6 agency 2007 --
7 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry.
8 MS. CORDRY: Wait a minute.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: Did --
10 MS. CORDRY: Wait, wait, wait.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Did you say page 27?
12 MS. ADELMAN: Page 28.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Page 20, we're looking at reference
14 list on page 21, there where we list references.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: And Janssen 86 was one of the
16 references I've just mentioned. Environmental, environment
17 agency 2007 was another example, a reference.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: And that is --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: That's the first reference on page
20 21.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: It, you're talking about the one
22 titled, mixing of ambient air in a plume?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I, so I just read it, two
24 references, environment agency, review of methods of NO, NO2
25 conversion --

Page 56

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Got it.
2 MR. SULLIVAN: -- in plumes, and Janssen et al,
3 which would be mixing of ambient air in a plume and its
4 effects on the oxidation of NO, 1986, that's the, another
5 example that I've provided.
6 MS. CORDRY: And just a question. This says
7 environment agency. Is this the EPA or is this some other
8 environmental agency?
9 MR. SULLIVAN: It's a different environmental
10 agency.
11 MS. CORDRY: Okay. Do we know which one?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: The report was provided. I have
13 the copy of it here. It's not a U.S. agency. It's an
14 Australian regulatory agency.
15 MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan, when you testified
16 about putting, where to locate the receptor, would it be
17 appropriate to put the receptor right in the queue itself?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it's not standard procedure to
19 do that. We did in this case because that's what being
20 discussed, but when EPA, we do modeling for EPA or states,
21 we put receptors on sidewalks; we don't put receptors in the
22 roadways.
23 MR. GOECKE: And why not?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: It's a transient source. I mean,
25 that's, if, the EPA guidance doesn't recommend putting

Page 57

1 receptors in transient sources.
2 MR. GOECKE: And that's what --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, isn't there a distinction
4 there because people aren't standing in the middle of the
5 roadway, but they are going to be located, for some period
6 of time, in the middle of queue. Is there a distinction
7 there?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: We, there is a distinction in that
9 context because they will be waiting while they're getting
10 gas --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: -- but the other point we made, we
13 showed that they'll only be there on a 40-queue day or hour
14 for, for at least 20 minutes. So it, they, they're not
15 there even for a full, a full hour, which the standard is
16 based upon. So, and that, that's been discussed in the past
17 as well. But it's not standard procedure to model inside
18 transient areas like a loading dock or a gas queue, it's
19 not, not a standard procedure.
20 MR. GOECKE: Does the time and distance it takes
21 for NO to convert to NO2 have anything to do with where you
22 locate receptors?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Not in this case. We would locate
24 the receptors where the points of concern were raised. I
25 mean, the opposition raised concerns about the gas queue.

Page 58

1 We, we put, we put receptors there to address the, the
2 issue, by the loading dock, recognizing that's not a typical
3 place that we model for, but in this case, to, for
4 completeness of the record, we, we put receptors there. But
5 it's not, that was not related to conversion time.
6 MR. GOECKE: One of Dr. Cole's criticisms was that
7 you underestimated exposure levels for folks in the queue by
8 assuming 20 minutes in a queue and then 40 minutes at
9 background levels. How do you respond to that criticism?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the hard numbers were
11 showing, including the February report. We're, we had them
12 there for a whole hour. And we're, we're not, we didn't
13 take credit for that fact; we just used that as, as a point
14 of context, as a background. But the reality is, they'll be
15 there 20 minutes on a bad, high queue day, and then they'll
16 get away from that, that zone. And as you can see with any
17 of the figures in my report, once you get away from the gas
18 queue area, if you go to the mall, you drive away, your
19 concentration is going to go down substantially.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: You're saying that your actual
21 figures that you calculated were not based on dividing the
22 one-hour exposure level by a third because it was only 20
23 minutes? That was just a side observation?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: That's a side observation for
25 context. And one of the ways it's conservative, that they

Page 59

1 aren't, they are not there for the full hour to experience
2 that full exposure.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I understand the point; I'm
4 just saying that Dr. Cole was put out by the fact that he
5 felt that that was a, as I recall his testimony, an improper
6 procedure or way to apply the EPA one-hour standard. But
7 you're telling me that you didn't apply it that way; you
8 actually just made the observation, but your actual figures
9 were based on the full one-hour standard.
10 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
12 MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan, does your report make
13 any final conclusions for maximum one-hour NO2
14 concentrations?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, it does.
16 MR. GOECKE: And would you mind taking us to that
17 page of your report on the slide?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, actually, my, my conclusion
19 is very short, it's one sentence and it's rather general,
20 but it would apply to NO2 one-hour in any, any conclusion of
21 discussion. And my statement was, it is Mr. Sullivan's
22 expert opinion, within a reasonable degree of scientific
23 certainty, that the proposed Costco gas station will not
24 violate any applicable federal or state ambient air quality
25 standards, and I stand behind that statement.

Page 60

1 MR. GOECKE: And in terms of the one-hour NO2
2 level, can you remind us what the EPA national ambient air
3 quality standard is?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: 98th percentile value is 190
5 micrograms per cubic meter.
6 MR. GOECKE: And what do you model locating the
7 concentrations based on the activities from the proposed
8 Costco gas station?
9 MR. SULLIVAN: The most accurate assessment we
10 have, we've done with the least amount of overstatement
11 would be stage 3 NO2 one-hour, which showed a maximum of 121
12 micrograms per cubic meter.
13 MR. GOECKE: I'd like to turn to some of the
14 points that Dr. Breyse made in his testimony. Were you
15 here when Dr. Breyse testified?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I was.
17 MR. GOECKE: All right. And do you recall his
18 testimony about the uncertainty that's involved in air
19 modeling?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: I do.
21 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And do you have any comments
22 and response to his testimony?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, Mr., I mean, Dr. Breyse
24 testified that for publishing technical papers in
25 environmental journals, for example, that the uncertainty

Page 61

1 generally addressed by Monte Carlo methods with a, with a
2 95th percentile value explained to provide an uncertainty
3 range for, for values. That, that was his position.
4 MR. GOECKE: And can you explain what a Monte
5 Carlo method is again?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: Monte Carlo means really, if you
7 have a, an input parameter that, that has uncertainty or has
8 variability, you can, you can basically spin the roulette
9 wheel and you're going to come up with an open number to
10 pick from among that distribution, and you model with that
11 number. And you'll run it, you'll simulate many years of
12 operation, and you can come up with an idea of the
13 distribution; how you're going to get the best estimate
14 might be 121, you might show as a range from 80 to 160. It
15 allows you to come up with that range by, by kind of
16 perturbing that variable and putting all the range that you
17 would into it and see what you got. I don't disagree with
18 that. I've done that. We developed a model to do that,
19 called FEMS.
20 MR. GOECKE: Called what?
21 MR. SULLIVAN: FEMS, F-E-M-S, is an agricultural
22 model that does Monte Carlo and comes up with distributions.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: You say we developed one. You mean
24 you yourself developed one?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: My firm, Sullivan Environmental,

1 developed a model that, that does just what Dr. Breyse was
2 talking about.

3 MR. GROSSMAN: And when was that developed?

4 MR. SULLIVAN: That was, that was developed in
5 2004, went before the EPA Science Advisory Panel, it was
6 accepted late 2004.

7 MR. GOECKE: Accepted by whom?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: The U.S. EPA. But the, the
9 fundamental difference is the air quality standards are not
10 percentile driven, their best estimate standards. So while
11 I don't disagree with him in, in context in showing
12 uncertainty -- you know, we do it for different contexts and
13 we do it for scientific papers, which I have done -- but for
14 evaluation next to the standards, it's a best, it's the
15 best-fit number. There is not a, there's not a place to put
16 that distribution in -- not required, not done. So it was
17 more academic, in my opinion, it was not -- interesting
18 information, but it was not applicable to this matter at
19 hand.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't, I really don't understand
21 your answer. You said that these standards are not
22 percentile driven, and we talked before about 98th
23 percentile for background levels as the EPA standard, so
24 would you explain that difference to me? I don't
25 understand.

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. What, what we're doing with,
2 with the 98th percentile means, we're modeling, we're taking
3 five views of meteorological data --

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

5 MR. SULLIVAN: -- and we're modeling it
6 separately, and we're determining what the average 98th
7 percentile is from that hard data set.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: We ran it 100 times with the same
10 exact answer. What Dr. Breyse was referring to is looking
11 at Monte Carlo distributions to see, well, let's say the
12 emission rate, we say it's, it's 100 units, but there's an
13 uncertainty range in that; it could be anywhere from 50 to
14 150. Well, let's vary it from 50 to 150. Each time you do
15 it, you're modeling an hour, let's go into that distribution
16 and pull a number. Maybe now it's going to be 79, next time
17 it's 142.

18 That, that approach is quite different where it'll
19 show you, here's my 98th percentile value, but here's the
20 range around that value. We say it's 121, it could be 80 to
21 160. It's, it's a different concept, it has a, it's
22 considering uncertainty in the input variables.

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And why is it that this
24 uncertainty factor is not appropriate for your kind of
25 modeling?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, it's actually, EPA's
2 guideline models do not require or even recommend that
3 uncertainty be part of the analysis. Their procedure is to
4 run the dispersion model, such as AERMOD, and put in
5 appropriate emissions information, representative
6 meteorological data, and rely upon that result.

7 For example, when I, when I submitted permits to
8 the EPA on behalf of, of applicants, for the air quality
9 permit to construct, for example, the EPA doesn't say, well,
10 I see you say you're under the standard, but what would
11 happen if you considered uncertainty in your analysis. I
12 mean, that's, that's a question that does not come up in
13 regulatory modeling that I've ever seen. I'm not saying it
14 has never happened, but I've never seen it applied that way.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: But let's say in this case; that
16 is, this application for special exception, I'm not, even if
17 I utilize EPA standards as a guideline, they're not directly
18 within the statute. The statute here talks about adverse
19 impacts on health. And so wouldn't uncertainty, in terms of
20 the projection, be a factor I'd have to consider?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: You, you certainly could, but in,
22 in considering that, I've made points all along, that for
23 example, when the NO2 one-hour value, let's say it's, we're
24 modeling 121, the measurements next to major highways are
25 like in the 80s and 90s, so I can make the, I think I can

1 make the argument persuasively that it's pretty unlikely
2 that the ring road's going to be higher, and that gas
3 station is going to be higher than I-95, so there's still a
4 residual uncertainty. If you're considering uncertainty,
5 most of it's in the upper end, and the actual, actual
6 realistic number is likely to be much lower than 121. So I
7 think if you consider uncertainty, really, it's going to
8 lower the number, have a much less probability of increasing
9 it.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: But of course, I also have to
11 factor in the other evidence that you presented earlier in
12 the case -- I mean, the 121 figure is based on your rebuttal
13 report -- but there were earlier figures that were
14 considerably higher.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: We showed 160 earlier, and that's
16 based on modeling NOX, 100 percent NOX and using that, that
17 procedure, and I'll stand behind that as being a
18 conservative representation. But would there be a need to
19 scale that if they hit higher? I'd say, well, well no, I
20 mean, it's, it's already very conservatively addressing NO2,
21 but going to a higher tier at this point in response to
22 context.

23 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, I'll let you
24 continue, counsel.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: Generally, a higher tier will trump

Page 66

1 the lower tier, lower tier analysis.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: We may be playing no trump.
3 MR. SULLIVAN: What's that?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: We may be playing no trump in this
5 hand -- for bridge players.
6 MR. SULLIVAN: Right.
7 MR. GOECKE: So building on what Mr. Grossman was
8 just asking you, how would you compare the assumptions that
9 you made in conducting your air modeling with another that
10 might include a range or a percentage of uncertainty?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, my, my expectation, if I
12 was trying to remove all conservatism completely and
13 identify uncertainty in different parameters, as Dr. Breyse
14 mentioned, my expectation is that the upper bound of that
15 analysis would be more like the 121 I have right now, and
16 the best fit or number would be more in the order of 80
17 micrograms or less. The lower bound could be much lower
18 than that. And many assumptions that have been made are
19 highly conservative.
20 MR. GOECKE: And I believe I asked Dr. Breyse
21 about that, with the different assumptions that you use,
22 whether or not that would sort of accomplish the same goal
23 as establishing a range of anticipated emission levels.
24 What's your opinion on that?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think by, by having

Page 67

1 embedded conservatism in a principle, you're, you're
2 responding to that issue because you're saying, look, I know
3 there's some uncertainty, I'm going to be conservative, and
4 you put that conservatism in. But at the end of the day,
5 you look at your modeling, you look at reality, people
6 measuring it, you say, well, this is pretty high, and you
7 can use some judgment then to interpret that model. The
8 modeling is, is a tool, but it has to be interpreted
9 relative to the other, other facts at hand here. And the
10 measured data are extremely relevant where they exist. And
11 they're, they're a lot lower than this thing, than we're
12 modeling here.
13 MR. GOECKE: And by measured data, you're
14 referring to what?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Measured one-hour NO2 98th
16 percentile data.
17 MR. GOECKE: At where?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the examples I gave was of
19 the I-710 in L.A., a highway in Las Vegas, and I-95 in, in
20 Richmond, Virginia.
21 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And so to Mr. Grossman's
22 point, if there is concern that the conservative assumptions
23 you made in your earlier reports produce numbers that are
24 closer to the EPA max than where you're at now, how is he or
25 anyone to know that those numbers are, aren't, in reality,

Page 68

1 going to be higher?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: I, there's two answers. One is,
3 that we have done a higher tier analysis. Standard EPA
4 procedure is you go from tier 1 to tier 2 to tier 3, relying
5 upon the more refined analysis as being more definitive.
6 But secondly, the earlier analysis would show 160 micrograms
7 as the, as the value. That's higher than I-710 in L.A.
8 What are the odds of that being, being correct, accurate?
9 It's conservative. It's an overstatement. Monitor would
10 never reach that value on a 98th percentile basis at that
11 mall or near the mall. It wouldn't happen. I mean, you
12 could ask, you could ask anybody in the profession. You
13 expect to see an exceedance at Wheaton Mall? They'd say no.
14 Based upon the measured data that exists --
15 MS. CORDRY: Can we object to that --
16 MS. ADELMAN: Yes.
17 MR. SILVERMAN: Object.
18 MS. CORDRY: -- please? Ask anybody that --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: You can object to, you don't have
20 to ask me permission to object.
21 MS. CORDRY: Well --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: You --
23 MS. CORDRY: -- then I will object to that. I
24 think it goes a long way beyond speculation to have Mr.
25 Sullivan decide what everybody else in the industry is going

Page 69

1 to say.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm going to sustain that
3 objection. Even though I recognize that's kind of his
4 opinion, he's an expert, he's giving his opinion, but
5 phrased in the way of asking anybody and they'll tell you is
6 problematic, so I'm going to sustain that objection.
7 MR. SULLIVAN: I reword my statement?
8 MS. CORDRY: Because we have someone else in the
9 industry who does not have that impression, so --
10 MS. ROSENFELD: We proffer.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: They proffer they have somebody
12 else who disagrees. But in any event --
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I'll --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- yes, you can reword that.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: I'll reword to saying that if, in
16 my judgment, if you would ask most state regulators involved
17 in air quality, if they would expect the violation of the
18 one-hour NO2 standard at the Wheaton Mall, based on this gas
19 station, you'd have a hard time finding one that would say
20 yes.
21 MS. CORDRY: Well, I think you would have a hard
22 time finding --
23 MS. ADELMAN: Uh-huh.
24 MS. CORDRY: -- any of them that would have had --
25 MS. ADELMAN: Uh-huh.

Page 70

1 MS. CORDRY: -- any involvement in this --
2 MS. ADELMAN: I disagree.
3 MS. CORDRY: -- so I think --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, okay, we're not, this is not
5 the debating society.
6 MS. CORDRY: No. Objection to speculation.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: This is his -- I understand.
8 MS. CORDRY: Objection to speculation.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I think that it's a fair objection.
10 On the other hand, it is an expression of his opinion as an
11 expert on this as to what, based on his experience in the
12 industry as to what regulators would say. So I'm going to
13 allow it and give it the weight it deserves.
14 MS. CORDRY: Which is nothing.
15 MR. GOECKE: So moving on, given the amount of
16 modeling that you and your firm have performed for the site,
17 in your opinion, has there been a sufficient, has the
18 modeling been sufficient, or do you think there's more
19 modeling that needs to be done?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I don't think more modeling
21 needs to be done. It's sufficient.
22 MS. CORDRY: We would agree with that. No more
23 modeling.
24 MR. GOECKE: Dr. Breyse, for example, suggested
25 that the hearing examiner should consider the synergistic

Page 71

1 effects of the chemicals that are, the concentration of
2 chemicals. Do you have any response to that?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: I do. The, in theory, it would be
4 nice to address synergistic effects on air pollution, but
5 the EPA doesn't know how to do it. It's not required by
6 EPA, they, they really don't have a handle on that.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: I think, wasn't he talking more
8 about health, the synergistic effects of these combined
9 pollutants in terms of health, not within this witness's
10 expertise. I don't know that he was saying that -- and
11 maybe I'm remembering it incorrectly -- but I don't know
12 that he was saying that the synergistic effects of the
13 various molecules in the air would have on each other; I
14 think he was talking about the synergistic effects of NO2
15 plus PM2.5, etcetera, on health.
16 MR. GOECKE: I think that's correct. I think one
17 of his criticisms of Mr. Sullivan's report were that it
18 didn't address the, do any analysis of the synergistic
19 effects in terms of identifying what levels there might be.
20 MS. CORDRY: I don't think he --
21 MR. GOECKE: Let me ask it this way.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know. Well, he can --
23 MR. GOECKE: Let me --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: -- ask the question.
25 MR. GOECKE: Let me ask it this way. And it

Page 72

1 sounds like you may have already answered this, but does EPA
2 have any thresholds that applicants must meet in terms of
3 measuring synergistic levels?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: No. An EPA, for example, in the
5 Clean Air Act, has national ambient air quality standards.
6 Each one is reviewed separately. So the PM2.5 is reviewed,
7 then SO2 is reviewed, and so forth. There's no combination.
8 What it, you don't add up CO --
9 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
10 MR. SULLIVAN: -- and SO2. It's not, it's not
11 part of the requirements.
12 MR. GOECKE: Right.
13 MR. SILVERMAN: Can we take a short break at some
14 point?
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's see how much, how many,
16 how much more do you figure is in your direct examination,
17 Mr. Goecke?
18 MR. GOECKE: I think I'll be done in 15 to 20
19 minutes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Do you want to
21 continue until you're finished or take a break now?
22 MR. GOECKE: We can take a break.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let's do that then. We'll
24 take a five-minute break.
25 (Whereupon, at 11:18 a.m., a brief recess was

Page 73

1 taken.)
2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are you ready to
3 proceed, Mr. Goecke?
4 MR. GOECKE: I am. Just wait one moment for Ms.
5 Harris. May I begin?
6 MR. GROSSMAN: You may.
7 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
8 Mr. Sullivan, in terms of PM2.5, Dr. Cole
9 testified that the PM2.5 levels off the mall site are not
10 likely to be significant, but still thinks that the levels
11 on the mall site itself may be significant. Do you agree
12 with him?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: I agree with the concentrations off
14 the mall are not significant; I don't agree with the latter
15 statement. We have specifically modeled it in the rebuttal
16 report and showed the concentrations were within the
17 standards.
18 MR. GOECKE: And do, can you tell us what the
19 anticipated emissions of PM2.5 from the COSTCO gas station
20 activities might be?
21 MR. SULLIVAN: The reports shows, showed the
22 culpability review for the 98th percentile value, and it
23 showed that the -- I'll find the page number in a minute.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: For the 90th percentile value or --
25 MR. SULLIVAN: 98th percentile. Let me find it

Page 74

1 here. I'm sorry -- the annual average, I should say, PM2.5
2 annual average value -- let me find the page that's it on
3 now. It's on page 14 of the February 14th rebuttal report.
4 MS. CORDRY: That is, looks like --
5 MR. SULLIVAN: 14.
6 MS. CORDRY: Looks like --
7 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry. That's NO2, I know.
8 It's on page 16.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Page 16 of the February 21, 2014
10 rebuttal report?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, sir.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13 MR. GOECKE: And so you're bringing slide, or page
14 16 up on the --
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, yes I am.
16 MR. GOECKE: -- on the screen right now. And can
17 you tell us what your model contributions to the PM2.5
18 levels are on the various gas station activities?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the first line that I'm
20 showing, the gas station contribution, all sources was .92
21 micrograms per cubic meter and --
22 MR. GOECKE: And when you say all sources, what
23 does that include?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, that would primarily be the
25 combustion sources, which would be the, the queue and

Page 75

1 delivery trucks. But you see the maximum is occurring right
2 in the gas queue itself, the maximum total contribution from
3 the gas is .92 micrograms from the gas station. The total
4 value there, model value is 10.8 micrograms, which is under
5 the standard, but again, this is a location that no one
6 would spend a year in the middle of a gas queue. The values
7 shown towards the neighborhood and so forth are quite a bit
8 lower than that; in fact, they're under 10 micrograms a
9 cubic meter.
10 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And so the highest
11 concentration is 10.77 micrograms per cubic meter? Do I
12 read that correctly?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, you do.
14 MR. GOECKE: And that's for the one-hour average,
15 or what's the time period?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: That's an annual average.
17 MR. GOECKE: Right. I meant to say annual
18 average. Thank you. And what is the standard, the EPA
19 standard?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: The standard is 12 micrograms.
21 MR. GOECKE: 12.0 micrograms?
22 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
23 MR. GOECKE: And the total contribution from the
24 gas station activities are 0.92?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct for that particular

Page 76

1 location in the middle of the gas queue itself.
2 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And so I see you've got
3 different categories in the blue box there, including the
4 warehouse, parking, roads. Are those contributions only
5 related to traffic for the gas station, or is that all
6 traffic at the mall, or what do those numbers represent?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: That's from all, all traffic, and
8 the ring road, and the, and then specific roads to be
9 modeled in the parking lots from the warehouse operations,
10 and especially, background. As you can see, 9.8 micrograms
11 of the 10.77 is background.
12 MR. GOECKE: And where did you get your background
13 number from?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: The background was based upon the
15 higher of the Rockville or Beltsville site, which was, my
16 recollection was Rockville had the higher.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: And that's using urban dispersion
18 rates?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, that's correct. Because this
20 modeling all is, these receptors are inside the, the ring
21 road area, they're in the, they're in that zone that would
22 be urban.
23 MR. GOECKE: In terms of the contributions from
24 traffic to the gas station, where did you get the number of
25 vehicles that you used in your modeling?

Page 77

1 MR. SULLIVAN: We, we got our, our basic data from
2 the traffic group, Mr. Guckert.
3 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And have you been here for
4 some of the hearings when Mr. Guckert has testified?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I have.
6 MR. GOECKE: You're familiar then that the
7 opposition has suggested that Mr. Traffic, Mr. Guckert found
8 the traffic levels are lower than what they might actually
9 be?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, what I heard was that the
11 point of contention was that Mr. Guckert's numbers, the peak
12 numbers are based on weekday analysis, and the point of
13 contention was that weekends could have higher, or did have
14 higher traffic volumes at the mall.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's one of many things
16 they contended.
17 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: I heard that.
20 MR. GOECKE: In terms of the contribution from the
21 traffic and the ring road, let's start with PM2.5, what is
22 the anticipated, the model concentrations from ring road
23 traffic?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the ring road is showing
25 0.028, or about .03 micrograms per cubic meter.

Page 78

1 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And we've talked a lot with
2 Mr. Guckert about intersection 16, which I'll point to on
3 the screen, the northwest area of this photograph here. Did
4 you do modeling for that specific intersection?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: That would be considered as part of
6 our -- find the right category -- roads. The roads category
7 would include all those roadways other than the ring road,
8 so it would have included intersection 16 and 20,
9 University, Veirs Mill, and Georgia Avenue.
10 MR. GOECKE: Okay. So the roads line item on the
11 blue box on page 16 includes the nearby roads, including
12 intersection 16?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: It does.
14 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And can we go to your slide
15 for the one-hour NO2 levels, please?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Stage 3 is what we consider the
17 most accurate to least conservative, extra conservatism
18 built into it.
19 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: What page is that?
21 MR. GOECKE: And this is --
22 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm on page 13.
23 MR. GOECKE: This is page 13 of your report?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Page 13.
25 MR. GOECKE: Okay.

Page 79

1 MR. SILVERMAN: States what? Where?
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 13.
3 MR. SULLIVAN: Page 13.
4 MR. GOECKE: And the total concentrations model
5 that is shown on page 13 are what?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: Approximately 121 micrograms per
7 cubic meter at a location inside the gas queue.
8 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And that's again for the one-
9 hour NO2 levels?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct. Figure 3 of my
11 February 14th, 2014 rebuttal report.
12 MR. GOECKE: Okay. If the traffic levels that you
13 based your modeling on were lower than the amount of cars
14 that are actually going to be traveling to the site, what
15 effect might that have on these calculations?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, my traffic number that we
17 used, the most significant one is for the ring road, the
18 southern ring road, and in that location, we used 639
19 vehicles. The updated information from Mr. Guckert was, it
20 was actually 783, which is a higher number than what we had.
21 MR. GOECKE: And what was the number you used?
22 MR. SULLIVAN: 639.
23 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
24 MR. SULLIVAN: So it's approximately 23 percent
25 difference. So if I went to the ring road, for example, 7.6

Page 80

1 micrograms, multiplied that times 23 percent increase, I'd
2 be at 9.29, 9.3, it would go up approximately one, one and a
3 half micrograms per cubic meter, from 121 to maybe 122, 122
4 and a half.
5 The other, the other issue is roads. So roads
6 1.43 -- the two issues I, as I recall though, if I remember
7 Mr. Guckert's testimony, I believe he said that the mall
8 traffic was higher in the weekends like I just described,
9 but that the traffic on other roads like Veirs Mill and
10 Georgia Avenue and University was lower in the weekday peak.
11 So there's some kind of balancing going on here.
12 But bottom line, if I were to take the highest
13 value, the weekend highest peak hour and assume it happened
14 all the time, every hour the mall is open, that I would come
15 up with a number in the order of maybe 2 micrograms higher,
16 maybe it's 123, counting other roads, counting the parking
17 lots, counting the ring road. So it's, it's a fact that it,
18 it's, the actual peak is higher, it's not, doesn't
19 significantly affect what I am doing, but clearly, the
20 number went up about 23 percent.
21 MR. GOECKE: And just refresh our recollection,
22 did you, when you used the traffic numbers, did you use peak
23 hour or did you use the average? What level traffic did you
24 use in your modeling?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: For all, all sources, it's, from

Page 81

1 the ring road in, which would be the ring road and the
2 parking lot, we used the peak weekday hour to represent all
3 hours the mall is open. And I'll contend that that's much
4 more, much more conservative than if we had used scalars to
5 show how that varied weekend, weekday throughout the, the
6 week.
7 MR. GOECKE: And why is that?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, because the peak Saturday
9 value occurs for an hour or two, and the mall is open, what,
10 15 hours every day? Generally, the five days of the week,
11 the numbers are significantly lower than that peak value.
12 By fixing the modeling to the peak value, it simplifies the
13 modeling, but obviously, it overstates it. The bottom line
14 is Mr. Guckert's change did not have the material effect on
15 our bottom line estimates for NO2, PM2.5, or for carbon
16 monoxide.
17 MR. SILVERMAN: May I ask a question for
18 clarification? Is stage 3 tier 3?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: There, yes, it is, it is considered
20 stage, tier 3.
21 MR. SILVERMAN: All right. All right.
22 MR. GOECKE: One of the other points raised by Dr.
23 Cole is that the MOVES versus Mobile6.1 in terms of
24 estimating motion levels. How did you address that in your
25 rebuttal report?

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we, we clarified, I mean, we,
2 we agree with Dr. Cole on the fleet average basis -- that
3 statement is correct, the literature shows that's correct --
4 but the fleet is not going through the COSTCO gas station.
5 What's going through the COSTCO gas station are gasoline
6 vehicles.

7 And the bottom line is, for, for gasoline
8 vehicles, Mobile6 is higher than MOVES, not lower. And so
9 we made, we properly adjusted for that in this modeling
10 based upon literature that shows, shows that fact. The
11 reason the fleet is so much higher is due to diesels,
12 standard heavy-duty diesels, passenger diesels, which are
13 underestimated by Mobile6 by factors shown to be 20 to 30-
14 fold. That weights the fleet average quite a bit.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that this
16 distinction of Mobile6 versus MOVES -- MOVES10, I guess it's
17 called -- where Dr. Cole testified that the values, I guess
18 for PM2.5, should be 10 times higher in MOVES than they
19 would be in Mobile6, but that's not correct when you're
20 considering only gasoline vehicles?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: No, we, we didn't disagree on
22 PM2.5. I accepted Dr. Cole's position. We factored up, on
23 the rebuttal report, we factored up the queue, for example,
24 to add an extra safety factor to get it up to 10. This
25 issue is specific to NO, to NO2.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay, so you're not talking
2 about NO2 now.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we might be --

4 MR. GROSSMAN: You're not talking about PM2.5 now?

5 MR. SULLIVAN: No.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: Where there was that 1 to 10 factor
7 difference between Mobile6 and MOVES?

8 MR. SULLIVAN: I think we're in agreement on that
9 point. It was, it was the NO2, I just made the
10 clarification. We're actually in disagreement, on the fleet
11 basis, we do agree, but the issue -- maybe we don't -- but
12 the issues on the actual numbers themselves, the literature
13 shows, by category, what's going on, and Mobile6 is higher,
14 higher than MOVES and higher than measured values.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. Let me
16 just, I just want to eliminate the PM2.5. So you're, what
17 you just, the statements you just made have nothing to do
18 with the PM2.5 measurements in which it's been testified
19 there was a 10 to 1 difference between MOVES and Mobile6, is
20 that correct?

21 MR. SULLIVAN: It did not address that, no.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Now, you're addressing NO2,
23 and you're saying, where there was testimony that there was
24 a 2 to 1 difference, MOVES showing twice the amount of NO2
25 compared to Mobile6. What you're saying now is, that's not

1 correct when you're talking about gasoline vehicles alone.
2 Is that what you're saying? That it's actually reversed? I
3 just want to understand you.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: It's not a factor to reverse, but
5 it's, it's, maybe on the order of 30 percent, 40 percent,
6 depending on which literature you look at, that MOVES is
7 maybe 30 or 40 percent higher than, than MOVES. Mobile6 is
8 higher than MOVES by 30 to 40 percent.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's the reverse of what, I
10 think the prior testimony was, that for NO2, MOVES would
11 show twice the level of NO2 compared to Mobile6.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: And that statement is --

13 MR. GROSSMAN: And you're saying it's more than
14 the reverse of that, it's not, now, it's not, it's no longer
15 MOVES being, showing twice as much NO2 as Mobile 6, but now,
16 you're saying Mobile6 would show 20, 30, 40 percent more
17 than MOVES.

18 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct on a specific
19 gasoline vehicle basis, but I, the issue, the previous
20 statement, I believe, was reasonably correct on a fleet
21 average. This was --

22 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I just want to make
23 sure I understand what you're saying. I understand the
24 fleet versus the gasoline vehicles, but all right. I don't
25 know if I've heard that difference before. Go ahead.

1 MR. GOECKE: What did you apply in your rebuttal
2 report? MOVES or Mobile6?

3 MR. SULLIVAN: We used, we used Mobile6. We, we
4 did it just for MOVES, like we did for PM2.5, but in this
5 case, it reduced by 20 percent.

6 MR. GOECKE: And that's PM2.5 or NO2?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: That's for NO2.

8 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And so the scaling effect
9 between Mobile6 and MOVES depends on which contaminant
10 you're talking about, doesn't it?

11 MR. SULLIVAN: Which pollutant, yes.

12 MR. GOECKE: Which pollutant, all right. You
13 mentioned that using the fleet average overstates the
14 application at this site. Can you elaborate on that, why
15 that is?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the basic issue is that the
17 fleet average is quite a bit affected by the diesels. Even
18 though diesels aren't a large fraction of the mix, you know,
19 they're underestimated by 20- to 30-fold, which literature
20 says that are with Mobile6. Well, that has a big effect on
21 the overall emissions from the fleet. So by, by
22 specifically looking at gasoline, which is what they're
23 selling here, we can refine the treatment. And we're, we're
24 adjusting for MOVES like was suggested, but for NO2, it goes
25 down a little bit. We adjusted it 20 percent down. And for

1 PM2.5, we factored it up to, to 10, try to reach consensus
2 on, well, if they used MOVES, here's what we would come up
3 with.

4 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, how does that take into
6 account the fact that there are diesel trucks that are
7 running along the ring road, and that are delivering goods
8 at the warehouses, and so on?

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, these numbers pertain to the
10 gas queue itself, would be gasoline only. The other, you
11 know, we applied the fleet mix to those in Mobile6. You can
12 look at the culpability. It's a pretty small number, but I
13 think that that, you, you multiply them by, by the factor of
14 10, the particulates, you still wouldn't have a high, a high
15 value.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.

17 MR. GOECKE: Going back to what we talked about a
18 bit before about the levels of conservatism and uncertainty
19 percentages, one of the points that Dr. Breyse made was
20 that conservatism is in the eye of the beholder. Were you
21 here when he testified that?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: I was.

23 MR. GOECKE: And how do you respond to that
24 comment?

25 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, conservatism really

1 is, is relative to the, to the facts at hand here. If, if
2 we know, for, for example, that you know, that vehicles that
3 are traveling on a ring road have, have 5 or 10 percent NO2
4 in the mix, we're modeling at 25 percent for simplicity, I
5 mean, do the same as the, the queue, well, there's no,
6 should be no disagreement that that's the conservative
7 treatment. It's five times more than the NO2.

8 You know, we, where we could be, we tried to be
9 conservative in this analysis, and I think it's just based
10 on the facts, not just, it's not emotion, it's facts that
11 the, those, those numbers are overstated, as are the trends
12 I mentioned, those are coming down, and we're modeling for
13 when the gas station's open, we're using trends that go back
14 to 2012 in some cases; that this is just, this is an
15 overstatement. So I mean, I think you have to look at it in
16 the context of the facts.

17 MR. GOECKE: One of the other points that Dr.
18 Breyse made was that efforts being undertaken to monitor
19 NO2 levels near roadways could include roadways such as
20 University Boulevard. Are you aware of any such efforts
21 currently being undertaken to monitor NO2 levels near
22 roadways like University Boulevard?

23 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I think, there are, there are
24 NO2 monitors that have been sitting in environments. I
25 think he was referring to, though, the near-road monitors.

1 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.

2 MR. SULLIVAN: And the near-road monitors, the
3 state has a limited number of monitors, which they do,
4 they'll tend to put them near I-95, the Beltway, and places
5 like that, rather than University Boulevard, looking at
6 what's been shown so far in literature.

7 MR. GOECKE: Is there data available for what
8 those monitors are measuring so far?

9 MR. SULLIVAN: For most of them, the answer is no
10 because they're just getting started right now. Maryland
11 started April 1st of 2014. They were supposed to start
12 January 1st, but I think most of the states just are, have
13 had delays.

14 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And -- I'm sorry.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Is there any data available for
16 monitoring of gas stations of the proposed size here?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: You mean a monitor near a proposed
18 gas station of this size?

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

20 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't, I don't know the answer to
21 that. I, I have not seen that. That'd be pretty specific.

22 MR. GOECKE: Going back to Mr. Grossman's point
23 from earlier this morning about the levels of modeled
24 contaminants in your various reports, why should he have
25 confidence that the actual levels are going to be below what

1 you've modeled in your report, in your earlier reports?

2 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, we've explained the,
3 two ways. One, we've explained, the initial modeling that
4 included the assumption that 100 percent of the NOX was NO2,
5 and that modeling, you know, conservatively applied, showed
6 well under the standard. And then you compare the modeling
7 to available measurements that exist, and there aren't a lot
8 of locations right now that come online with near road, that
9 look at those as an extreme example. And you find that
10 those values, with the exception of Port of Long Beach, are,
11 are half of what that early modeling was.

12 MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. You say your
13 initial modeling, after corrected for the mathematical
14 errors, showed NO2 one-hour levels below the standard?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. It was, it was 160 as I
16 recall, in the August 2013 supplemental report. So if you
17 put the couple, that fact and the more recent higher tier
18 modeling that shows more accurate, and still conservative
19 numbers at 120, you compare those to the values being
20 measured at I-95 and other places along major highways, and
21 conclude, you know, this, this conversion of NO2, NO rather
22 to NO2 is happening slowly; otherwise, those highways would
23 have a lot more NO2 measurements next to them --

24 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: -- but they don't. So you put, you

Page 90

1 put, I'd say put the whole package together, conservative
2 modeling coupled with a linkage to available measured data
3 in extreme locations even, you find that the modeling tends
4 to be higher than those, those measurements, you conclude
5 the modeling is quite conservative.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: And I guess I asked my question
7 wrong. Are you saying that your NO2 one-hour levels, after
8 mathematically correcting, but without changes in other
9 assumptions made from your November 2012 report, showed NO2
10 one-hour levels below the standard?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: I think that is correct. But when
12 I just, may, in my August report 2013, I first just
13 corrected that error.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: And then I, then I showed the more
16 refined treatment.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And before you do the more
18 refined treatment, but just correcting the error --
19 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. That --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Then --
21 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Then the NO2 level, one-hour levels
23 were above the max standard, is that correct?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 91

1 MR. SULLIVAN: It would have been well above any
2 measured values that I've seen near anything for NO2.
3 MR. GOECKE: And in your initial report, what were
4 some of the levels of conservatism that you employed there,
5 that you're not employing, or that you may be have not
6 employed in the rebuttal report?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, early, earlier we assumed
8 that the 40-hour peak queue occurred all the time.
9 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh.
10 MR. SULLIVAN: And we assumed 100 percent NO2 was,
11 100 percent of the NOX was NO2.
12 MR. GOECKE: You treated all NOX as NO2?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. We, we're using, of
14 course, earlier trend, well, up the trend curve, higher
15 background values you would apply when the gas station's
16 open. And that's the example of factors that would tend to
17 make it an overstatement.
18 MR. GOECKE: Have you made any changes in your
19 assumptions about the trucks at the loading dock?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: We refined the trucks. I mean, the
21 initial modeling of the trucks, we had a tremendous
22 overstatement of their emissions. We, we made it more
23 realistic. But even to more current assessment, to be
24 conservative with the one-hour NO2, we had 72 trucks a day
25 in our model going there, but there's only 10 heavy-duty

Page 92

1 diesel trucks going there a day. And this, so it's still
2 quite a conservative treatment, but a lot less than the
3 treatment we had before when we had, you know, a lot of
4 trucks that created that peak that Mr. Grossman was
5 referring to that was higher than the standard at that, for
6 that, for those model runs at that point in time.
7 MR. GOECKE: And was the loading dock a
8 significant contributor of emissions?
9 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, that, that was the dominant
10 source. It affected that particular peak that he's
11 referring to.
12 MR. GOECKE: For which contaminants?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: That, well, that was for NO2.
14 MR. GOECKE: Uh-huh. And we testified, or you
15 testified a bit before about some of the levels of the
16 conservatism that still remain in your modeling analysis.
17 Can you just refresh us as to what those are?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, when I was referring to NO2,
19 one-hour, for example, I mentioned the fact that the idling
20 ratio, we used 25 percent, but the more, a period of the
21 literature shows that the midpoint value of prior idle in
22 that queue would be more like 20 percent, so there's some
23 conservatism built into the queue number itself right there.
24 I mentioned that the traveling cars along the ring
25 road and other roadways, we had 25 percent as initial ratio

Page 93

1 of NO2 to NOX; it's really, literature shows it's more like
2 5 to 10 percent issue. Those, there, I mean, those are two
3 examples of where the conservatism was still embedded in the
4 analysis.
5 And, and frankly, the trend line. I mean, we're
6 using, for the, this stage 3 modeling, we're using 2010 to
7 2012 background, but if you look at the curve, at the trend
8 line, it's going quite a bit down in 2012. And when the gas
9 station is open, it'll be lower.
10 So we have, we have the trend line, we have the
11 idling, we have the ring road, 20, 25 percent versus 5 to
12 10, and other railways, the same, the same thing. These are
13 all added up. As I indicated earlier, at least a 20-
14 microgram or so difference overstatement relative to what
15 we'd expect to see. But I wouldn't expect to see 100
16 micrograms. If you had a monitor there, 98th percentile,
17 why would it be higher than 995? It doesn't make sense to
18 me.
19 MR. GOECKE: Is it fair to say that these
20 conservative assumptions address some of the inherent
21 uncertainty in the process that Dr. Breyse was talking
22 about?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: That was the intent.
24 MR. GOECKE: You testified earlier that the EPA
25 has guidelines for the methodology to apply in air modeling.

Page 94

1 In your opinion, why does the EPA not require a Monte Carlo
2 methodology?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: It'd be difficult for them to
4 implement the regulations that way. I mean, where do you
5 draw the line? It's much more consistent and simpler to
6 say, you know, run, run a regulatory model and run it in a
7 way that's accurate. They don't cookie-cutter tell you
8 exactly how to do it, but run it in an accurate way and
9 we'll rely upon those results.
10 It promotes standardization and consistency. And
11 if they got in Monte Carlo in that kind of a standard, where
12 do you draw the line? You got to 99.99 percentile, you got
13 with the 75th percentile? It becomes much, much more
14 subjective and much more difficult to implement. And that's
15 a policy call that they've made. I mean, it's not my call;
16 it's EPA's call.
17 MR. SILVERMAN: I object. Are there facts in
18 evidence that indicate the EPA has not looked at uncertainty
19 in making their analysis?
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's testified to what he's
21 testified, and you can, and I don't think that's
22 objectionable, so I'll overrule on the objection.
23 MR. SILVERMAN: Did he, he testified to that, the
24 EPA doesn't look at uncertainty.
25 MR. SULLIVAN: I never said that.

Page 95

1 MR. GROSSMAN: No, he didn't say that; he had, he
2 said something, but I'm not going to review his testimony.
3 MR. SILVERMAN: All right. Thank you.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: I'll overrule the objection.
5 MR. GOECKE: One moment, please.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
7 MR. GOECKE: When you met with the opposition to
8 discuss the modeling protocol, did Dr. Cole or anyone else
9 suggest that a Monte Carlo type approach should be used
10 here?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't recall that, no.
12 MR. GOECKE: I have no further questions.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Shall we break for lunch
14 before cross-examination or -- I see a lot of shaking heads,
15 so I'll take it as yes. And I guess we'll give you a little
16 bit more time this time so we'll come back at 1 o'clock.
17 Does that work for everybody? 1 o'clock to resume with
18 cross-examination of Mr. Sullivan.
19 (Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., a luncheon recess was
20 taken.)
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Alrighty. Ready to go back on the
22 record? Okay. Who wishes, in the opposition, to begin the
23 cross-examination? Unless you don't have any cross-
24 examination.
25 MS. CORDRY: I --

Page 96

1 MR. GROSSMAN: They're just laughing at me.
2 You're not answering, just --
3 MS. CORDRY: You know, you do, you bring levity,
4 which is sorely needed from time to time. Thank you.
5 MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, there's a
6 possibility that Mr., that Dr. Cole will go on on the 8th,
7 and I was wondering if we'll have a transcript, you know, of
8 today's proceeding.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: No. I don't think there is a
10 possibility unless you directly order it. Usually, it takes
11 a week to 10 days. 10 days, I guess, is the official --
12 COURT REPORTER: Seven days.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Pardon me?
14 COURT REPORTER: Seven.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Seven days, but that's, is that
16 seven business days I think, so that probably means there
17 won't be a transcript by the 8th.
18 MR. SILVERMAN: Well, that causes us some concern,
19 but I'll need to confer about that.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 MS. ADELMAN: Is there a way for you to ask them
22 to expedite it?
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I think if more money is paid. You
24 want to pay the extra money?
25 MS. ADELMAN: No. You're advertising your rate.

Page 97

1 You're, all that money --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: We, you can discuss it offline
3 afterwards.
4 MS. ADELMAN: I'll see what I can do.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Thank you. All right.
6 Ms. Rosenfeld, if you --
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, thank you.
8 CROSS-EXAMINATION
9 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Sullivan, first, I just have
10 some preliminary questions. You said you had spoken with
11 Mr. David Krask. Do you have his contact information, his
12 e-mail and his phone number?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I do. Mr. Krask's phone
14 number is 410-537-3756.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
16 MR. GOECKE: I think Mr. Silverman may have it
17 too. I think they've met before.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And looking at your
19 February 21, 2014 report, if we could go through figures 1
20 through 8. And I have the same series of questions for each
21 of these, so it'd probably just be most efficient if we go
22 through them one by one. First, for the background number
23 on figure 1, what monitor or monitors did you use to get
24 your background number?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: For NO2, it was Arlington.

Page 98

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And what date did you get that,
2 get your data?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: This would have been the current as
4 of the report we did in 2013. I don't remember the, I guess
5 I don't recall the exact dates that that might have
6 pertained to, but the most current at that point in time.
7 Presumably, it would have pertained to 2010 to 2012, based
8 on the footnote, but I, I would, I would have to check to
9 confirm that.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: It says for all sources using
11 urban dispersion plus 90 background 2006 to 2010. Is that,
12 would those be the dates or should they be updated?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, actually, this was concurrent
14 background, so if it was, if this one is not concurrent
15 background, so this is based upon one background number for
16 the analysis, so it would have been, the 90 would be
17 representative of the period I'm showing, 2006 to 2010. I
18 don't remember, I don't remember which years exactly used
19 the 90. I'd have to check my records.
20 MS. CORDRY: So, I'm sorry, so you say the 2006 to
21 2010, the 90 does pertain to that time period? It's from
22 that time period?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: I'd have to check. Yeah, I believe
24 it does, but I'd have to check to see what year, what
25 particular year that 90 pertains to. I just don't recall.

Page 99

1 I can see the 98, the 98 we used, I mentioned, in the August
2 report, was 2009 to 2011, so actually, I'd have to, I would
3 have to assume, as an assumption, that this would be an
4 update from that. It could have been actually at the end of
5 that period; it could have been 2010 to 2012, because it is
6 a, certainly lower than the 98 that was shown there.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Could you confirm that for us
8 tomorrow --
9 MR. SULLIVAN: Sure.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: -- after you get back to your
11 office? And how did you calculate that background number?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: My recollection of the average and
13 the period that we used, the average concentration,
14 background concentration of that monitor, based upon the
15 98th percentile -- I'm sorry -- yeah, 98th percentile values
16 that it, that it reported.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
18 MR. SULLIVAN: But I'll, I'll confirm that for
19 you.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And I would have the next
21 question for figure 2. What monitor or monitors did you use
22 to get your background numbers?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: It'd be the, this would have been
24 for Arlington. All the NO2 are based on Arlington.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: And again, what date or dates did

Page 100

1 you derive your data from?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: The background for these runs were
3 concurrent background 2006 to 2010.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And by concurrent, do you, is this
5 the hourly match that your, your hourly analysis?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: It's a paired --
7 MS. ROSENFELD: It's not based on an annual?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: It's a paired analysis, so it is
9 hourly-based, yes.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: And I'm sorry, you said it's a
11 paired analysis done hourly?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: The, on the, on this, on this run,
13 we're talking about a figure number 2, it is done hourly,
14 and we have real time ozone and real time NO2 in the
15 calculations. And it was for that five-year period of 2006
16 to 2010.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And did you get the ozone
18 and the NO2 both from Arlington?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: The, we got the, the NO2 certainly
20 -- we're talking about NO2 here, yes, the NO2 was from
21 Arlington.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: And where would you have gotten
23 your hourly ozone data?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Ozone was from, it was closer data
25 for that, and that was the higher of Rockville or

Page 101

1 Beltsville, as I recall. Well, actually, I'm not sure on
2 that point actually. I, I have to check.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: And okay, would you provide that
4 information tomorrow as well?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: You want to know the basis for the
6 figure 2, and that would pertain to figure 3, the, the basis
7 for the, the ozone?
8 MS. ROSENFELD: That's right. And if they're
9 paired hourly, I assume that would have been done on a
10 particular date?
11 MR. SULLIVAN: It's paired hourly for all dates,
12 some of the rates, we're talking about figure number 2,
13 we're modeling 2006 to 2010, using concurrency for each of
14 those, each of those hours.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: And which date would have been the
16 highest?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: I'd have to look them all up to
18 tell you which of the years had the highest. We, we would
19 be averaging. It would have run five years, the paired
20 data, you'd take the average of those five to represent your
21 model value.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: You use the term paired data. What
23 do you mean by that?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Paired in time, so in other words,
25 if we're modeling January 1st, 2006, we will, we will have,

Page 102

1 1 o'clock in the morning, we will have meteorological data
2 for that period, we'll have a representative ozone
3 concentration for that period, and representative NO2 value
4 for that, that particular hour.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what is, so what's the
6 difference between that and the use of the term concurrent?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: There really isn't a difference. I
8 think paired and concurrent are synonyms in this context.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: And so, for example, if you
11 modeled January 1st, would you model January 1st in 2006,
12 and January 1st in 2007, and January 1st in 2008, and
13 January 1st in 2009, and January 1st in 2010?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: We modeled every, every hour of
15 every day from January 1st, 2006 to December 31st, 2010.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And based on that date, how
17 did you determine the background number in figure 2, for
18 example, for the loading dock?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: We --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: How did --
21 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, we had, as I mentioned, we
22 had paired hour by hour --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.
24 MR. SULLIVAN: -- and representative NO2 data.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.

Page 103

1 MR. SULLIVAN: -- from Arlington, and that was
2 used as a, as a background value consistent with Fox 2011
3 for this application, and you know, with, if the background
4 or the measured values in Arlington were, you know, 20
5 micrograms per cubic meter, we would add that to the, to the
6 modeled values, so that would have been used. And the ozone
7 would have been used for the OLM contribution, so the OLM
8 would have pulled that number from the file as well.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: And so this background, 68.82 for
10 the loading dock on figure 2, is that 365 days a year times
11 five divided by your highest number? What formula, how do
12 you come up with that number, 68.82?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, this, what this, what this
14 block is showing us -- and it's common to all of these
15 figures --
16 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.
17 MR. SULLIVAN: -- it's looking at, well, what is
18 the, what is the average, if you look at each of those five
19 years, and each year, we compute 98 percentile
20 concentration, what is the average of those five
21 concentrations, and it's showing, it's showing the typical
22 background, roads, and gasoline. So it's related to those,
23 those five hours that produced these, these 98th percentile
24 values in each case.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Again, I'm, this is an average of

Page 104

1 the five 98th percentile numbers, you're saying?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: For a one-hour period?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. For example, 2006, for
5 the loading dock, we have, we have a receptor there, a
6 culpability run. And we, we know what the, what the
7 maximum, what the 98th percentile was for the hour when we
8 had the, the peak value, the 98th percentile occurred in the
9 modeling. We'd pull that value out to see what the
10 contribution was for that particular hour, it defined that
11 98th percentile for that year, we'll pull that out. And do
12 the same thing for the warehouse, the ring road, and so
13 forth.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: The 98th percentile at the loading
15 dock, but not the 98th percentile at the monitor?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: It's referring, what this is
17 referring to, you're talking about what are we, how are we
18 doing this culpability. It's only for one hour, for
19 example, so it's the, if it's 2006 for the loading dock, we
20 model that one hour that corresponded to the 98th percentile
21 modeled concentration for that particular location, and
22 we're showing what the contribution is for that hour in each
23 particular source category. We did that for 2006, 2007,
24 through 2010, and this is the average of those five numbers.
25 So in the block on the right side, that's loading dock --

Page 105

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.
2 MR. SULLIVAN: -- culpability number 1.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: Culpability number 2 is on the
5 left side, and that's showing to, the, at the queue area,
6 but it's the same procedure.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: I take it that when you say you
8 calculate it, I take it that this is a model readout; in
9 other words, you have the receptors, for example, at the
10 loading dock or wherever you are, at the ring road, you have
11 a receptor and you can then pull the information regarding
12 what that receptor is telling you for that particular
13 location on that average.
14 MR. SULLIVAN: In that time.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: In that time.
16 MR. SULLIVAN: So in other words, there's a whole
17 lot of numbers modeled here --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: -- but each year comes down to one
20 number, what is the 98th percentile defining the time period
21 for that number, and what was happening at all these sources
22 at that point in time that contributed.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
24 MR. SULLIVAN: We, we had a finer breakdown for
25 those particular hours. That's what's showing in these

Page 106

1 boxes.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay.

3 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And so for each of these

4 years, there would be one day that would have been modeled

5 as the highest, as the 98th percentile?

6 MR. SULLIVAN: No. For the culpability runs, we

7 would, we would have, we'd have, we have two runs for each

8 year, and one run would be for the loading dock, one run

9 would be for the gas queue --

10 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.

11 MR. SULLIVAN: -- and we would only model one

12 hour, the modeling, the 98th percentile hour that defined

13 that particular concentration for that year. All we're

14 doing is breaking it down into its part.

15 MS. ROSENFELD: So out of 24 hours, you're only

16 modeling one hour?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.

18 MS. ROSENFELD: Which hour did you model?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, it's shown, it's shown in

20 each of the output files, but for example, if we're talking

21 about 2006, the loading dock, the question would be, what,

22 when did it, when did 98th percentile occur for that

23 receptor in that year. And let's say it's July 3rd, at 8:00

24 a.m. Well, we want to know, well, what happened, what's

25 going on July 3rd, 8:00 a.m.; what's contributing to that

Page 107

1 value. So we do a special run so as to pull out each, as a

2 source group, separately at the output, which we don't do

3 for all the runs, it'd be too much data. We say, what is

4 the gasoline station contributing, what is the warehouse

5 contributing. We'd break that out for that particular

6 defining hour.

7 MR. GROSSMAN: But it's always the 98th percentile

8 hour?

9 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Yes. We do it for each of

10 the years.

11 MS. ROSENFELD: And do you, if you could let me

12 know what those days were that would, there would be five

13 days for each of the five years, is that correct?

14 MR. SULLIVAN: All the, yeah, I just have to --

15 MS. ROSENFELD: That were the 98 --

16 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm sorry.

17 MS. ROSENFELD: That would be the 98th percentile?

18 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. All I'd have to do is, is for

19 Dr. Cole to refer to the date of this and go to the files

20 that show culpability runs, like culp 1, culp 2, and those

21 runs, if you go to the meteorological section of the file,

22 they show you what day and what hour was modeled. Look

23 at --

24 MS. ROSENFELD: Do they show which --

25 MR. SULLIVAN: -- the start and stop --

Page 108

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Do they --

2 MR. SULLIVAN: -- times. They're on there.

3 They're on there.

4 MS. ROSENFELD: Do they show which is the highest?

5 I mean, do they pull out the highest?

6 MR. GROSSMAN: By the highest, you mean the 98th

7 percentile?

8 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. The 98th percentile.

9 MR. SULLIVAN: They, what they do is they show the

10 contribution for that particular hour --

11 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.

12 MR. SULLIVAN: -- from each of the sources. It's

13 shown in those runs. The culp 1 and culp 2 runs. There's

14 one for each, like I say, for each year, there's one for

15 each, receptor for each year. You'll find the year, the

16 actual hour is shown there, and the results.

17 MS. ROSENFELD: So under culp 1, for example, for

18 the loading dock, would there be one set of data that shows

19 that 98th percentile day, or is it going to show me 365 days

20 and I have to read the whole thing and find the 98th

21 percentile?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: It's going to show, it's going to

23 show you one hour --

24 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.

25 MR. SULLIVAN: -- of data. The start hour and the

Page 109

1 stop hour are the same, same day, same hour. It's only

2 modeling one hour.

3 MS. ROSENFELD: One more question on, just

4 generically, did you look at the wind direction, did your

5 modeling protocols take into account wind direction as, when

6 evaluating the background?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: We did not do a quadrant analysis

8 or wind direction analysis. That's one option. We did not.

9 The earlier modeling was based on the maximum either way.

10 This analysis is based upon the paired approach as discussed

11 in Fox 2011.

12 MS. ROSENFELD: Going to figure 3, if you could

13 tell me what monitor you used for the queue. There's a,

14 this would be, this is for NO2 again, for ozone and NO2.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: This run was based on Arlington and

16 concurrent data 2010 through 2012.

17 MS. ROSENFELD: And that was for both NO2 and

18 ozone? Both were derived from the Arlington monitor?

19 MR. SULLIVAN: No. As I mentioned, I will, I'll

20 get that to you about the basis -- I know for ozone, we had

21 two stations we looked at, and one was generally higher,

22 which we relied upon. We sometimes filled with the other

23 one, and I'd have to check my files to give you a, a

24 complete answer on that, which I will do.

25 MS. ROSENFELD: And would one of those stations be

Page 110

1 the Hayes monitor and --
2 MR. SULLIVAN: I'd just rather look at my records
3 and tell you. I don't believe it was. I, I will get back
4 to you.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: What, just out of curiosity, why,
7 for example, in figure 3, did you use years 2010 through
8 2012, whereas, in figure 2 and I think it's in your 1, you
9 used 2006 through 2010?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: When we did, when we did figure 2,
11 we relied upon the five-year data set, the same data set
12 that we modeled all along, which is 2006 to 2010, but
13 concerning the trend line, how much the NO2 is decreasing,
14 we elected to do a, a stage 3 run that went as far as we
15 could into the data set, the hour data set for NO2, which
16 went up to 2012.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 MR. SULLIVAN: So basically updated the, and made
19 the background more current.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: And for figure 4, you'll provide
22 me with the monitors?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: This would be Arlington?
24 MS. ROSENFELD: On -- okay. And did this also
25 include ozone or just NO2?

Page 111

1 MR. SULLIVAN: This is NO, this was NO2.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: And then for figure 5?
3 MR. GROSSMAN: So now we've switched from NO2 to
4 PM2.5?
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. PM2.5.
6 MR. SULLIVAN: What is your question for figure 5?
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Which monitor or monitors did you
8 use?
9 MR. SULLIVAN: This would be based upon Rockville.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: So why switch from Arlington to
11 Rockville from, you go from NO2 to PM2.5?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: When we, when we started this
13 process, the, the only source of suburban NO2 data was
14 Arlington. Sometime mid to late 2011, Beltsville came along
15 with NO2. It has lower NO2 than Arlington, so we continued
16 to use Arlington for NO2. But for PM2.5, Rockville and
17 Beltsville are closer to the site, arguably more
18 representative, and we used the higher of the two which ends
19 up being Rockville.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: And do you know what, for figure
22 5, was that averaged over a period of years, or was that a
23 one-year specific calculation?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Figure 5 would be a, a five-year
25 run.

Page 112

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And which five years?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: 2006 to 2010.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: And the same question for figure
4 6, which monitor or monitors? This, again, is, this is
5 annual PM2.5.
6 MR. SULLIVAN: That, that's correct. That would
7 be, that'd be Rockville, 2006 to 2010.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Going back for a moment to figure
9 5, looking at the background, so am I reading this correctly
10 that the background at 23, that's the 98th percentile
11 concentration --
12 MR. SULLIVAN: That's, that's right, yes --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: -- for PM, 24?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: -- that's correct.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: And is that a one year, or is that
16 an average of the five?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: My recollection is an average of
18 five.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: And could you confirm that for
20 me --
21 MR. SULLIVAN: Sure.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: -- tomorrow? Thank you. And so
23 figure 6, would that also be an average of five years?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And figure 7, this is now

Page 113

1 CO, which monitor was the CO number derived from?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: It would have been, it would have
3 been the higher of the representative monitors. I'd have to
4 refer to the protocol to tell, we didn't change anything in
5 the protocol, it's the same as the process we used
6 previously.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Most likely it was either Rockville
9 or Beltsville. I don't remember which.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And was this also from 2006
11 to 2010?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: 2006 to 2010, that's correct.
13 MS. ROSENFELD: And would it have been an average
14 or a peak year?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: It would have been an average, as I
16 recall.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And if you could just
18 confirm that. And then the same questions for figure 8.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: Same answer.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: And now we've switched to carbon
21 monoxide.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh, right. And that was
23 figure 7 as well. And same answer means the higher of the
24 representative monitors and you'll let me know which ones?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

Page 114

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And it was an average then from
2 2006 to 2010?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And then if we could go to page 26
5 of your report. Are these, let's go, for example, to the
6 Rockville number. Is that an average number over the period
7 of three years?
8 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, we're showing running
9 averages, that's, that's correct. So the very first set, it
10 says 2007-2009, will be the running average for that
11 particular three-year period, and the same for 2008-2010,
12 and so forth.
13 MS. ROSENFELD: And in, and so Rockville is the,
14 is the Rockville monitoring site that we've seen in exhibits
15 earlier in this case, I assume?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: And Beltsville, is this one
18 monitor or, or is there more than one?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: We have three PM10 monitors in
20 Beltsville.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: And so is this the average of one
22 of those monitors, or two of them, or average of all three?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: I showed it two ways. First, I
24 showed it, the average at Beltsville 1 and 2, which are the
25 reference method monitors; and I show the average of

Page 115

1 Beltsville 1, 2, and 3 where, where one of the monitors, I
2 guess, it's 3, was called a TEOM, which is not a reference
3 method monitor, it's an alternative method monitor.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And when you say a reference
5 monitor, what do you mean by that?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: EPA has what they define as
7 reference monitors that are definitives, the definitive
8 monitors that relate to the standards. They also define
9 alternatives, which are equivalents, which can be used. In
10 the case of the TEOM versus the filter approach used for
11 the, the reference method, they're quite different, and in
12 some cases, the TEOM has data that's in conflict and
13 incorrect. In this case, there were, there were dual
14 reference monitors in Beltsville that matched, and there was
15 a TEOM that had very different values for some of the years
16 that were investigated here. In our, in my judgment, the
17 TEOM was not representative; it conflicted with two gold
18 standard methods at the same spot.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: How do you spell TEOM?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: All caps, T-E-O-M.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: What does it, it's an acronym, I
22 take it?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: It, I hope you don't ask me what it
24 stands for.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: What's it stand for?

Page 116

1 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't, I don't recall.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
3 MR. SULLIVAN: I knew at one time.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, why do they include it if
5 it's not the referenced standard and it has such a wide
6 variance from the gold standard as you've said?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: It has some value. I mean, they
8 have reported, the literature shows bias in the instrument,
9 but the value it has is, it, it tells you hour by hour what
10 the PM levels are, where the, where the, the filter method,
11 you take a, a weight, pre-weight filter, you put it on, on a
12 unit, and you, you draw air with a vacuum through it for 24
13 hours, and you reanalyze it. That may, is more accurate,
14 but it doesn't tell you hour by hour what's going on.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: I see. Okay.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: And did I hear you reference a
17 gold standard?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: I referred to the reference
19 standard as a gold standard. If there's a conflict between
20 a reference standard and an equivalent method, like a TEOM,
21 I would rely upon the reference method.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: And is that a defined term in the
23 EPA, or you're just using that as --
24 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it's a defined term by EPA.
25 MS. CORDRY: Gold standard?

Page 117

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Gold standard?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: I've heard it called that. I mean,
3 it won't be, the Federal Register won't call it a gold
4 standard, but if you have one method that's considered the
5 reference, it's like going to the NIST to get, you know,
6 something calibrated. If you have, you go up against the
7 NIST-certified calibrated --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: NIST being an acronym for?
9 MR. SULLIVAN: National Institute for Standards
10 and whatever the --
11 MS. CORDRY: Technology.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: -- T stands for.
13 MR. SILVERMAN: Technology.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: The -- thank you. And so they have
16 an official meter there, well, this is how long our meter
17 is, and you have your yardstick that doesn't match it,
18 theirs is going to win. Well, it's a similar argument here.
19 If you have a reference method versus a non-reference
20 method, and there's a conflict, especially when there's two
21 reference methods at the same spot, you're going to rely
22 upon the two reference methods.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: And do you recall where in EPA
24 guidance that hierarchy is set forth?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: It's set forth in various in

Page 118

1 various Federal Register notices, it's shown for each of the
2 criteria pollutants. I don't remember the citations.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: All right. Just to keep the
4 record straight as I move forward through my questioning,
5 the report dated February 21st of 2014, which is Exhibit
6 466, I'm just going to refer to that as the new report.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: And if I have questions or --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't you call it the rebuttal
10 report because that's what it is.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: We could call it the rebuttal
12 report.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: That's what we've referred to it
14 before as.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: And Ms. Rosenfeld, if I could just
16 clarify too. I referred to this at one point today as a
17 February 14th report. It is dated the 21st of February.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: So clarify that --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I actually corrected it then to say
21 February, I thought, I assumed you mean February of 2014, so
22 I clarified it, February 21, 2014. That's --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And then Exhibit 15A, I'm,
24 which was the original November 2012 report, I'll just refer
25 to that as the November 2012 report, for clarity. Mr.

Page 119

1 Sullivan, to start with, could you just give me a general
2 overview as to how you developed the OLM methodology in your
3 rebuttal report?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I, I didn't develop the OLM
5 methodology. I, I used the, you know, applied the OLM
6 methodology. Is that what you mean?
7 MS. ROSENFELD: In applying the OLM methodology,
8 you need to make certain modeling assumptions, is that
9 correct?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Could you explain how you
12 came up with the modeling assumptions that you used?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I will. Basically, the OLM
14 method, which was devised for primarily stacks, needed to be
15 applied in this case to a ground-based area source. One of
16 the constraints of the OLM method is that there needs to be
17 enough plume travel time to produce complete mixing to the
18 molecular level between the ambient ozone that's outside the
19 plume with the NO that's inside the plume.
20 Since I'm modeling a, an application where there
21 are receptors, and the ones the, perhaps, the most defined
22 receptors are inside the source, by definition, I can't have
23 complete mixing of the ambient ozone. It's impossible. And
24 one meter from that location, I can't complete mixing of the
25 ambient air; there's not sufficient travel time.

Page 120

1 I reviewed the literature and looked at the travel
2 times to produce significant conversion for the plumes of
3 various locations, and the data clearly shows that --
4 literature would show maybe 300 meters in some cases,
5 usually a kilometer or more is required before you get
6 substantial conversion because of the fact that you need to
7 get to the molecular level. It's not just dispersion or
8 plume; it's down to the molecular level. I looked at the
9 references, and particularly Janssen 86 and in the other
10 report I referenced earlier.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Fox?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Not the, not the, not for this
13 pairing, not the Fox one, but there was environment agency
14 2007. Those reports provided, based upon empirical data, a
15 formula to compute the ratio of NO2 to NOX, to function of
16 travel distance, and ozone concentration.
17 Looking at the concentrations ozone, we have the
18 peak periods, I could use that equation and compute at
19 different distances how much NO2 would be in that mix. And
20 what I found is, at 40 meters, travel distance, that the
21 ration was shown to be .06 for the, for this particular
22 power plant plume. Power plant plumes typically start with
23 5 to 10 percent NO2/NOX ratios to begin with, so there's no
24 significant conversion happening in 40 meters.
25 Also found that 40 meters was all, only allowed

Page 121

1 for 10-fold dilution, which is pretty small relative to the
2 molecular diffusion level, so my conclusion was, although
3 the amount of time required to, to get enough dilution,
4 enough contact were probably more on the lines of a
5 kilometer, I used 40, 40 meters as a, extremely conservative
6 basis to start applying the OLM for this ground-based
7 source, and that's, that's the basic procedure that we
8 followed, and that's the derivation for the, the approach
9 that I've taken.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Is there any diagram in your
11 report that shows that, I assume 40 meters would be a
12 circumference around whatever --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: A radius or a circumference?
14 MS. ROSENFELD: A radius around whatever central
15 point you've chosen. Do you have a figure that shows that
16 40-meter circle?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: It's not a circle. It's, if the
18 actual queue itself is a rectangle --
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Uh-huh.
20 MR. SULLIVAN: -- this 40-meter rectangle outside
21 that particular zone.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. So your 40 meters doesn't
23 start from the center point of the queue; it starts at the
24 boundary of the special exception?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: It starts at the edge of the -- no,

Page 122

1 it starts at the edge of queue source.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: And do you have any figure that
3 shows what that perimeter is?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: No, just, I've just defined it in
5 our report, and defined it -- no, we don't have a figure
6 that shows that, no.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. So visually, I can't tell
8 from -- do you have anything that's to scale that I could
9 figure out where that 40 meters begins and ends?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the modeling files will show
11 where the source is, where the gas queue is located. That
12 could be plotted and you could add 40 meters onto that, and
13 you can see the exact diagram. I don't have that diagram
14 here.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. But there's --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: I think there are lots of things in
17 the record that show the queue, the, I presume you're
18 talking about the gas queue at the station --
19 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- or station, and you could just
21 measure 40 meters off of that, I mean, if you want to do
22 a --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I, my, I, Mr. Sullivan, is
24 there anything that is scaled in your report, or would it
25 have to, that distance have to be scaled on one of the

Page 123

1 engineering drawings?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: No. The most accurate way to do
3 what you're asking would be to go to the model files and
4 look at the coordinates for the gas queue, and add 40 meters
5 all around it to come up with a larger rectangle. That's
6 how I would approach it if I was trying to do the figure
7 you're describing.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I'm just asking whether
9 that's in this report, the rebuttal report itself?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it's not.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And this is the first time
12 in this case that you have used the ozone limiting
13 methodology, is that correct?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: That's correct.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: And in the rebuttal report, do you
16 cite to any EPA values that applies OLM to a negative gas
17 station?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: As you know, EPA's guidance isn't
19 that specific to how to apply OLM to a negative gas station
20 or very specific sources like that.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: And in your survey of articles and
22 studies, did you find any articles or studies that applied
23 the OLM to a negative gas station setting?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: I, I did not, no.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Or a source. When you developed

Page 124

1 your modeling assumptions, did you seek EPA guidance in
2 terms of what your input or assumptions would be to your
3 protocol?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Did I seek EPA guidance, do you
5 mean by calling EPA or looking at guidance?
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Did you --
7 MR. SULLIVAN: I did not --
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Did you speak with anybody? Did
9 you speak with any regulators at EPA?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: I did not. The reason EPA is not
11 involved -- and I don't think wants to be involved in this
12 matter.
13 MS. ROSENFELD: And as you've testified, before
14 you filed your November 2012 report, you did meet with Dr.
15 Cole regarding the protocol you would follow in your
16 November 2012 report, is that correct?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: We did meet, yes.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: And did you discuss the protocol
19 you would follow?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: And in some areas, you agreed, and
22 others, you agreed to disagree?
23 MR. SULLIVAN: That's fair.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: But you did have a dialog?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: We had a good dialog, and we agreed

Page 125

1 on some things, we disagreed on others, so that's a fair
2 statement.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: And did you go through that
4 consultation process with Dr. Cole as you developed your OLM
5 modeling protocol?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: I did not.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Did you consult with anybody with
8 respect to your modeling assumptions in the rebuttal report
9 as it relates to OLM?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: I did.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: And who did you speak with?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: I discussed it with Mr. Hlinka, who
13 works for me.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: And he, he's one of the partners
15 in Sullivan Environmental Consulting or works --
16 MR. SULLIVAN: He's an employee --
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
18 MR. SULLIVAN: -- of the company, correct.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: And anybody else?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: I've mentioned, I, I read the
21 literature and acquired information that I could regarding
22 conversion rates, initial ratios, and that sort of thing,
23 and I reviewed EPA guidance documents and came up with a, a
24 modeling approach that, in my judgment, very conservatively
25 represented the model application at hand.

Page 126

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Mr. Grossman, I'm handing
2 out --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Be careful of the wire right in
4 front of you.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Oh. Thank you. I will watch --
6 that could end the day very badly. Do you mind giving this
7 to Mr. Grossman?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: This is Exhibit --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Is this a new exhibit or a copy?
11 MS. ROSENFELD: No, this is a copy. It's Exhibit
12 285, which is already in the record.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: It is what's, references Appendix
15 W, EPA --
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Guidelines on Air Quality
18 Models. It is in the record in its entirety, and I'm just
19 providing it because I think it'll --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: It's easier than going through
21 those volumes of files. Thank you.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: -- digging them out. That's
23 correct. Mr. Sullivan, are you familiar with this document,
24 this Exhibit 285?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: I am.

Page 127

1 MS. ROSENFELD: If you would please turn to page
2 68232.
3 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And let me just ask a background
5 question. Is the OLM methodology that you applied, is that
6 considered an alternative model under EPA guidance?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: I would say no. I'm using the
8 AERMOD --
9 MS. ROSENFELD: And why did you --
10 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm using the AERMOD dispersion
11 model, which is an EPA guideline model.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: And where in this document is it
13 shown as an EPA guideline model?
14 MR. SULLIVAN: I don't know the specific
15 reference, but it's commonly known that, the AERMOD is an
16 EPA guideline model. It's the most commonly used guideline
17 model that exists for this type of model application.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: But the ozone limiting method is
19 not a typical modeling protocol, is it?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: The ozone limiting method is not a
21 guideline option, meaning it's not, it's not an option that
22 is in the standard set of EPA to solve assumptions.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: That's, and so it's an alternative
24 model?
25 MR. SULLIVAN: No.

Page 128

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And could you please clarify again
2 for me the distinction?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: An alternative model would be a
4 model with a different software package than AERMOD, it
5 would be a different model. This is using the same model.
6 We're talking about how to set up a model. It's a very
7 question.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Then in that case, would
9 you turn to page 68235, please?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: What page are we on? 6 --
11 MS. ROSENFELD: 68235.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: 235, okay.
13 MS. ROSENFELD: And under Section 5.2.4, models
14 for nitrogen dioxide annual average, under Section (a), it
15 says a tiered screening approach is recommended to obtain
16 annual average estimates of NO2 for point sources for new
17 source review analysis. Is this one of the standard models?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, you're, is what a standard
19 model? I mean, is AERMOD a standard model?
20 MS. ROSENFELD: These three tiers that are
21 referenced under 5.2.4.
22 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, these three tiers are showing
23 EPA's guidance, a guidance document for modeling NO2. It's
24 showing a tiered, a tiered approach, and there's three
25 tiers.

Page 129

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And looking at page 68236,
2 tier 1 and tier 2 and tier 3, would these be the three tiers
3 that you understood Mr., Dr. Cole to be discussing during
4 his testimony?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: Dr. Cole mentioned the ozone
6 limiting method, which is a tier 3. I don't recall if he
7 mentioned the three tiers specifically, but I remember him
8 mentioning tier 3.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: In your report, you reference Dr.
10 Cole's testimony a number of times. You said you provided
11 the OLM methodology in response to Dr. Cole's suggestions,
12 and that was on page 2. And on page 2, you also say, Dr.
13 Cole testified that COSTCO should have used the ozone
14 limiting method, which is a more refined analysis. And on
15 page 6, you have a heading that says, as Dr. Cole suggests,
16 you applied the OLM method. Can you tell me where in the
17 record of these proceedings Dr. Cole said that you should
18 have used the ozone limiting method or that he suggested
19 that you do so?
20 MR. SULLIVAN: I can paraphrase. I don't know
21 where in the record the exact line and date, but what Dr.
22 Cole said was that if we're not going to assume 100 percent
23 NO2, which is tier 1, that if we're going to go to an
24 alternative approach, then we should follow a method, a more
25 refined method such as OLM. That's a paraphrasing, but

Page 130

1 that's essentially what I recall is on the record.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: And in your report, you have an
3 appendix, Appendix F, key portions of opposition testimony
4 that generated need for rebuttal report. And in this, you
5 go through Dr. Cole's testimony, and I think your report
6 suggested this is the basis for the rebuttal report. If you
7 could look at page 46, there is text that's highlighted in a
8 red box, is there any discussion of the ozone limiting
9 method on page 46? Actually, I believe the text that's
10 highlighted here is me speaking, not Dr. Cole, but --
11 actually, the answer is Dr. Cole.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Can you repeat the question?
13 MS. ROSENFELD: Yeah, I'll --
14 MS. ADELMAN: Uh-huh.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: I'll make it much shorter. Can
16 you, would you tell me if Dr. Cole discusses the ozone
17 limiting method in the text highlighted on page 46?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Which date of transcript is this?
19 MS. ROSENFELD: It does not say on, on this, it's
20 page 161, and it's page 46 of the rebuttal report.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 MR. GOECKE: December 5th, Mr. Grossman.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
24 MR. SULLIVAN: This statement isn't about the
25 ozone limiting method at all. That's not what this is

Page 131

1 about.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And on page 47?
3 MR. SULLIVAN: But just before we go through all
4 this, can I clarify, this came up earlier today in the
5 discussion. Didn't we find the exact location in the
6 transcript where Dr. Cole mentioned the ozone limiting
7 method. I don't remember off the top of my head, but I
8 recall it being --
9 MS. ROSENFELD: On --
10 MR. SULLIVAN: -- discussed earlier.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: On, your report says that it
12 references these exhibits as the basis for your having
13 applied the ozone limiting method, and I'm trying to find
14 out where in this testimony it's included.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, again, I was, I heard, I was
16 here when Dr. Cole testified, I heard what he said, and I
17 paraphrased it. And if I didn't include the exact phrase
18 from here, it was said earlier today. If I remember
19 correctly, they identified Mr. Goecke, or Mr. Grossman
20 identified the line number and page number when he said
21 that.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that's actually when he first
23 mentioned it. He --
24 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, but --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: He did mention it again, if you

Page 132

1 want the reference --
2 MS. ROSENFELD: But my question, that's not my
3 question. Mr. Sullivan's report says that the OLM analysis
4 in his report was provided in response to Dr. Cole's
5 suggestions, and that Dr. Cole testified that Costco should
6 have used the ozone limiting method. Both of those
7 statements are on page 2 of his report. On page 6, he says
8 he applied the OLM method to model one-hour NO2, quote, as
9 Dr. Cole suggests, end quote. And I am looking for where in
10 the record Dr. Cole said that you, quote, should have used,
11 end quote, the ozone limiting method, or that he suggested
12 that you do so.
13 MR. SULLIVAN: It's on the record earlier today.
14 MS. CORDRY: No, then --
15 MS. ROSENFELD: I will --
16 MR. SULLIVAN: I could look through --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: I can --
18 MR. SULLIVAN: -- the whole transcript --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I can --
20 MR. SULLIVAN: -- to look for it.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I can help you out here, Ms.
22 Rosenfeld. It's on page 130 of the transcript from December
23 6th, lines 1 through 18, where the first line is me asking
24 the three-tier analysis, and then Dr. Cole says the three-
25 tier analysis at tier 1 is 100 percent, which is what Mr.

Page 133

1 Sullivan used; tier 2 is 80 percent, which doesn't buy you a
2 whole lot in terms of reduction; tier 3 requires an analysis
3 where you consider ozone concentrations, and they have to
4 use either the ozone limiting method or another model, the
5 name of which, it's an acronym and incorporates the
6 interplay between dispersion and chemistry, and so on. So
7 that's where the, that's the reference.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: But where does that say that
9 Costco should do that analysis? It's explaining what the
10 OLM is and what the three tiers reflect, but I want to know
11 where Dr. Cole said this analysis should be conducted.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Could I --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: As a matter of fact, if you go to
14 the end of his comments on that, 14, 15, and, 15, lines 15,
15 16, and 17, so, but I repeat, I don't find anything in the
16 record that would substantiate going below the 100 percent.
17 They would have to justify and they haven't done that
18 analysis. That's not a recommendation that they would do it
19 or should do it; it simply reflects that it hasn't occurred.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: If your point is that you don't
21 think that Dr. Cole said that that, the ozone limiting
22 method was the preferred method or something like that, I
23 don't know if that, if that's the point you're trying to get
24 at, I think what the witness testified to just a few moments
25 ago in response to your question, was that Dr. Cole

Page 134

1 suggested the OLM method in his thing, he did suggest that
2 as one of the methods. Whether he says that that's what he
3 thinks ought to be used or not is a different --
4 MS. CORDRY: Well --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- is a different issue. So --
6 MS. CORDRY: -- it's what we're getting at.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I understand, but if --
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Yeah, I certainly think that
9 that's what his report is saying. He's saying that Dr. Cole
10 was advising them to use this methodology. And if Mr.
11 Sullivan is prepared to say that's not what Dr. Cole's
12 testimony is, then I'll be satisfied with that answer and we
13 can move on.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Well --
15 MS. CORDRY: Yeah --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- Dr. Cole's testimony is what it
17 is; it's not what Mr. Sullivan says it is. It is what the
18 transcript says it is. So I don't --
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, but -- well, I do think it's
20 important because Mr. Sullivan's report, if you read Mr.
21 Sullivan's report, he's saying he produced this methodology
22 because he was, it was recommended that he do so by Dr.
23 Cole.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand the point you're
25 making; I'm just saying that questioning him about what Dr.

Page 135

1 Cole said is not --
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Well then, let me --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- does not resolve the issue of
4 what Dr. Cole. What Dr. Cole said is what's in the
5 transcript.
6 MS. CORDRY: Right.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: That's all I'm saying.
8 MS. CORDRY: Yeah. And if the --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: And he's testified as to what his
10 understanding of what Dr. Cole meant from what he heard in
11 the testimony when he was here. So you can put that all
12 together anyway you want, but that's --
13 MS. CORDRY: If I might just say.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
15 MS. CORDRY: The only other place where Dr. Cole
16 talked about the ozone limiting method was simply, he was
17 asked about, have you ever done any air modeling himself --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. He said he --
19 MS. CORDRY: -- and so he mentioned it.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. One of, the first reference
21 I found in it was the --
22 MS. CORDRY: Right. He said and mentioned, I've
23 done this, at which --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: He's the one who created it, I
25 think he said, he created this OLM method --

Page 136

1 MS. CORDRY: Right.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I think, is what he said --
3 MS. CORDRY: Right.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- as part of his credentials
5 examination.
6 MS. CORDRY: Right. So that was not a
7 recommendation either, so we have --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: No. I --
9 MS. CORDRY: -- a witness --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: That was the first time, I hadn't
11 remembered that but when I went back and looked for the
12 term, limiting, in the index, I found that, and then I found
13 this other reference to it.
14 MS. CORDRY: Right.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I can read it. I mean, I, if
16 it would help, I can read it --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: No, you don't have to read it.
18 There's no reason for you to read what's in the transcript.
19 That speaks for itself. I read a portion of it myself, and
20 that's what he said, according to the transcript.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: If you would turn to page 28 of
22 your report, in the second paragraph, you say that the OLM
23 was developed for stack sources, primarily power plants.
24 Not to state the obvious, but does the proposed gas station
25 involve power plant stacks?

Page 137

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Is that a question? I didn't hear
2 it.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: That is a question.
4 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it does not involve power plant
5 stacks?
6 MS. ROSENFELD: And in the next sentence, on the
7 same page, you say that the application for a relatively
8 large -- excuse me -- ground-based area source is not a
9 standard application, correct?
10 MR. SULLIVAN: Which line is that you're referring
11 to?
12 MS. ROSENFELD: In the next sentence, also on page
13 28.
14 MR. SULLIVAN: The next sentence would be the
15 second sentence of the first full paragraph? I mean, I'm
16 just not sure where --
17 MS. ROSENFELD: The first, the second paragraph,
18 the OLM method was developed for stack sources, primarily
19 power plant stacks.
20 MR. SULLIVAN: Could I please have a, a master
21 version of the report? I don't have a copy of what you're
22 looking at.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Do you have an electronic version?
24 I didn't --
25 MR. SULLIVAN: I, I do not.

Page 138

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Sorry. I didn't bring --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: What, which, what are you looking
3 at, by the way?
4 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking at his rebuttal
5 report.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what page?
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 28.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: 28? Okay.
9 MR. SULLIVAN: So in the second paragraph? Okay.
10 I'm with you now.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
12 MR. SULLIVAN: What's the question?
13 MS. ROSENFELD: It says, the application for a
14 relatively large ground-based area source is not a standard
15 application, correct?
16 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: And you say, but we have developed
18 the methodology conservatively by the OLM method for this
19 use.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't see where you're reading
21 actually.
22 MR. SILVERMAN: The second paragraph, second
23 sentence.
24 MS. ADELMAN: Second paragraph.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't have a second paragraph on

Page 139

1 page 28.
2 MS. ADELMAN: That's the wrong page. Turn to 28.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
4 MS. CORDRY: This page, it looks like this.
5 MR. SILVERMAN: Try 27.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: My page 28 is the one I'm looking
7 at. I have a different page 28, apparently.
8 MS. ADELMAN: Well, okay.
9 MS. CORDRY: Well, this is the page 28 we're
10 looking at.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: You have a page 27. Okay.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, in light of that, I'd
13 like --
14 MS. CORDRY: Yeah, I mean, the ones you handed out
15 today all show page --
16 MS. ROSENFELD: Mine's 28 as well.
17 MR. GOECKE: That's a page 27 for me, not 28.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.
19 MS. CORDRY: Well, then somewhere, somewhere the
20 pages got, the page number got changed. You might have put
21 a one on the front page of this version and not on your
22 original version, so --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So anyway, so what was
24 the point in this question? I didn't, now that I'm looking
25 at the right spot?

Page 140

1 MS. CORDRY: Okay. Paragraph 2.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: And what was the, what was the
3 point of the question?
4 MS. ROSENFELD: In the next sentence, you say, the
5 application for a relatively large ground-based area source
6 is not a standard application, is that correct?
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8 MR. SULLIVAN: That, that is correct. This method
9 is generally, usually used for power plants or tall stacks.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: And then you go on to say, we have
11 developed a methodology to conservatively apply the OLM
12 method for this use, correct?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: That is correct.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: And who is the we?
15 MR. SULLIVAN: My firm, my modeling team.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: And when we were --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: My version, by the way, doesn't
18 have that exact language. My version says, but Sullivan
19 Environmental applied the methodology --
20 MS. CORDRY: Well --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- conservatively --
22 MS. CORDRY: -- that's changed again.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- apply --
24 MS. ROSENFELD: Wait a second.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the OLM method for this use.

Page 141

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Wait a second. All right. I --
2 MS. ADELMAN: Would you like to look at mine?
3 MS. ROSENFELD: This is really troubling. Could,
4 can we --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's probably we got one
6 draft versus another draft.
7 MR. GOECKE: It looks like they've got an earlier
8 draft, yeah.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know which draft I have. I
10 have one that's been actually signed --
11 MS. ROSENFELD: So is mine.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and it's Exhibit, copy of
13 Exhibit 466 --
14 MS. ROSENFELD: Mine is not signed.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- probably as it was e-mailed to
16 me, and I printed it out from an e-mail.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Mine is not signed. Mine is dated
18 February 21, 2014.
19 MS. CORDRY: We've got the numbers at the bottom.
20 Can you tell from that?
21 MR. GOECKE: Can we take a break and copy the
22 signed one?
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
24 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
25 MS. ADELMAN: Would you like to have mine?

Page 142

1 MS. CORDRY: No, no. Because he's --
2 MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Grossman, your, your page 27 is
3 the start of Appendix B?
4 MS. CORDRY: He's going to copy that one.
5 MS. ADELMAN: Oh, okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
7 MS. ADELMAN: Is that the one, mine says page 28
8 is what we're discussing?
9
10 MS. CORDRY: Well, page 27.
11 MS. ADELMAN: Yours is signed and that's --
12 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. That's the signed version?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.
14 MS. CORDRY: No.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Mine is not signed.
16 MS. ADELMAN: Well then, that's, those are all--
17 MR. GOECKE: That's not the signed one.
18 MS. ADELMAN: We should take those --
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, how, wait, wait, wait, wait.
20 For the record --
21 MR. GOECKE: Even unsigned --
22 MS. ROSENFELD: -- for the record, how is it that
23 we have an unsigned copy and there is in the record
24 somewhere a signed copy of this document? This is not the
25 first time, frankly, even in the last few weeks that we

Page 143

1 don't have the current version of the document that's being
2 produced as material evidence in this case.
3 MS. HARRIS: What was, I believe what was
4 distributed via e-mail was the signed copy.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, this was printed from my e-
6 mail.
7 MS. HARRIS: It was distributed --
8 MS. ROSENFELD: I have a color printer. I take
9 what you e-mail and I print it.
10 MS. CORDRY: And we don't have the Sullivan
11 Associate --
12 MS. ROSENFELD: I've been preparing for this
13 testimony for a long time, and I don't even have the right
14 document?
15 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I understand you're
16 being upset, but it may not, there may not be any material
17 differences between the signed version and this version.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Well --
19 MS. ADELMAN: There are. You just read it.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: There may be some -- well, that's
21 not, I said material differences.
22 MS. ADELMAN: Well, it's hard to say.
23 MR. SILVERMAN: How would you know?
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we don't, we don't know, and
25 I guess we'll find out as this goes along. But you know, if

Page 144

1 it's just a matter of language, when he substituted the word
2 Sullivan Environmental applied, to the term, we, that kind
3 of a change is not material.
4 MR. SILVERMAN: There's a difference between
5 develop and apply, the verb.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: That's -- and I don't consider that
7 a particularly --
8 MS. ADELMAN: Well, having --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- material development. But I
10 understand your concern, and let's get, let's get the
11 version copied that's the correct version. I'm not sure why
12 you got the incorrect version. And if it makes a
13 difference, then we'll handle that.
14 MR. GOECKE: So this is Exhibit 466 we're talking
15 about?
16 MR. GROSSMAN: You looking for the file with 466
17 in it?
18 MR. GOECKE: Yeah.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Hold on a second.
20 MR. GOECKE: I want to make sure I got the right
21 one.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, I think the files you're
23 looking through probably don't have that one. It's right
24 here.
25 MR. GOECKE: Okay.

Page 145

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Here, probably. Let's see if this
2 one has 466. Sorry, guys. This is file 6. Might have to
3 look at file 7.
4 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, I suspect it's in file 7.
6 MR. GOECKE: Which is over here?
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Should be over there.
10 COURT REPORTER: Mr. Grossman, now we're going off
11 the record?
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we'll go off the record for a
13 few minutes. Take a five-minute break while we --
14 (Whereupon, at 2:04 p.m., a brief recess was
15 taken.)
16 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we ready to go back
17 on the record?
18 MR. GOECKE: We are.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: So everybody now have a copy of the
20 correct final version of the exhibit?
21 MR. GOECKE: They do, Mr. Grossman, and I want to
22 apologize to everybody. It looks like I e-mailed out
23 inadvertently and circulated a draft of Mr. Sullivan's
24 report. The signed final copy is part of the record,
25 Exhibit 466, that's been copied and given to anybody,

Page 146

1 everyone now.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Did you put the original back in
3 the file?
4 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, I did.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6 MR. GOECKE: And we are also in the process of
7 making a worksheet compared with my markup, showing the
8 changes so that everyone will be able to see what the
9 differences are --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 MR. GOECKE: -- between the two versions, and I'll
12 circulate that as soon as it's available.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's move along on the
14 assumption that there are no material differences until we
15 know otherwise.
16 MS. CORDRY: I can find at least one that I
17 consider material --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: And --
19 MS. CORDRY: -- already.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- all right, what's that Ms.
21 Cordry?
22 MS. CORDRY: Well, it is in talking about
23 background levels, for instance, with respect to this TO
24 monitor -- and we're going to talk about, when we get to
25 that eventually, whether that is or is not wrong -- and the

Page 147

1 original one said, the TO monitor was biased high. The
2 other, this other one says it was shown to be biased high,
3 which indicates to me that someone had somehow maneuvered it
4 so as that, that someone somehow shows that it was actually
5 biased high, and that that was, that there's some kind of
6 proof of that. And I, you know, I'm going to be discussing
7 that --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you could explore whether
9 that ends up being a material difference or not.
10 MS. CORDRY: Yeah, I mean, I --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that that is.
12 MS. CORDRY: It's the kind of thing that I just --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: I mean, that sounds like a, it
14 might just be a word-smithing thing, so --
15 MS. CORDRY: Well, it's, obviously an implication
16 there.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I may.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: You may, because I think you're
19 going to whether I say no or not.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: I will. Well, I appreciate the
21 indulgence nonetheless. Exhibit 465, which was the HCM
22 highway capacity manual analysis from Mr. Guckert, at the
23 time he testified on March 11th, there were two pages
24 missing, we requested copies of those pages, we were told it
25 was a copying error, and they would be provided. And in his

Page 148

1 testimony on Tuesday, Mr. Guckert testified that, in fact,
2 those two missing pages never even existed -- material
3 components of an exhibit that just were proffered as
4 existing that didn't exist.
5 MS. CORDRY: If you recall, that's what he said,
6 that he said he just estimated those numbers, he never
7 actually did the papers, even though he testified that he
8 had just left them on the copying machine.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: And that just happened on Tuesday,
10 where the actual status of that document was made known to
11 us on Tuesday. Exhibit, I, we were provided with a copy of
12 a truck turning, of a, of a series of physical changes to
13 intersection 16 that were provided to us, it was proffered
14 to us during the hearing that those were provided to Park
15 and Planning staff to review and evaluate. And we learned
16 weeks later that an entirely different layout had been
17 provided to staff, staff had already commented. And
18 frankly, I can't even find in the record where that original
19 intersection 16 was provided to you. Again, the --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean what they provided to
21 staff.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: That what they -- no, you --
23 MS. CORDRY: No.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: -- ultimately did receive what was
25 provided to staff. I don't know whether you were ever

Page 149

1 provided what had originally been provided to us. Material,
2 material changes to that intersection that were proffered
3 both at the time, as curative measures for substantive
4 traffic impacts, as well as curative measures for impacts to
5 pedestrians.
6 Now, I'm sitting here with Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal
7 report that is not the one that is in the record, that
8 clearly has verbiage changes that may or may not be
9 material, and I, frankly, am unwilling to continue with my
10 cross-examination until I have the actual report with the
11 redline changes so that I can conduct a meaningful cross-
12 examination. This is an absolute waste of my time to go
13 through and guess what may have changed or may have not
14 changed between this report that I've been reading now for
15 nearly a month and what Mr. Sullivan has actually entered
16 into the record.
17 I, you know, at what point is this, you know, at
18 some point, I question whether these are inadvertent errors
19 or if this really is a calculated effort to try and divert
20 attention from what the real issues in this case are. We
21 have found over and over again errors in these reports. We
22 have taken time, we've evaluated them, we've cross-examined
23 on them extensively, and I submit to you, with some very,
24 very productive results. And to sit here today -- I can't
25 tell you how angry and outraged I am to be here right now in

Page 150

1 this position.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you can. You just did.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I can and I do. Ms. Adelman
4 has made it perfectly clear that no matter what I say, my
5 face, the color -- I'm not making light of this. It, this
6 is a pattern, Mr. Guckert, and a very troubling one.
7 MS. CORDRY: Mr. Grossman.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman.
9 MS. CORDRY: Mr. Guckert is a pattern.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman.
11 MS. CORDRY: He's a pattern to.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't make the errors; Mr.
13 Guckert --
14 MS. CORDRY: Yes.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not trying to --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: So I'll make my own errors later
17 on.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Fine. I'm not trying to cast
19 aspersions.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Here's the, first of all, as far as
21 the intersection 16, I already ruled that that ends up not
22 being material because we're not going to --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: I understand.
24 THE COURT: -- involve that change in the outcome
25 of this case. So that, now, we're talking, we're down to

Page 151

1 the Guckert document and the missing page issue. He
2 testified that it didn't exist. I don't really have a basis
3 one way or the other of knowing. My assumption is, and I
4 think it's probably reasonable, is that it just, and I think
5 all of it is inadvertent errors to tell you the truth.
6 As far as this, Mr. Goecke has stated he
7 inadvertently sent the draft out instead of the final copy,
8 so I don't think I can, I don't think outrage is the
9 appropriate level of concern here.
10 MS. CORDRY: If I could go back to Mr. Guckert's,
11 he testified at least twice on the day, very shortly after
12 these documents were produced, that there was a copying
13 problem and that's why it wasn't, that it was missing,
14 because I don't know whether the copy machine has all the
15 sheets in there or not. He says that twice on both page 155
16 and 157.
17 That was repeated through Ms. Harris's, a e-mail
18 from Ms. Harris, which I will give her the benefit of the
19 doubt, but she was again told by Mr. Guckert that it hadn't
20 been copied, and that's why it wasn't produced to us.
21 And then we get up there on the stand, and you saw
22 how taken aback I was when he said, oh, I never actually did
23 that report, I never made it, I just estimated those numbers
24 out of my head.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's his testimony.

Page 152

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: You didn't make a motion regarding
3 that. So what is that you --
4 MS. CORDRY: Well, I don't know what kind of a
5 motion --
6 THE COURT: What are you --
7 MS. CORDRY: Well, my --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- asking me to do?
9 MS. CORDRY: Well, my point is at this is a
10 pattern of getting testimony from witnesses that is not
11 correct; that they misstate things; that we don't get the
12 full documents; and then it turns out, maybe the documents
13 don't even exist. I mean, it's just, this is the problem
14 we've had throughout this case.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: And I understand that the
16 intersection 16 changes are not under consideration, but the
17 reality is, what was provided to us bore no resemblance to
18 what had been provided to Park and Planning staff, or later,
19 submitted into the record. The pattern that I'm talking
20 about --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand the concern.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: All right. All right.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand the concern, but I
24 don't attribute evil motive the way you are suggesting is a
25 possibility here. But I'll hear from Mr. Goecke or Ms.

Page 153

1 Harris.
2 MS. HARRIS: In terms of the intersection 16, to
3 be fair, the, what was submitted initially were, was shared
4 with Park and Planning. And like in any planning process,
5 staff came back and said, you should consider this or that
6 after we sat down with them, it's somewhat iterative
7 process. And so what we ultimately submitted to Park and
8 Planning was what was then provided to, it was attached to
9 Mr. Axler's e-mail to you, and that was provided to
10 opponents.
11 MS. CORDRY: Well --
12 MS. HARRIS: And there was no, and furthermore,
13 the changes were not material. There were some changes --
14 MS. ROSENFELD: Oh --
15 MS. HARRIS: -- granted, but they were not
16 material changes.
17 MS. CORDRY: Well --
18 MS. HARRIS: And so I think that's hyperbole in
19 terms of the description. And there was no, there's
20 certainly was no evil motive; it was an attempt to perfect
21 the concept that was initially submitted.
22 MS. CORDRY: Well, the data that we got, we got
23 originally one page --
24 MS. HARRIS: Because that's what was originally
25 prepared.

1 MS. CORDRY: But what you then gave to Park and
2 Planning that we saw was a seven-page document, six- or
3 seven-page document --

4 MS. ROSENFELD: Six.

5 MS. CORDRY: -- that had the same thing on it. It
6 was dated at the same date as the one page you gave us, but
7 the one page you gave us, there was a one-page picture of
8 the intersection and then five or six pages of truck turning
9 diagrams. We didn't get the truck turning diagrams until
10 weeks later when we asked about them repeatedly, if there
11 were truck turning radiuses. We were never told they'd
12 already been prepared.

13 The version, the one-page intersection diagram we
14 got and that was submitted by Mr. Agliata as being what
15 Westfield was approving was not the same one page that was
16 attached to what Park and Planning looked at.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.

18 MS. ADELMAN: Right.

19 MS. CORDRY: This is --

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's hear, but let's hear
21 from Ms. Harris without interruption here.

22 MS. CORDRY: Well, I thought she had finished what
23 she was saying, and --

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well --

25 MS. ADELMAN: Could I just add before Ms. Harris

1 says something.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead.

3 MS. ADELMAN: At the meeting we had, Karen was
4 present, I was there with Park and Planning, Kalig, Renee,
5 and Ed, I produced the document that you saw that was
6 produced by the applicant with the green arrows, the red
7 arrows, you remember that document, and said, have you seen
8 this document. That was the document entered into this
9 hearing. And the reply from three people was, no.

10 MS. CORDRY: Well --

11 MS. HARRIS: I can, I will go back --

12 MR. GROSSMAN: The reply from three --

13 MS. HARRIS: -- and show you --

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second, Ms. -- reply
15 from --

16 MS. ADELMAN: From Kalig, from Ed, and from Renee.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

18 MS. HARRIS: And I will go back and show you the
19 e-mail where Wes forwarded to them the diagram with the
20 turning diagrams on there. They have that.

21 MS. CORDRY: Well --

22 MS. ADELMAN: They truck turning diagram, it's not
23 the same as the --

24 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.

25 MS. ADELMAN: -- non-stop --

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Folks, I'm not going to waste any
2 more time on intersection 16 because it's not going to be as
3 we, as I earlier ruled, it's not going to be a factor, at
4 least the proposed changes, the intersection 16 are not a
5 factor in this case anymore, so let's not waste an
6 inordinate amount of time. I understand the concerns that
7 have been announced.

8 The real, more immediate problem is whether or not
9 Mr. Sullivan's cross-examination should go forward when
10 there's this concern about the copy of the rebuttal report.
11 How long will it take before this side-by-side comparison is
12 finished, Mr. Goecke?

13 MR. GOECKE: We're being told that they're having
14 problems because it's in the PDF and you can't do a work
15 share compare on PDFs so --

16 MS. CORDRY: And I think Mr. Sullivan has stated
17 that he doesn't keep his drafts, so I don't know, somebody's
18 going to have to do a line-by-line --

19 MS. HARRIS: Well, I just informed my office that
20 they'll be doing a line-by-line manual comparison if need
21 be. But obviously, it's not going to be in the next 10
22 minutes because of that.

23 MS. ROSENFELD: I mean, the first indication, of
24 course, was when there was 70-foot versus the 50-foot --

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

1 MS. ROSENFELD: -- distance on page 26 or 28. I
2 have verbiage changes, number changes. I have no way to
3 know.

4 MR. GOECKE: And if I could also just address Ms.
5 Rosenfeld's accusation that this is part of an intentional
6 pattern or practice, I appreciate your statement that you
7 don't think that's the case, and I can assure you it's not
8 the case. And I can't speak to the nuances behind what
9 happened with Mr. Guckert's documents in his office, but you
10 know, we've been working on this case for over, well over a
11 year now; we've had, this is day 31, we've got 550 exhibits,
12 there's lots of people involved.

13 I made a mistake when I e-mailed out this
14 document. I apologize for that. I assure everyone that it
15 was not intentional, and it's not part of any pattern.

16 We've worked very hard to do the opposite, but mistakes are
17 made. And even this morning, Ms. Cordry passed out three
18 documents that were amendments to exhibits she had done
19 before --

20 MS. CORDRY: Two.

21 MR. GOECKE: -- so we're not the only ones who
22 make mistakes. They've been making mistakes as well. I
23 think it's unfair to just look at it so one-sidedly. I
24 appreciate their frustration, but I just think that's, it's
25 important to know.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I actually agree with what Mr.
2 Goecke said. We've all made some mistakes in this. There
3 have been documents where you've provided corrections, Ms.
4 Cordry. It's understandable with the level, the number of
5 documents and the level of detail here that there would be
6 some mistakes made. The question now is -- I'm, that's my
7 conclusion. There's no intentional misstating of
8 documentation here; it's just what happens in a case that's
9 gone on for a year with all these documents.

10 Just the question now, how do you propose to
11 proceed at this juncture? I'll hear from the applicant.

12 MR. GOECKE: If there are not portions of his
13 testimony that can be done outside the report, I, you know,
14 the potential prejudice is on them, so I'm, that would be my
15 suggestion that we do what we can today to the extent it
16 doesn't prejudice them. If they feel like they can't
17 proceed without being prejudiced, I can't object to that.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So are there portions
19 of the cross-examination that go outside of the rebuttal
20 report that can be proceeded with now, either from Mr.
21 Silverman or from you, Ms. Rosenfeld?

22 MS. CORDRY: Not realistically. I mean, we
23 developed it in a certain way. There's some portions that,
24 perhaps, are not strictly out of here, but they're ones that
25 we were still finalizing because from the time we've spent,

1 we knew we were not going to get to them by the end of
2 today. And I don't have all the exhibits copied and the
3 questions finalized or anything like that for that, so --

4 MS. ROSENFELD: I, everything that I had prepared
5 for today --

6 MS. CORDRY: Was doing his rebuttal.

7 MS. ROSENFELD: -- was based on his rebuttal
8 report. I mean, we've, there, we've --

9 MR. GROSSMAN: I suspect that --

10 MS. ROSENFELD: -- covered everything.

11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that you're going to find, when
12 it's all, when it all shakes out that the changes are minor
13 and that all of your work will not have been in vein --

14 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I --

15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- with the exception of perhaps a
16 couple of page references.

17 MS. ROSENFELD: I --

18 MR. GROSSMAN: So I suspect that's the way it's
19 going to shake out, but --

20 MS. ROSENFELD: The ones that are questions that I
21 have that, frankly, came up as a result of earlier testimony
22 today on his August 16th, 2013 report, which I'm happy to go
23 through. But for that --

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

25 MS. ROSENFELD: -- everything else relies on his

1 rebuttal report.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: What about you, Mr. Silverman?

3 MR. SILVERMAN: Yeah, I would agree. I want to
4 hear Ms. Rosenfeld's, kind of, thoughts on the complete, so
5 I didn't waste your time --

6 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So let's go ahead with
7 the thing you can go ahead with, Ms. Rosenfeld, and then
8 we'll break, and can we get the side-by-side by the end of
9 the day?

10 MS. HARRIS: I will try it. I mean, I, I'm not
11 sure, and it's probably going to be a hand marked up
12 highlight because we can't do it electronically. And well,

13 I'll go out in the hall and try to make arrangements for
14 someone to start on that. That's what I've been doing now.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let's say by, since we, May
16 8th is when we're coming back, let's say by tomorrow, have
17 that --

18 MS. HARRIS: Okay.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to the other side.

20 MS. HARRIS: Got it.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: And then go on from there at the
22 May 8th session. All right.

23 All right. Do you want to continue with your
24 cross-examination?

25 MS. ROSENFELD: Sure. Thank you.

1 I'm handing out excerpts from Hearing Examiner
2 Exhibit 255A, which is the August 16th, 2013 report. Mr.
3 Sullivan, did I understand you to testify earlier that in
4 your August 2016 report, your one-hour NO2 concentrations
5 were 168 -- I'm sorry -- were 160? And I'm looking at, did
6 I understand your testimony correctly?

7 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe I said 160.

8 MS. ROSENFELD: 1, 6, zero? Okay. And is that
9 the number that's reflected on the figure small (i) on page
10 5?

11 And Mr. Grossman, these are excerpts of pages.

12 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

13 MS. ROSENFELD: I can just provide a whole copy.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: It says 160.2.

15 MS. ROSENFELD: And is that the, talking about
16 160? And if I go to page 4, which is the preceding page,
17 the first bulleted point -- I want to make sure I'm reading
18 this correctly -- we've assumed conservatively that
19 individuals were in the queue for an hour even though
20 transaction queue data shows that the maximum time is 16
21 minutes on weekdays and 20 minutes on weekends, based on
22 passage through a 40-car queue, based on the observed 4
23 minutes fueling time per vehicle, through put for passage
24 through the queue.

25 Then you go on to say, in the refined model, we

Page 162

1 assume 20 minutes in queue and 40 minutes at the background
2 concentration for the one-hour NO2 concentrations. Does
3 this paragraph reflect the 160 number that's shown in figure
4 I?
5 MR. GROSSMAN: When you say, does that reflect,
6 you mean that, does the, is the 160 number derived from a
7 20-minute exposure, is that what you're saying?
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Question is? Okay.
10 MR. SULLIVAN: I, my recollection, it's been a
11 while since I reviewed this report from 2013, but figure 2
12 on page 6, which you don't have, I don't believe have in
13 here, it shows the, what the concentration is with the
14 maximum timing queue considered, and that maximum is 113.4.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: So the 113.4 is reduced for the
16 time in queue?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: So the second paragraph that
19 you're talking about, this first bulleted paragraph on page
20 4 is talking about figure 2 and not figure 1?
21 MR. SULLIVAN: And again, please point me to the
22 right page and paragraph you're asking this question from?
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 4, the first bulleted
24 paragraph.
25 MR. SULLIVAN: It conservatively address any

Page 163

1 individuals in queue even though they were only there 20
2 minutes would be consistent with clock, figure I on page 5,
3 and consideration of timing queue would be consistent with
4 figure 2, figure 2 on page 6.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: So this first bulleted point is
6 talking about two different figures, figure 1 and figure 2?
7 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. Well, the first part is
8 talking about the difference, what we did in figure I.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
10 MR. SULLIVAN: And this last part would be figure
11 II.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. All right. Thank you. And
13 then when I look at figure I on page 5, it says, plot
14 showing refined modeling of one-hour NO2 concentrations
15 based on Sections 4 and 5 of this report. The following
16 page after that figure I, Section 4, I believe under Section
17 4, you made some adjustments to reduce emission rates for
18 the heavy-duty vehicles. Am I reading that correctly?
19 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not really sure where you're
20 at. I'm looking at, you're asking about Section 4?
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Right, which begins on page 18 of
22 your August report.
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. We, we had found that the
24 computations for the loading dock had an excessive number of
25 trucks, and the, the refined calculation shown on page 18 is

Page 164

1 trying to clarify that.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: And then Section 5, which is the
3 next page of it, so did it, page 23, Section 5 says,
4 modeling results focused on the areas of highest
5 concentrations at the mall based on refined NO2 analysis for
6 Section 4 and urban rural plots for all pollutants. Then it
7 goes on to say, figures 9 through 12 include all of the
8 refinements of Section 4, except for the time in queue. So
9 if I go to 9 through 12, am I looking at the numbers without
10 the corrected factor, without reducing it to the 20 minutes?
11 MR. GROSSMAN: I hate to ask this question after
12 our last discussion, but my page 23 doesn't say figures 9
13 through 12 include; it says, figures 9 through 12 present
14 a --
15 MS. ROSENFELD: They do. I misread it. It does
16 say, that's my error. Figures 9 through 12 present.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: You guys have to master the
18 Washington lingo. You've said it's my error, Mr. Goecke
19 said I made a mistake. You're supposed to say, mistakes
20 were made, is that --
21 MS. CORDRY: Were made -- yes, exactly, we
22 understand that.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's done in this
24 area.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: As an English major, I know that's

Page 165

1 not --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: I know it's passive, but --
3 MS. ROSENFELD: -- grammatically --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that's the Washington way. All
5 right.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: So figures 9 through, if I'm
7 reading this correctly -- and I know it's been a while, take
8 your time to look at it -- if I'm reading, am I reading this
9 correctly to say that figures 9 through 12 are straight up
10 numbers, you didn't make any reductions based on time and
11 queue?
12 MR. SULLIVAN: That's my recollection that's what
13 it says.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. So then if I go to figure
15 9, which in my report, is on page 24 --
16 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: -- refined predicted 98th
18 percentile one-hour NO2 ISO crest runs, it says max, 168.
19 MR. SULLIVAN: It, yes, it does.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: If that is the number based on the
21 modification for the heavy-duty vehicles but without
22 discounting for the 20 minutes, how do you get from the 168
23 in figure 9 to the 160 on figure I on page 5?
24 MR. SULLIVAN: This came up in the record earlier,
25 and the issue is that this particular figure 9 is using a

Page 166

1 98th background instead of 90. And that clarification is on
2 the record already.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Where does figure 1 say it's based
4 on the 98th percentile?
5 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm looking at figure, right now,
6 I'm looking at figure 9. It shows 98, it's actually 98.
7 Figure 1 you referred to earlier is based upon 90, as I, I
8 recall correctly.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: It's not percentile difference,
10 it's background --
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Right.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- levels, 1 is at 98 --
13 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct. And the cubic meter.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and this one says 90, right.
15 MR. SULLIVAN: One is based on the more updated
16 background, one is not.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Figure 9 is based on 90?
18 MR. SULLIVAN: Figure 9 is based on 98, is my
19 recollection --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, if you would look at page
21 20 --
22 MR. SULLIVAN: -- and figure 1 is based upon 90.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Please look at figure 9 on
24 page 24. Urban dispersion plus 90 background.
25 MR. SULLIVAN: This, as I said on the record, we

Page 167

1 clarified, I clarified previously that it was 98, not 90.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: So I should cross out 90 on page
3 24 and write 98?
4 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: That applies to figure 10 as well?
6 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: I don't remember that.
8 MR. SULLIVAN: It's the record I'm sure.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Thank you for that.
10 Answers my question. I have no further questions at this
11 time.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, if there are no
13 further questions from the opposition on cross-examination,
14 is there anything further that we can do today in the time
15 that's left over, or should we just break until May 8th?
16 MS. HARRIS: I have a question and I don't know if
17 it relates specifically to your question, which is how do
18 you anticipate handling the conditions in your discussion of
19 the conditions? You have ours, you have the mutual-agreed
20 upon conditions, and then you have --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
22 MS. HARRIS: -- in addition to what --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I've gone through all of them, and
24 what I was planning to do was, for the ones that are all
25 mutually-agreed, I don't think we need any further

Page 168

1 discussion. They would be included as an appendix to the
2 report as conditions that are mutually-agreed if the special
3 exception is approved with the opposition not waiving any
4 objection to the special exception itself.
5 As to the ones that are disputed, we'd discuss
6 them here and see, you know, if there are, any disputes can
7 be resolved; and if not, I would include them as well as
8 ones you would, as you would have it and ones as the
9 opposition would have it, just so the Board of Appeals would
10 have a full picture of the conditions that were suggested.
11 And may well have my own, may or may not have additional
12 ones that I would suggest.
13 MS. HARRIS: So the goal of the mutual discussion
14 would be to see whether there's other additional ones that
15 can be mutually agreed upon?
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Unless anybody else has any
17 other ideas on that. It seems to me that that would be the
18 way to handle it. It would be, I would make sure that it's
19 clear that the opposition is not agreeing to the special
20 exception with these conditions, but rather just stating
21 that these are the ones, these are the conditions if, over
22 their objection, the special exception is granted.
23 MR. SILVERMAN: These conditions are all
24 enforceable?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, yes, they wouldn't be --

Page 169

1 MR. SILVERMAN: And so --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: They're, usually, the way it works
3 is, the Department of Permitting Services makes annual
4 inspections and enforces conditions if there's not a; if
5 there's a violation, they issue a violation notice.
6 MR. SILVERMAN: But aren't certain of the
7 conditions like with the pedestrian path and the wall are
8 not under the control of Westfield?
9 MR. GROSSMAN: That's true, but they are, since
10 they are conditions that the applicant and Westfield has
11 agreed to, they would be enforceable as part of the special
12 exception; that is, if they were not complied with by the
13 applicant, who has responsibility for carrying out its
14 portion, then there could be sanctions by the Board of
15 Appeals.
16 MR. SILVERMAN: Against the applicant?
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it doesn't have power over
18 anybody but the applicant. Ultimately, the special
19 exception is at risk, it could be revoked if conditions are
20 violated.
21 MR. SILVERMAN: After the station's built.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Could be revoked, it's a special
23 exception.
24 MR. SILVERMAN: And that, of course, being said,
25 based on a letter --

1 MR. GROSSMAN: In the file.
 2 MR. SILVERMAN: -- in the file, and we should give
 3 that, I mean, what weight is that at? Is that a binding
 4 contract? Is that, what is it? I just, you know, it's, I
 5 mean, to me, it's always seemed that Westfield should be
 6 part of this case and subject to the jurisdiction of the
 7 Board. I don't really understand why they're not if they're
 8 so critical to some key provisions.
 9 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, they're not an applicant
 10 here, so they're not before the Board in that sense. But,
 11 and it's conceivable that the Board might decide that they
 12 do not want to impose a condition that involves a portion of
 13 land outside of the subject site. I can't tell you that the
 14 Board would do that; I can tell you that I have, in the
 15 past, recommended such a condition in another case, and it
 16 was applied with the commission of the owner of the
 17 property. And I believe it also involved a wall.
 18 MS. CORDRY: Fence, I believe, perhaps.
 19 MR. GROSSMAN: It was a gas station and I think it
 20 was something enough to --
 21 MS. CORDRY: Up in New Hampshire Avenue?
 22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the barrier. Pardon me?
 23 MS. CORDRY: Up in Spencerville, if I'm
 24 remembering, I think.
 25 MR. GROSSMAN: Might be. Exxon, it was an Exxon

1 gas station.
 2 MS. CORDRY: I thought that was eventually,
 3 actually not done, but anyway --
 4 MR. GROSSMAN: That may be the case.
 5 MS. CORDRY: -- hardly meaningful at this point,
 6 yes.
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know. I'm just saying that
 8 it was part of the special exception. There was an issue
 9 raised, there was oral argument before the Board of Appeals,
 10 and there was an issue raised about having such a condition.
 11 But in any event, my recollection is they did, in fact,
 12 impose that condition with the consent of the owner.
 13 MR. SILVERMAN: And with something like a
 14 pedestrian path, there's a wall, is there an implicit
 15 construction that these are built but maintained? Or is
 16 that explicit or, and again, is that directed?
 17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, there was language about
 18 maintaining the wall and the path, I think, in the post-
 19 condition. And I think it was being maintained by Costco,
 20 if I recall.
 21 MR. SILVERMAN: And we have, do you construe the
 22 letters we have from Westfield as inferring a legally
 23 important right to Costco to carry out these provisions?
 24 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't, I wouldn't be in a
 25 position to make that kind of decision; that's between

1 Costco and Westfield. I'm not a court, and I'm not, I can't
 2 make that kind of decision. All I can say is that if the
 3 Board imposes a condition with a requirement upon Costco and
 4 it's not fulfilled, then there can be a sanction up to
 5 revoking the special exception upon an appropriate
 6 proceeding. So there's a strong incentive for an applicant,
 7 especially one that's made a big investment, to carry out
 8 the condition.
 9 MR. SILVERMAN: It seems like if the conditions
 10 are intended to protect citizens in the neighborhood, it
 11 seems like the, a weak protection.
 12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's not get into that
 13 debate. The statute provides for enforcement in the way the
 14 statute provides, so --
 15 MR. SILVERMAN: I mean, just as a practical
 16 matter, that shutting down an existing gas station, that's a
 17 very, that's a very, that's bad for everybody. It's just
 18 it's, I'm just wondering here, Mr. Grossman, I'm new to
 19 this, and I, it seems to me that people who are critical to
 20 the successful resolution of cases are the, it's, I guess,
 21 my position.
 22 And there is a motion in the Federal Rules of
 23 Civil Procedure that says that, a motion to dismiss for
 24 failure to produce an indispensable party --
 25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Familiar with it.

1 MR. SILVERMAN: And I'm sure you are. I wonder if
 2 we are missing and indispensable party in this case as well.
 3 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think so.
 4 MR. SILVERMAN: Okay.
 5 MR. GROSSMAN: And the rules, the Federal Rules of
 6 Civil Procedure, nor the Maryland Rules, for that matter,
 7 don't apply to this administrative proceeding.
 8 Okay. So lacking anything else to, on our agenda,
 9 we'll adjourn until May 8, in this location, at 9:30 a.m.,
 10 and hopefully, by tomorrow, we'll have the side-by-side
 11 version and, of the rebuttal report.
 12 MS. CORDRY: And that we'd also have all of Mr.
 13 Sullivan's background. He was going to check several of
 14 those things about where the background came from and so
 15 forth so, which he was going to be able to provide to us by
 16 tomorrow as well.
 17 MR. GOECKE: Right. If you could send us a list
 18 of exactly what you want so we make sure we get you the
 19 right information.
 20 MS. CORDRY: Okay.
 21 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I mean, that's, he has
 22 volunteered to do it. Mr. Goecke has apparently volunteered
 23 to supply it. It's not a requirement. Usually, if a
 24 witness doesn't know an answer, they say, I don't know.
 25 MS. CORDRY: Well, okay.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: And so it's not a requirement that
2 it be done, but he's agreed to do it, so --

3 MS. CORDRY: But it was simply questions about
4 what background monitors he was using in his report, so I
5 think it would be difficult for him to say he didn't know
6 what he had done. He didn't know it off the top of his
7 head, but in any case --

8 MR. GROSSMAN: But that's what happens when a
9 witness is on the stand; they either know it or they don't
10 know it, and if they don't know, they say they don't know,
11 and usually, that's the end of the story. But I'm not
12 saying he can't supply it. I mean, he's agreed to supply
13 it, that's fine. Okay.

14 Then we are adjourned until May 8th. Thank you.

15 (Whereupon, at 3:01 p.m., the hearing was
16 concluded.)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2
3 DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that
4 the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the
5 electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the
6 Office of Zoning and Administrative Hearings for Montgomery
7 County in the matter of:

8
9 Petition of Costco Wholesale Corporation
10 Special Exception No. S-2863
11 OZAH No. 13-12

12
13 By:

14
15
16
17
18 Kimberly Chwirut, Transcriber

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A				
<p>aback (1) 151:22</p> <p>Abigail (1) 4:8</p> <p>ability (1) 37:19</p> <p>able (3) 54:11;146:8;173:15</p> <p>above (8) 17:1,5;42:6,14;44:7; 47:22;90:23;91:1</p> <p>absolute (1) 149:12</p> <p>academic (1) 62:17</p> <p>acceptable (1) 51:23</p> <p>accepted (5) 51:21;52:2;62:6,7; 82:22</p> <p>accidents (1) 6:14</p> <p>accomplish (1) 66:22</p> <p>according (1) 136:20</p> <p>account (2) 86:6;109:5</p> <p>accurate (11) 19:1;24:9;47:1;60:9; 68:8;78:17;89:18;94:7; 8;116:13;123:2</p> <p>accusation (1) 157:5</p> <p>acknowledged (1) 49:20</p> <p>acquired (1) 125:21</p> <p>acronym (3) 115:21;117:8;133:5</p> <p>Act (1) 72:5</p> <p>activities (4) 60:7;73:20;74:18; 75:24</p> <p>actual (18) 9:9;15:11;17:11; 23:21;28:13;47:4;53:6; 58:20;59:8;65:5,5; 80:18;83:12;88:25; 108:16;121:18;148:10; 149:10</p> <p>actually (45) 5:13;6:8,19;7:7,17; 10:3;14:3;15:21,25; 19:14,21;27:17;29:25; 30:16;31:23;32:19; 49:4,8;54:9;59:8,18; 64:1;77:8;79:14,20; 83:10;84:2,98:13;99:2,</p>	<p>4;101:1,2;118:20; 130:9,11;131:22; 138:21;141:10;147:4; 148:7;149:15;151:22; 158:1;166:6;171:3</p> <p>add (7) 28:6;72:8;82:24; 103:5;122:12;123:4; 154:25</p> <p>added (1) 93:13</p> <p>addition (1) 167:22</p> <p>additional (3) 52:25;168:11,14</p> <p>address (9) 43:4;58:1;71:4,18; 81:24;83:21;93:20; 157:4;162:25</p> <p>addressed (2) 15:16;61:1</p> <p>addressing (2) 65:20;83:22</p> <p>adds (1) 6:14</p> <p>Adelman (43) 4:8,8,10,13;12:7; 14:21;18:16;21:21; 23:15;45:23,25;46:3, 16,18;55:12;68:16; 69:23,25;70:2;96:21, 25;97:4;130:14; 138:24;139:2,8;141:2, 25;142:5,7,11,16,18; 143:19,22;144:8; 150:3;154:18,25; 155:3,16,22,25</p> <p>adjacent (1) 53:22</p> <p>adjourn (1) 173:9</p> <p>adjourned (1) 174:14</p> <p>adjust (3) 42:4,5,13</p> <p>adjusted (2) 82:9;85:25</p> <p>adjusting (1) 85:24</p> <p>adjustment (1) 42:19</p> <p>adjustments (1) 163:17</p> <p>adjusts (1) 42:4</p> <p>administrative (2) 38:1;173:7</p> <p>adverse (2) 21:15;64:18</p> <p>advertising (1) 96:25</p> <p>advising (1) 134:10</p>	<p>Advisory (1) 62:5</p> <p>advocating (1) 28:14</p> <p>AERMOD (8) 26:3;52:1;64:4; 127:8,10,15;128:4,19</p> <p>affect (3) 19:23;45:14;80:19</p> <p>affected (5) 40:8;44:23;45:7; 85:17;92:10</p> <p>afterwards (1) 97:3</p> <p>again (24) 9:7;16:4;18:4,5,9,10, 19;49:14;61:5;75:5; 79:8;99:25;103:25; 109:14;112:4;128:1; 131:15,25;140:22; 148:19;149:21;151:19; 162:21;171:16</p> <p>against (2) 117:6;169:16</p> <p>agency (11) 20:21,21;55:6,17,24; 56:7,8,10,13,14;120:13</p> <p>agenda (1) 173:8</p> <p>agile (1) 32:14</p> <p>Agliata (1) 154:14</p> <p>ago (2) 34:18;133:25</p> <p>agree (15) 12:1;38:18;41:22; 42:1;43:25;44:19;48:3; 70:22;73:11,13,14; 82:2;83:11;158:1; 160:3</p> <p>agreed (7) 124:21,22,25; 168:15;169:11;174:2, 12</p> <p>agreeing (1) 168:19</p> <p>agreement (1) 83:8</p> <p>agricultural (1) 61:21</p> <p>ahead (6) 16:8;34:12;84:25; 155:2;160:6,7</p> <p>air (53) 10:22;11:9,13;20:20; 34:18,19;35:14,21; 36:2,10,14;38:20; 41:10,23;42:2,4,4,10, 12;43:4,11,22;44:21, 23;45:1,18,19;48:14; 50:5;51:21;52:24,25; 53:2,13,14;55:22;56:3;</p>	<p>59:24;60:2,18;62:9; 64:8;66:9;69:17;71:4, 13;72:5,5;93:25; 116:12;119:25;126:17; 135:17</p> <p>al (2) 54:20;56:2</p> <p>Alexandria (5) 33:4;39:4;40:5,9,19</p> <p>all- (1) 142:16</p> <p>allow (4) 3:5;37:20;54:3; 70:13</p> <p>allowable (1) 38:2</p> <p>allowed (1) 120:25</p> <p>allows (4) 26:4;49:25;50:3; 61:15</p> <p>almost (1) 21:9</p> <p>alone (1) 84:1</p> <p>along (9) 38:10;64:22;86:7; 89:20;92:24;110:12; 111:14;143:25;146:13</p> <p>Alrighty (1) 95:21</p> <p>alternative (6) 30:10;115:3;127:6, 23;128:3;129:24</p> <p>alternatives (1) 115:9</p> <p>although (2) 37:12;121:2</p> <p>always (3) 10:19;107:7;170:5</p> <p>ambient (11) 35:21;36:14;53:2; 55:22;56:3;59:24;60:2; 72:5;119:18,23,25</p> <p>amendments (1) 157:18</p> <p>among (1) 61:10</p> <p>amount (7) 25:25;60:10;70:15; 79:13;83:24;121:3; 156:6</p> <p>analects (2) 16:20;19:22</p> <p>analysis (33) 9:6;16:12;64:3,11; 66:1,15;68:3,5,6; 71:18;77:12;87:9; 92:16;93:4;94:19; 98:16;100:5,8,11; 109:7,8,10;128:17; 129:14;132:3,24,25; 133:2,9,11,18;147:22;</p>	<p>164:5</p> <p>analyzing (2) 14:1,9</p> <p>Angeles (2) 21:4;23:3</p> <p>angry (1) 149:25</p> <p>announced (1) 156:7</p> <p>annual (10) 50:17;74:1,2;75:16, 17;100:7;112:5; 128:14,16;169:3</p> <p>answered (1) 72:1</p> <p>anticipate (2) 28:19;167:18</p> <p>anticipated (3) 66:23;73:19;77:22</p> <p>anymore (1) 156:5</p> <p>apologize (2) 145:22;157:14</p> <p>apparently (2) 139:7;173:22</p> <p>Appeals (5) 3:4,16;168:9;169:15; 171:9</p> <p>appeared (1) 29:18</p> <p>Appendix (8) 53:1;54:18,24; 126:14;130:3,3;142:3; 168:1</p> <p>applicable (3) 27:19;59:24;62:18</p> <p>applicant (8) 155:6;158:11; 169:10,13,16,18;170:9; 172:6</p> <p>applicants (2) 64:8;72:2</p> <p>applicant's (2) 4:21,24</p> <p>application (15) 44:20;53:1;54:12; 64:16;85:14;103:3; 119:20;125:25;127:17; 137:7,9;138:13,15; 140:5,6</p> <p>applied (16) 16:12;20:3;53:25; 64:14;86:11;89:5; 119:5,15;123:22; 127:5;129:16;131:13; 132:8;140:19;144:2; 170:16</p> <p>applies (3) 40:23;123:16;167:5</p> <p>apply (18) 13:15;40:22;50:14; 51:6,16;53:17;54:11; 59:6,7,20;85:1,91:15;</p>

<p>93:25;123:19;140:11, 23;144:5;173:7 applying (3) 13:13;119:7;121:6 appreciate (3) 147:20;157:6,24 approach (14) 13:25;14:9;28:15; 52:2;63:18;95:9; 109:10;115:10;121:8; 123:6;125:24;128:15, 24;129:24 approaching (1) 35:4 appropriate (7) 34:24;40:6;56:17; 63:24;64:5;151:9; 172:5 approved (1) 168:3 approving (1) 154:15 approximately (6) 21:1;42:10,19;79:6, 24;80:2 April (5) 3:11;4:15;5:5;6:18; 88:11 arbitrarily (1) 25:18 area (20) 13:19,19;33:22; 38:21;41:14;42:8,9; 43:3,21;44:2;45:9; 58:18;76:21;78:3; 105:5;119:15;137:8; 138:14;140:5;164:24 areas (3) 57:18;124:21;164:4 arguably (1) 111:17 argue (1) 21:17 argument (4) 39:19;65:1;117:18; 171:9 Arlington (22) 29:14;30:1,7,21,24; 31:19;33:5;39:15; 97:25;99:24,24; 100:18,21;103:1,4; 109:15,18;110:23; 111:10,14,15,16 around (10) 11:13;16:24;37:11; 43:21;48:25;49:2; 63:20;121:12,14;123:5 arrangements (1) 160:13 arrive (4) 24:10,11,25;38:5 arrived (1) 24:4</p>	<p>arrows (2) 155:6,7 articles (3) 52:3;123:21,22 Asian (2) 21:5,6 aside (1) 30:11 aspersions (1) 150:19 asphalt (2) 45:6;46:4 asserted (2) 36:22;37:18 assessment (2) 60:9;91:23 Associate (1) 143:11 associated (1) 23:8 assume (8) 36:25;80:13;99:3; 101:9;114:15;121:11; 129:22;162:1 assumed (5) 19:10;91:7,10; 118:21;161:18 assumes (2) 50:6,8 assuming (5) 19:9;27:14;36:20; 51:10;58:8 assumption (5) 19:23;89:4;99:3; 146:14;151:3 assumptions (15) 27:10;50:23;66:8,18, 21;67:22;90:9;91:19; 93:20;119:8,12;124:1, 2;125:8;127:22 assure (2) 157:7,14 atmosphere (5) 48:7,8,12,16;50:12 atmospheric (4) 48:17,24,25;49:4 attached (2) 153:8;154:16 attaching (1) 10:3 attempt (2) 6:19;153:20 attempts (1) 49:24 attention (2) 22:12;149:20 attest (1) 27:6 attribute (1) 152:24 August (9) 17:9;27:2;89:16; 90:12;99:1;159:22;</p>	<p>161:2,4;163:22 Australian (1) 56:14 automobile (1) 3:6 automobiles (1) 34:7 available (9) 29:8;30:9;41:3; 50:12;88:7,15;89:7; 90:2;146:12 Avenue (3) 78:9;80:10;170:21 average (34) 63:6;74:1,2;75:14, 16,18;80:23;82:2,14; 84:21;85:13,17;99:12, 13;101:20;103:18,20, 25;104:24;105:13; 112:16,17,23;113:13, 15;114:1,6,10,21,22, 24,25;128:14,16 averaged (2) 25:3;111:22 averages (1) 114:9 averaging (1) 101:19 avoiding (1) 25:19 avoids (1) 25:23 aware (5) 11:2;23:10,20;35:17; 87:20 away (9) 25:14;32:14;48:25; 50:7,10;54:6;58:16,17, 18 Axler's (1) 153:9</p>	<p>162:1;166:1,10,16,24; 173:13,14;174:4 bad (2) 58:15;172:17 badly (1) 126:6 balance (1) 25:22 balancing (1) 80:11 barrier (1) 170:22 base (1) 51:24 based (47) 13:17;27:4;30:20; 45:9,13;51:14;54:1,10; 57:16;58:21;59:9;60:7; 65:12,16;68:14;69:18; 70:11;76:14;77:12; 79:13;82:10;87:9;98:7, 15;99:14,24;100:7; 102:16;109:9,10,15; 111:9;120:14;159:7; 161:21,22;163:15; 164:5;165:10,20; 166:3,7,15,17,18,22; 169:25 basement (1) 11:2 basic (3) 77:1;85:16;121:7 basically (4) 54:5;61:8;110:18; 119:13 basis (13) 24:16;50:4;68:10; 82:2;83:11;84:19; 101:5,6;109:20;121:6; 130:6;131:12;151:2 Beach (2) 21:5;89:10 became (1) 50:20 becomes (1) 94:13 begin (4) 54:4;73:5;95:22; 120:23 begins (3) 42:8;122:9;163:21 begun (1) 3:11 behalf (2) 3:21;64:8 behind (3) 59:25;65:17;157:8 beholder (1) 86:20 belated (1) 37:16 below (5) 34:22;88:25;89:14;</p>	<p>90:10;133:16 Beltville (20) 29:17,23,25;30:9; 31:22;32:25;33:5,5; 39:15;41:1;76:15; 101:1;111:14,17; 113:9;114:17,20,24; 115:1,14 Beltway (1) 88:4 benefit (1) 151:18 best (4) 61:13;62:10,14; 66:16 best-fit (1) 62:15 better (2) 30:18,19 beyond (1) 68:24 bias (1) 116:8 biased (3) 147:1,2,5 bible (2) 11:15;12:14 big (4) 11:12;13:20;85:20; 172:7 binding (1) 170:3 bit (9) 4:11;75:7;82:14; 85:17,25;86:18;92:15; 93:8;95:16 blank (1) 9:10 block (2) 103:14;104:25 bloweth (1) 11:20 blue (2) 76:3;78:11 Board (10) 3:3,15;168:9;169:14; 170:7,10,11,14;171:9; 172:3 bore (1) 152:17 both (9) 21:22;24:14;51:9; 100:18;109:17,18; 132:6;149:3;151:15 bottom (5) 80:12;81:13,15;82:7; 141:19 Boulevard (3) 87:20,22;88:5 bouncing (1) 33:24 bound (3) 11:11;66:14,17</p>
		B		
		<p>back (23) 6:19;9:8;15:1;18:20; 29:21;30:4;33:11; 86:17;87:13;88:22; 95:16,21;99:10;110:3; 112:8;136:11;145:16; 146:2;151:10;153:5; 155:11,18;160:16 background (50) 7:22;8:1;26:25;27:1; 28:4;29:11,16,19; 38:12;39:21;40:15; 58:9,14;62:23;76:10, 11,12,14;91:15;93:7; 97:22,24;98:11,14,15, 15;99:11,14,22;100:2, 3;102:17;103:2,3,9,22; 109:6;110:19;112:9, 10;127:4;146:23;</p>		

<p>boundary (2) 54:1;121:24</p> <p>bounds (1) 37:10</p> <p>box (3) 76:3;78:11;130:8</p> <p>boxes (1) 106:1</p> <p>brain (1) 8:19</p> <p>BRANN (2) 3:18,18</p> <p>break (10) 72:13,21,22,24; 95:13;107:5;141:21; 145:13;160:8;167:15</p> <p>breakdown (2) 41:23;105:24</p> <p>breaking (1) 106:14</p> <p>Breyse (11) 60:14,15,23;62:1; 63:10;66:13,20;70:24; 86:19;87:18;93:21</p> <p>bridge (1) 66:5</p> <p>brief (2) 72:25;145:14</p> <p>briefing (1) 6:1</p> <p>briefly (1) 22:16</p> <p>bring (4) 14:6;46:10;96:3; 138:1</p> <p>bringing (1) 74:13</p> <p>brought (1) 50:19</p> <p>building (2) 40:13;66:7</p> <p>buildings (1) 45:7</p> <p>built (5) 34:21;78:18;92:23; 169:21;171:15</p> <p>bulleted (4) 161:17;162:19,23; 163:5</p> <p>bumps (1) 31:1</p> <p>bus (3) 40:8,16,17</p> <p>buses (1) 40:13</p> <p>busier (1) 28:24</p> <p>business (2) 39:24;96:16</p> <p>busses (1) 40:17</p> <p>busy (1) 20:14</p>	<p>buy (1) 133:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C-2 (1) 3:10</p> <p>calculate (3) 38:11;99:11;105:8</p> <p>calculated (3) 43:11;58:21;149:19</p> <p>calculation (2) 111:23;163:25</p> <p>calculations (6) 9:14;41:20;43:7,10; 79:15;100:15</p> <p>calibrated (2) 117:6,7</p> <p>California (1) 21:5</p> <p>call (6) 94:15,15,16;117:3; 118:9,11</p> <p>called (10) 5:1;15:25;16:5; 44:15;55:1;61:19,20; 82:17;115:2;117:2</p> <p>calling (1) 124:5</p> <p>came (9) 5:9;111:14;119:12; 125:23;131:4;153:5; 159:21;165:24;173:14</p> <p>can (88) 4:23;5:13,16,18,20; 6:23;7:1,24;8:18;13:2; 21:25;23:17;25:14,15; 30:24;38:5;43:9,12; 45:7,7;48:15;49:11,14; 51:11;58:16;60:2;61:4, 8,8,12;64:25,25;67:7; 68:15,19;69:14;71:22; 72:13,22;73:18;74:16; 76:10;78:14;85:14,23; 86:11;92:17;94:21; 97:2,4;99:1;105:11; 115:9;122:13;129:16, 20;130:12,15;131:4; 132:17,19,21;134:13; 135:11;136:15,16; 141:4,20,21;146:16; 149:11;150:2,3;151:8; 155:11;157:7;158:13, 15,20;160:7,8;161:13; 167:14;168:6,15; 170:14;172:2,4</p> <p>canst (1) 11:22</p> <p>capacity (1) 147:22</p> <p>caps (1) 115:20</p> <p>carbon (2)</p>	<p>81:15;113:20</p> <p>care (1) 44:9</p> <p>careful (1) 126:3</p> <p>Carlo (8) 61:1,5,6,22;63:11; 94:1,11;95:9</p> <p>carried (1) 27:5</p> <p>carry (2) 171:23;172:7</p> <p>carrying (1) 169:13</p> <p>cars (10) 19:17,20,21;21:7,17; 27:23;30:18;31:11; 79:13;92:24</p> <p>case (38) 3:16;10:22;34:16; 38:12,13;42:7;45:5; 49:1;50:2;51:11,14; 56:19;57:23;58:3; 64:15;65:12;85:5; 103:24;114:15;115:10, 13;119:15;123:12; 128:8;143:2;149:20; 150:25;152:14;156:5; 157:7,8,10;158:8; 170:6,15;171:4;173:2; 174:7</p> <p>cases (5) 17:23;87:14;115:12; 120:4;172:20</p> <p>cast (1) 150:18</p> <p>catch (1) 7:25</p> <p>categories (1) 76:3</p> <p>category (4) 78:6,6;83:13;104:23</p> <p>caught (1) 9:25</p> <p>caused (1) 26:22</p> <p>causes (1) 96:18</p> <p>center (1) 121:23</p> <p>central (2) 39:24;121:14</p> <p>certain (3) 119:8;158:23;169:6</p> <p>certainly (11) 17:15;18:11;43:16; 51:25;52:8;54:5;64:21; 99:6;100:19;134:8; 153:20</p> <p>certainty (1) 59:23</p> <p>chamber (3) 48:6,11,13</p>	<p>chance (2) 11:3;22:22</p> <p>change (6) 20:5;27:8;81:14; 113:4;144:3;150:24</p> <p>changed (5) 27:2;139:20;140:22; 149:13,14</p> <p>changes (16) 26:22;90:8;91:18; 146:8;148:12;149:2,8, 11;152:16;153:13,13, 16;156:4;157:2,2; 159:12</p> <p>characteristics (8) 41:6,23;43:5;44:24; 45:2,3,14;47:20</p> <p>characterization (1) 41:10</p> <p>characterize (1) 26:16</p> <p>check (7) 98:8,19,23,24;101:2; 109:23;173:13</p> <p>checked (1) 6:18</p> <p>chemicals (2) 71:1,2</p> <p>chemistry (1) 133:6</p> <p>chosen (1) 121:15</p> <p>chronologically (1) 32:8</p> <p>chunks (1) 48:25</p> <p>circle (2) 121:16,17</p> <p>circulate (1) 146:12</p> <p>circulated (1) 145:23</p> <p>circumference (2) 121:12,13</p> <p>circumstances (1) 38:2</p> <p>citation (2) 15:18;53:9</p> <p>citations (1) 118:2</p> <p>cite (1) 123:16</p> <p>cited (4) 52:6,8,10;54:15</p> <p>citizens (1) 172:10</p> <p>Civil (2) 172:23;173:6</p> <p>clarification (4) 53:1;81:18;83:10; 166:1</p> <p>clarified (4) 82:1;118:22;167:1,1</p>	<p>clarify (8) 13:11;18:19;23:23; 118:16,19;128:1; 131:4;164:1</p> <p>clarity (1) 118:25</p> <p>classified (1) 41:17</p> <p>clean (2) 8:13;72:5</p> <p>clear (4) 10:9;16:11;150:4; 168:19</p> <p>clearly (9) 17:17;19:13,16; 24:19;31:7;36:19; 80:19;120:3;149:8</p> <p>clock (1) 163:2</p> <p>close (2) 40:10,11</p> <p>closely (1) 42:4</p> <p>closer (6) 19:20;47:9,11;67:24; 100:24;111:17</p> <p>closest (1) 41:2</p> <p>cluster (1) 23:1</p> <p>CO (3) 72:8;113:1,1</p> <p>Coalition (2) 4:7,9</p> <p>COB (1) 3:13</p> <p>coefficients (2) 10:25;13:18</p> <p>Cole (64) 4:4,5,5;11:23;12:1,4; 13:12,15;14:8,11,16, 20,24;15:3,4,15;16:2; 23:17;24:3,14;25:2; 34:14;39:11;41:7,12; 42:1;43:23;47:14;51:9; 59:4;73:8;81:23;82:2, 17;95:8;96:6;107:19; 124:15;125:4;129:3,5, 13,15,17,22;130:10,11, 16;131:6,16;132:5,9, 10,24;133:11,21,25; 134:9,23;135:1,4,4,10, 15</p> <p>Cole's (14) 13:23;14:3;29:12; 44:20;47:24;51:15; 58:6;82:22;129:10,11; 130:5;132:4;134:11,16</p> <p>color (3) 5:23;143:8;150:5</p> <p>Colvin (1) 40:19</p> <p>combination (1)</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>72:7 combined (1) 71:8 combustion (1) 74:25 cometh (1) 11:22 coming (3) 43:23;87:12;160:16 comment (1) 86:24 commented (1) 148:17 comments (2) 60:21;133:14 commission (1) 170:16 common (1) 103:14 commonly (3) 51:21;127:15,16 community (5) 49:21,22,23;50:22; 51:21 company (1) 125:18 compare (5) 23:2;66:8;89:6,19; 156:15 compared (9) 19:6;20:1,10;23:8; 45:9;54:7;83:25;84:11; 146:7 comparison (3) 24:16;156:11,20 complete (7) 50:6;53:23;109:24; 119:17,23,24;160:4 completely (3) 48:18;50:8;66:12 completeness (2) 51:19;58:4 complied (1) 169:12 components (1) 148:3 computations (1) 163:24 compute (3) 103:19;120:15,18 conceivable (1) 170:11 concentration (17) 13:18;40:4;45:18,19; 58:19;71:1;75:11; 99:13,14;102:3; 103:20;104:21;106:13; 112:11;120:16;162:2, 13 concentrations (25) 16:23;17:8,11;18:3; 23:11;24:18;28:23,24; 33:20;38:21;45:21;</p>	<p>50:23;59:14;60:7; 73:13,16;77:22;79:4; 103:21;120:17;133:3; 161:4;162:2;163:14; 164:5 concept (3) 25:14;63:21;153:21 concern (10) 35:5;42:13;57:24; 67:22;96:18;144:10; 151:9;152:21,23; 156:10 concerned (1) 34:9 concerning (1) 110:13 concerns (2) 57:25;156:6 conclude (2) 89:21;90:4 concluded (2) 51:14;174:16 conclusion (4) 59:18,20;121:2; 158:7 conclusions (4) 16:16,17;20:6;59:13 concurrency (1) 101:13 concurrent (7) 98:13,14;100:3,4; 102:6,8;109:16 condition (7) 170:12,15;171:10, 12,19;172:3,8 conditions (18) 14:12;41:13,15,16; 44:15;167:18,19,20; 168:2,10,20,21,23; 169:4,7,10,19;172:9 conduct (3) 36:14;38:9;149:11 conducted (1) 133:11 conducting (1) 66:9 confer (1) 96:19 confidence (1) 88:25 confirm (8) 21:20;37:20;46:24; 98:9;99:7,18;112:19; 113:18 confirmed (1) 46:12 confirms (1) 20:8 conflict (3) 115:12;116:19; 117:20 conflicted (1) 115:17</p>	<p>congested (1) 20:14 congestion (1) 21:15 connection (1) 15:8 consensus (1) 86:1 consent (1) 171:12 consequences (1) 11:25 conservatism (17) 19:4,6,25;27:16; 35:4;50:24;66:12;67:1, 4;78:17;86:18,20,25; 91:4;92:16,23;93:3 conservative (30) 16:20,25;17:17;19:2, 20;20:4,7;27:9;28:3; 49:21,24;50:8,22; 58:25;65:18;66:19; 67:3,22;68:9;78:17; 81:4;87:6,9;89:18; 90:1,5;91:24;92:2; 93:20;121:5 conservatively (13) 18:23;19:11;39:5; 54:3,10;65:20;89:5; 125:24;138:18;140:11, 21;161:18;162:25 consider (8) 64:20;65:7;70:25; 78:16;133:3;144:6; 146:17;153:5 considerably (1) 65:14 consideration (2) 152:16;163:3 considered (7) 13:15;64:11;78:5; 81:19;117:4;127:6; 162:14 considering (6) 27:3;28:23;63:22; 64:22;65:4;82:20 consistency (1) 94:10 consistent (7) 9:3;16:24;33:19; 94:5;103:2;163:2,3 constraints (1) 119:16 construct (2) 3:6;64:9 construction (1) 171:15 construe (1) 171:21 consult (1) 125:7 consultation (1) 125:4</p>	<p>Consulting (1) 125:15 contact (7) 48:23;49:15;50:9; 54:7,10;97:11;121:4 contacted (1) 35:24 contain (1) 19:4 contained (1) 44:6 containing (1) 19:25 contains (1) 27:16 contaminant (1) 85:9 contaminants (2) 88:24;92:12 contend (1) 81:3 contended (1) 77:16 contention (2) 77:11,13 context (9) 48:5;52:2;57:9; 58:14,25;62:11;65:22; 87:16;102:8 contexts (1) 62:12 continue (4) 65:24;72:21;149:9; 160:23 continued (1) 111:15 contract (1) 170:4 contributed (1) 105:22 contributing (3) 106:25;107:4,5 contribution (8) 74:20;75:2,23;77:20; 103:7;104:10,22; 108:10 contributions (3) 74:17;76:4,23 contributor (1) 92:8 control (1) 169:8 controls (2) 30:18,19 conversion (14) 14:9;47:11,14;48:15; 49:8,25;50:3;55:25; 58:5;89:21;120:2,6,24; 125:22 conversions (2) 49:6,11 conversion's (1) 47:8</p>	<p>convert (6) 47:19,24;50:10,11, 12;57:21 converts (2) 48:11;50:10 cookie-cutter (1) 94:7 coordinates (1) 123:4 copied (4) 144:11;145:25; 151:20;159:2 copies (2) 22:1;147:24 copy (22) 12:25;13:2;22:7; 46:3;47:5;56:13; 126:10,11;137:21; 141:12,21;142:4,23,24; 143:4;145:19,24; 148:11;151:7,14; 156:10;161:13 copying (3) 147:25;148:8;151:12 CORDRY (145) 3:25,25;4:1,18;5:3, 12,15,17,20;6:5,7,11, 14,23,25;7:2,5,9,13,17, 20;8:1,5,10,12,15;9:4, 6,15,17,19,21,25;10:1, 6,8,11,13;11:5;14:5; 18:4,9;32:16,21,25; 33:10,13;37:15;39:16; 46:6;55:8,10;56:6,11; 68:15,18,21,23;69:8, 21,24;70:1,3,6,8,14,22; 71:20;74:4,6,9;25; 96:3;98:20;116:25; 117:11;132:14;134:4, 6,15;135:6,8,13,15,19, 22;136:1,3,6,9,14; 139:4,9,14,19;140:1, 20,22;141:19;142:1,4, 10,14;143:10;146:16, 19,21,22;147:10,12,15; 148:5,23;150:7,9,11, 14;151:10;152:4,7,9; 153:11,17,22;154:1,5, 19,22;155:10,21; 156:16;157:17,20; 158:4,22;159:6; 164:21;170:18,21,23; 171:2,5;173:12,20,25; 174:3 Cordry's (3) 38:13,19;39:19 core (1) 39:24 corner (2) 9:12,12 Corporation (1) 3:3 corrected (10)</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>7:22;8:21;9:20;16:1; 18:7,8;89:13;90:13; 118:20;164:10 correcting (2) 90:8,18 corrections (1) 158:3 correctly (11) 16:6;36:23;75:12; 112:9;131:19;161:6, 18;163:18;165:7,9; 166:8 corresponded (1) 104:20 Costco (19) 3:3,19,22,24;4:6,8; 35:10;59:23;60:8; 73:19;82:4,5;129:13; 132:5;133:9;171:19, 23;172:1,3 counsel (1) 65:24 count (2) 9:9,9 countdown (1) 7:10 counting (3) 80:16,16,17 country (3) 16:25;17:19;21:16 County (3) 6:2,3,17 couple (2) 89:17;159:16 coupled (1) 90:2 course (6) 29:16;36:19;65:10; 91:14;156:24;169:24 COURT (10) 6:6;10:22;11:4; 37:25;96:12,14; 145:10;150:24;152:6; 172:1 covered (1) 159:10 crash (2) 5:5;6:4 CRC (1) 20:25 created (3) 92:4;135:24,25 creates (2) 44:17;45:6 credentials (1) 136:4 credit (1) 58:13 crest (1) 165:18 criteria (1) 118:2 critical (2)</p>	<p>170:8;172:19 criticism (2) 38:19;58:9 criticisms (3) 38:17;58:6;71:17 criticizing (1) 38:13 cross (2) 4:21;167:2 cross- (2) 95:23;149:11 cross-examination (11) 29:13;46:22;95:14, 18,23;97:8;149:10; 156:9;158:19;160:24; 167:13 cross-examined (1) 149:22 cubic (18) 17:22;19:3;20:23; 21:2;28:15;31:19;33:9, 16;60:5,12;74:21;75:9, 11;77:25;79:7;80:3; 103:5;166:13 culp (5) 107:20,20;108:13, 13,17 culpability (8) 73:22;86:12;104:6, 18;105:2,4;106:6; 107:20 curative (2) 149:3,4 curb (1) 11:9 curiosity (1) 110:6 current (6) 19:1;91:23;98:3,6; 110:19;143:1 currently (1) 87:21 curve (2) 91:14;93:7</p>	<p>161:20 date (10) 52:18;98:1;99:25; 101:10,15;102:16; 107:19;129:21;130:18; 154:6 dated (5) 52:23;118:5,17; 141:17;154:6 dates (4) 98:5,12;99:25; 101:11 David (2) 36:3;97:11 day (17) 3:2;21:7;57:13; 58:15;67:4;81:10; 91:24;92:1;102:15; 106:4;107:22;108:19; 109:1;126:6;151:11; 157:11;160:9 days (10) 81:10;96:11,11,12, 15,16;103:10;107:12, 13;108:19 DC (2) 39:2,20 deal (1) 53:20 debate (1) 172:13 debating (1) 70:5 December (11) 7:16,17,18;14:19; 15:10,11;30:5;31:24; 102:15;130:22;132:22 decide (3) 11:7;68:25;170:11 decided (4) 10:22;11:8;26:10,12 decision (5) 3:16;11:14;26:20; 171:25;172:2 decline (3) 26:23;33:6,8 decrease (1) 29:15 decreasing (1) 110:13 defending (1) 11:14 define (2) 115:6,8 defined (7) 104:10;106:12; 116:22,24;119:21; 122:4,5 defining (2) 105:20;107:6 definition (1) 119:22 definitive (2)</p>	<p>68:5;115:7 definitives (1) 115:7 degree (5) 19:4;45:4;51:1,4; 59:22 delays (1) 88:13 delicately (1) 37:11 delivering (1) 86:7 delivery (1) 75:1 Department (5) 6:4;20:17;35:24; 36:5;169:3 depending (1) 84:6 depends (3) 48:4,5;85:9 depot (1) 40:8 DEQ (2) 20:15,16 derivation (1) 121:8 derive (1) 100:1 derived (3) 109:18;113:1;162:6 describe (1) 17:23 described (3) 19:16;24:5;80:8 describes (1) 52:10 describing (1) 123:7 description (1) 153:19 deserves (1) 70:13 designed (1) 24:13 detail (4) 16:19;25:19,23; 158:5 details (1) 25:16 determination (2) 26:17,18 determine (1) 102:17 determining (1) 63:6 develop (2) 119:4;144:5 developed (15) 15:25;61:18,23,24; 62:1,3,4;119:2;123:25; 125:4;136:23;137:18; 138:17;140:11;158:23</p>	<p>development (1) 144:9 devised (1) 119:14 diagram (6) 121:10;122:13,13; 154:13;155:19,22 diagrams (3) 154:9,9;155:20 dialog (2) 124:24,25 diesel (5) 21:7;40:16,17;86:6; 92:1 diesels (5) 82:11,12,12;85:17, 18 difference (25) 6:6,13;7:23;23:5,6; 28:18;47:2,6,12;48:10; 62:9,24;79:25;83:7,19, 24;84:25;93:14;102:6, 7;144:4,13;147:9; 163:8;166:9 differences (4) 143:17,21;146:9,14 different (22) 14:2;24:19;39:6; 46:10,10;56:9;62:12; 63:18,21;66:13,21; 76:3;115:11,15; 120:19;128:4,5;134:3, 5;139:7;148:16;163:6 difficult (3) 94:3,14;174:5 diffusion (3) 48:17;49:4;121:2 digging (1) 126:22 dilution (2) 121:1,3 dilutions (1) 54:6 dioxide (1) 128:14 direct (6) 4:21;12:20,22;13:13; 22:12;72:16 directed (1) 171:16 direction (3) 109:4,5,8 directly (4) 28:23;38:5;64:17; 96:10 directors (1) 52:25 disagree (5) 61:17;62:11;70:2; 82:21;124:22 disagreed (1) 125:1 disagreement (2)</p>
	D			
	<p>Dash (2) 40:9,9 data (52) 5:5;6:4,20,21;17:17, 18,19;19:16;20:2,10; 23:24,25;27:5;28:4; 29:8;30:9;33:19;34:11; 41:3;63:3,7;64:6; 67:10,13,16;68:14; 77:1;88:7,15;90:2; 98:2;100:1,23,24; 101:20,22;102:1,24; 107:3;108:18,25; 109:16;110:11,11,15, 15;111:13;115:12; 120:3,14;153:22;</p>			

<p>83:10;87:6 disagrees (2) 11:23;69:12 disc (1) 19:16 discounting (1) 165:22 discretion (1) 11:9 discuss (9) 4:24;39:10,13;43:7; 52:4;95:8;97:2;124:18; 168:5 discussed (7) 15:15;51:9;56:20; 57:16;109:10;125:12; 131:10 discusses (1) 130:16 discussing (4) 23:11;129:3;142:8; 147:6 discussion (12) 15:8;28:22;30:2; 41:5;51:12;59:21; 130:8;131:5;164:12; 167:18;168:1,13 discussions (1) 38:24 dismiss (1) 172:23 dispersion (13) 10:25;13:18;44:24; 45:14;47:19;52:1;64:4; 76:17;98:11;120:7; 127:10;133:6;166:24 dispersions (1) 45:4 disputed (1) 168:5 disputes (1) 168:6 distance (5) 57:20;120:16,20; 122:25;157:1 distances (1) 120:19 distant (1) 17:19 distinction (5) 57:3,6,8;82:16;128:2 distribute (1) 5:7 distributed (2) 143:4,7 distributing (1) 5:12 distribution (7) 24:19,19;25:16; 61:10,13;62:16;63:15 distributions (2) 61:22;63:11 district (1)</p>	<p>39:24 divert (1) 149:19 divided (1) 103:11 dividing (1) 58:21 division (1) 52:25 dock (15) 57:18;58:2;91:19; 92:7;102:18;103:10; 104:5,15,19,25;105:10; 106:8,21;108:18; 163:24 document (17) 22:14,20;126:23; 127:12;128:23;142:24; 143:1,14;148:10; 151:1;154:2,3;155:5,7, 8,8;157:14 documentation (1) 158:8 documents (9) 125:23;151:12; 152:12,12;157:9,18; 158:3,5,9 dominant (1) 92:9 done (25) 5:23;6:17;20:7; 35:22;44:16;60:10; 61:18;62:13,16;68:3; 70:19,21;72:18; 100:11,13;101:9; 133:17;135:17,23; 157:18;158:13;164:23; 171:3;174:2,6 doubt (1) 151:19 down (24) 5:1;8:2;28:21;29:12; 31:5,7;33:16,20,24,25; 34:1,13;54:7;58:19; 85:25,25;87:12;93:8; 105:19;106:14;120:8; 150:25;153:6;172:16 downward (1) 30:14 downwind (1) 21:10 Dr (88) 4:4,5;11:23;12:1,4; 13:12,15,23;14:2,8,11, 16,20,24;15:3,4,15; 16:2;23:17;24:3,14; 25:2;29:12;34:14; 39:11;41:6,12;42:1; 43:23;44:20;47:14,24; 51:8,14;58:6;59:4; 60:14,15,23;62:1; 63:10;66:13,20;70:24; 73:8;81:22;82:2,17,22;</p>	<p>86:19;87:17;93:21; 95:8;96:6;107:19; 124:14;125:4;129:3,5, 9,11,12,15,17,21; 130:5,10,11,16;131:6, 16;132:4,5,9,10,24; 133:11,21,25;134:9,11, 16,22,25;135:4,4,10,15 draft (6) 141:6,6,8,9;145:23; 151:7 drafts (1) 156:17 draw (3) 94:5,12;116:12 drawings (1) 123:1 drive (1) 58:18 driven (2) 62:10,22 drop (2) 30:20;34:6 dropped (1) 26:25 dropping (3) 28:5;30:17;34:17 dual (1) 115:13 due (5) 31:10,11;45:4,4; 82:11 during (5) 13:12;41:21;45:7; 129:3;148:14</p>	<p>56:4;71:1,4,8,12,14, 19 efficient (1) 97:21 effort (1) 149:19 efforts (2) 87:18,20 either (6) 109:9;113:8;133:4; 136:7;158:20;174:9 elaborate (1) 85:14 elected (2) 41:20;110:14 electronic (2) 7:6;137:23 electronically (2) 6:24;160:12 elevated (1) 40:19 eliminate (1) 83:16 else (10) 9:24;39:8;68:25; 69:8,12;95:8;125:19; 159:25;168:16;173:8 e-mail (7) 97:12;141:16;143:4, 9;151:17;153:9;155:19 e-mailed (3) 141:15;145:22; 157:13 embedded (2) 67:1;93:3 emission (5) 34:21;45:14;63:12; 66:23;163:17 emissions (15) 19:11;23:1,7;34:3; 35:18;36:17;44:6,13, 23;45:18;64:5;73:19; 85:21;91:22;92:8 emit (1) 19:17 emitted (1) 34:7 emotion (1) 87:10 empirical (1) 120:14 employed (2) 91:4,6 employee (1) 125:16 employing (1) 91:5 encountered (2) 42:22;45:12 encounters (1) 44:1 end (12) 6:17;42:22;65:5;</p>	<p>67:4;99:4;126:6;132:9, 11;133:14;159:1; 160:8;174:11 ends (4) 111:18;122:9;147:9; 150:21 enforceable (2) 168:24;169:11 enforcement (1) 172:13 enforces (1) 169:4 engineering (1) 123:1 English (1) 164:25 enough (5) 42:6;119:17;121:3,4; 170:20 entered (2) 149:15;155:8 entire (1) 9:16 entirely (1) 148:16 entirety (1) 126:18 entitled (1) 52:25 entrance (1) 9:8 Environment (9) 35:25;36:5;44:17,18; 55:5,16,24;56:7; 120:13 Environmental (9) 20:18;55:16;56:8,9; 60:25;61:25;125:15; 140:19;144:2 environments (1) 87:24 EPA (53) 11:8;23:12,22;25:13, 25;26:1,12,20;34:22; 51:25;52:11,15;53:14; 56:7,20,20,25;59:6; 60:2;62:5,8,23;64:8,9, 17;67:24;68:3;71:5,6; 72:1,4;75:18;93:24; 94:1,18,24;115:6; 116:23,24;117:23; 123:16;124:1,4,5,9,10; 125:23;126:15;127:6, 11,13,16,22 EPA's (5) 14:11;64:1;94:16; 123:18;128:23 equation (1) 120:18 equilibrate (1) 47:11 equilibration (1) 47:15</p>
		E		
		<p>e- (1) 143:5 earlier (26) 19:7;45:18;65:11,13, 15;67:23;68:6;88:23; 89:1;91:7,14;93:13,24; 109:9;114:15;120:10; 131:4,10,18;132:13; 141:7;156:3;159:21; 161:3;165:24;166:7 early (3) 42:16;89:11;91:7 Earth (2) 46:12,14 easier (1) 126:20 easy (1) 50:19 Ed (2) 155:5,16 edge (2) 121:25;122:1 effect (4) 79:15;81:14;85:8,20 effects (7)</p>		

<p>equivalent (1) 116:20</p> <p>equivalents (1) 115:9</p> <p>Erich (1) 3:18</p> <p>error (5) 90:13,18;147:25; 164:16,18</p> <p>errors (6) 89:14;149:18,21; 150:12,16;151:5</p> <p>ES-1 (2) 22:13,19</p> <p>escaped (1) 9:22</p> <p>especially (6) 30:19;34:2;35:2; 76:10;117:20;172:7</p> <p>essentially (1) 130:1</p> <p>establish (1) 39:21</p> <p>establishing (1) 66:23</p> <p>estimate (3) 25:4;61:13;62:10</p> <p>estimated (2) 148:6;151:23</p> <p>estimates (2) 81:15;128:16</p> <p>estimating (1) 81:24</p> <p>et (2) 54:20;56:2</p> <p>etcetera (1) 71:15</p> <p>evaluate (1) 148:15</p> <p>evaluated (1) 149:22</p> <p>evaluating (1) 109:6</p> <p>evaluation (1) 62:14</p> <p>even (20) 17:20;31:4;42:11; 57:15;64:2,16;69:3; 85:17;90:3;91:23; 142:21,25;143:13; 148:2,7,18;152:13; 157:17;161:19;163:1</p> <p>event (2) 69:12;171:11</p> <p>eventually (2) 146:25;171:2</p> <p>everybody (6) 14:7;68:25;95:17; 145:19,22;172:17</p> <p>everyone (3) 146:1,8;157:14</p> <p>evidence (9) 3:15;29:20;30:13; 34:15,17;38:1;65:11; 94:18;143:2</p> <p>evil (2) 152:24;153:20</p> <p>exact (9) 46:24;53:12;63:10; 98:5;122:13;129:21; 131:5,17;140:18</p> <p>Exactly (8) 9:17;11:7;23:19; 29:14;94:8;98:18; 164:21;173:18</p> <p>EXAMINATION (6) 12:22;30:1;72:16; 95:24;136:5;149:12</p> <p>Examiner (3) 3:14;70:25;161:1</p> <p>example (30) 17:9;20:12,24;27:13; 28:4;54:20;55:5,17; 56:5;60:25;64:7,9,23; 70:24;72:4;79:25; 82:23;87:2;89:9;91:16; 92:19;102:10,18; 104:4,19;105:9; 106:20;108:17;110:7; 114:5</p> <p>examples (4) 20:13;21:14;67:18; 93:3</p> <p>exceed (1) 25:15</p> <p>exceedance (1) 68:13</p> <p>exceeded (3) 23:12,22;50:23</p> <p>except (1) 164:8</p> <p>exception (14) 3:4;64:16;89:10; 121:24;159:15;168:3, 4,20,22;169:12,19,23; 171:8;172:5</p> <p>excerpts (2) 161:1,11</p> <p>excessive (1) 163:24</p> <p>excuse (1) 137:8</p> <p>executive (2) 22:13,19</p> <p>exhaust (2) 49:1;50:2</p> <p>exhibit (32) 5:19,22;7:14,15,22; 8:1,9;10:4;12:25;13:8; 22:1,7,10;31:14,21; 52:18;53:6;118:5,23; 126:9,10,11,24;141:12, 13;144:14;145:20,25; 147:21;148:3,11;161:2</p> <p>exhibits (9) 4:16,24;5:4;8:24; 114:14;131:12;157:11, 18;159:2</p> <p>exist (5) 67:10;89:7;148:4; 151:2;152:13</p> <p>existed (1) 148:2</p> <p>existing (2) 148:4;172:16</p> <p>exists (3) 29:8;68:14;127:17</p> <p>expect (6) 29:1;33:25;68:13; 69:17;93:15,15</p> <p>expectation (4) 28:7;34:5;66:11,14</p> <p>expected (1) 16:23</p> <p>expedite (1) 96:22</p> <p>experience (3) 43:22;59:1;70:11</p> <p>expert (3) 59:22;69:4;70:11</p> <p>expertise (1) 71:10</p> <p>explain (6) 24:22,23;43:17;61:4; 62:24;119:11</p> <p>explained (3) 61:2;89:2,3</p> <p>explaining (1) 133:9</p> <p>explicit (1) 171:16</p> <p>explore (1) 147:8</p> <p>exposure (4) 58:7,22;59:2;162:7</p> <p>expression (1) 70:10</p> <p>extensively (1) 149:23</p> <p>extent (2) 48:15;158:15</p> <p>extra (3) 78:17;82:24;96:24</p> <p>extreme (5) 17:23;21:14;25:15; 89:9;90:3</p> <p>extremely (4) 20:7;49:4;67:10; 121:5</p> <p>extremes (1) 25:19</p> <p>Exxon (2) 170:25,25</p> <p>eye (1) 86:20</p>	<p>F</p> <p>face (1)</p>	<p>150:5</p> <p>facilities (3) 35:19;36:13,17</p> <p>facility (4) 35:18;38:8;40:9,17</p> <p>fact (22) 16:23;17:16,18;20:8; 21:20;27:3;31:18; 34:10;38:19;45:6; 58:13;59:4;75:8;80:17; 82:10;86:6;89:17; 92:19;120:6;133:13; 148:1;171:11</p> <p>factor (12) 23:6,7;63:24;64:20; 65:11;82:24;83:6;84:4; 86:13;156:3,5;164:10</p> <p>factored (3) 82:22,23;86:1</p> <p>factors (5) 26:22;27:6;28:22; 82:13;91:16</p> <p>facts (6) 67:9;87:1,10,10,16; 94:17</p> <p>failure (1) 172:24</p> <p>fair (8) 9:1;19:4;26:16;70:9; 93:19;124:23;125:1; 153:3</p> <p>fair-minded (2) 8:25;9:2</p> <p>fairness (1) 41:17</p> <p>familiar (5) 3:20;38:12;77:6; 126:23;172:25</p> <p>fans (2) 48:13,16</p> <p>far (8) 16:6;32:14;50:23; 88:6,8;110:14;150:20; 151:6</p> <p>fashion (2) 4:23;20:4</p> <p>fast (1) 48:22</p> <p>faster (1) 44:18</p> <p>feasible (1) 53:23</p> <p>February (14) 6:3;31:17;58:11; 74:3,9;79:11;97:19; 118:5,17,17,21,21,22; 141:18</p> <p>federal (5) 59:24;117:3;118:1; 172:22;173:5</p> <p>feel (1) 158:16</p> <p>feet (24)</p>	<p>21:1;42:10,11,12,14, 19;44:3,7,8,10,10,11; 46:3,4,14;47:3,3,7,7,9, 10,11,17,18</p> <p>felt (1) 59:5</p> <p>FEMS (2) 61:19,21</p> <p>F-E-M-S (1) 61:21</p> <p>Fence (1) 170:18</p> <p>few (3) 133:24;142:25; 145:13</p> <p>figure (60) 26:9,11;65:12;72:16; 79:10;97:23;99:21; 100:13;101:6,6,12; 102:17;103:10;109:12; 110:7,8,10,21;111:2,6, 21,24;112:3,8,23,25; 113:18,23;121:15; 122:2,5,9;123:6;161:9; 162:3,11,20,20;163:2, 4,4,6,6,8,10,13,16; 165:14,23,23,25;166:3, 5,6,7,17,18,22,23; 167:5</p> <p>figures (13) 58:17,21;59:8;65:13; 97:19;103:15;163:6; 164:7,12,13,16;165:6,9</p> <p>file (11) 32:9,10;103:8; 107:21;144:16;145:2, 3,5;146:3;170:1,2</p> <p>filed (2) 15:10;124:14</p> <p>files (7) 106:20;107:19; 109:23;122:10;123:3; 126:21;144:22</p> <p>filled (2) 9:10;109:22</p> <p>filling (1) 3:6</p> <p>filter (3) 115:10;116:10,11</p> <p>final (5) 7:18;59:13;145:20, 24;151:7</p> <p>finalized (4) 5:6;6:8,15;159:3</p> <p>finalizing (1) 158:25</p> <p>find (18) 6:19;43:12;73:23,25; 74:2;78:6;89:9;90:3; 108:15,20;123:22; 131:5,13;133:15; 143:25;146:16;148:18; 159:11</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>finding (2) 69:19,22</p> <p>fine (3) 4:13;150:18;174:13</p> <p>finer (1) 105:24</p> <p>fine-scale (1) 49:3</p> <p>finished (3) 72:21;154:22;156:12</p> <p>firm (3) 61:25;70:16;140:15</p> <p>first (28) 4:17;11:2;15:7;35:2, 10;49:25;55:19;74:19; 90:12;97:9,22;114:9, 23;123:11;131:22; 132:23;135:20;136:10; 137:15,17;142:25; 150:20;156:23;161:17; 162:19,23;163:5,7</p> <p>fit (1) 66:16</p> <p>five (24) 25:4;42:14;44:7,8, 10,12;63:3;81:10;87:7; 101:19,20;103:11,18, 20,23;104:1,24;107:12, 13;112:1,16,18,23; 154:8</p> <p>five-fold (1) 27:25</p> <p>five-minute (2) 72:24;145:13</p> <p>five-year (4) 29:15;100:15; 110:11;111:24</p> <p>fixing (1) 81:12</p> <p>fleet (15) 30:17,20;31:10,11; 82:2,4,11,14;83:10; 84:20,24;85:13,17,21; 86:11</p> <p>flooded (1) 11:3</p> <p>floor (1) 3:12</p> <p>flow (2) 21:10;43:24</p> <p>flows (1) 42:2</p> <p>focused (1) 164:4</p> <p>fold (1) 82:14</p> <p>folder (2) 32:10,10</p> <p>folks (2) 58:7;156:1</p> <p>follow (4) 12:13;124:15,19; 129:24</p>	<p>followed (1) 121:8</p> <p>following (1) 163:15</p> <p>foot (1) 42:20</p> <p>footnote (1) 98:8</p> <p>form (1) 49:13</p> <p>formula (3) 11:11;103:11;120:15</p> <p>forth (10) 16:13;37:17;52:9; 72:7;75:7;104:13; 114:12;117:24,25; 173:15</p> <p>forward (3) 4:23;118:4;156:9</p> <p>forwarded (1) 155:19</p> <p>found (12) 16:22;23:21;33:5; 50:21;77:7;120:20,25; 135:21;136:12,12; 149:21;163:23</p> <p>four (2) 42:18;44:11</p> <p>four-feet (1) 42:18</p> <p>Fox (11) 52:10,10,10,19,20, 24;53:13;103:2; 109:11;120:11,13</p> <p>Fox's (1) 53:10</p> <p>fraction (1) 85:18</p> <p>frankly (6) 28:3;93:5;142:25; 148:18;149:9;159:21</p> <p>free-flowing (1) 27:22</p> <p>front (3) 47:22;126:4;139:21</p> <p>frustration (1) 157:24</p> <p>fueling (1) 161:23</p> <p>fulfilled (1) 172:4</p> <p>full (9) 53:8;57:15,15;59:1, 2,9;137:15;152:12; 168:10</p> <p>function (1) 120:15</p> <p>fundamental (1) 62:9</p> <p>FURTHER (7) 12:22;37:22;95:12; 167:10,13,14,25</p> <p>furthermore (1)</p>	<p>153:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>Gas (59) 4:7,8;21:18;23:2; 27:2,4,16;29:1;34:20; 40:1;42:7;45:12;48:8; 49:1;51:2;53:21,22,22; 54:2,6;57:10,18,25; 58:17;59:23;60:8;65:2; 69:18;73:19;74:18,20; 75:2,3,3,6,24;76:1,5, 24;79:7;82:4,5;86:10; 87:13;88:16,18;91:15; 93:8;106:9;122:11,18; 123:4,16,19,23;136:24; 170:19;171:1;172:16</p> <p>gasoline (11) 23:8;82:5,7,20;84:1, 19,24;85:22;86:10; 103:22;107:4</p> <p>gave (4) 67:18;154:1,6,7</p> <p>general (3) 13:20;59:19;119:1</p> <p>generally (9) 17:20;31:5;49:18; 50:18;61:1;65:25; 81:10;109:21;140:9</p> <p>generated (1) 130:4</p> <p>generically (1) 109:4</p> <p>Georgia (2) 78:9;80:10</p> <p>gets (3) 10:2;43:2;49:3</p> <p>Ginsburg (2) 10:23;12:6</p> <p>given (4) 24:20;51:23;70:15; 145:25</p> <p>gives (1) 6:14</p> <p>giving (2) 69:4;126:6</p> <p>goal (7) 39:5;40:3,3,20,21; 66:22;168:13</p> <p>Goecke (222) 3:23,23;4:25;5:1;9:1, 3;11:6;12:21,23;13:6, 9;16:11,15,21;17:3; 18:13,19,24;19:5;20:9; 21:25;22:6,9,11,16,19, 22,25;23:10,14,16,19; 24:2;26:16,21;27:9,12; 28:10,17;29:3,13;30:3, 11,23;34:13,25;35:11, 17,22;36:1,4,11,15; 37:1,4,8,10,16;38:4,10, 16;39:10,16,19;40:5,</p>	<p>22,24;41:4,9,15,22,25; 42:25;43:4,9,13;44:25; 45:13,19;46:23;47:2,6, 13,18,23;48:3,10;49:7, 17,22;50:14;51:6,17, 20,24;52:3,6,12;53:7, 17;54:13,15;56:15,23; 57:2,20;58:6;59:12,16; 60:1,6,13,17,21;61:4, 20;62:7;66:7,20;67:13, 17,21;70:15,24;71:16, 21,23,25;72:9,12,17, 18,22;73:3,4,7,18; 74:13,16,22;75:10,14, 17,21,23;76:2,12,23; 77:3,6,20;78:1,10,14, 19,21,23,25;79:4,8,12, 21,23;80:21;81:7,22; 85:1,6,8,12;86:4,17,23; 87:17;88:1,7,14,22; 89:24;91:3,9,12,18; 92:7,12,14,93;19,24; 95:5,7,12;97:16; 130:22;131:19;139:17; 141:7,21,24;142:17,21; 144:14,18,20,25;145:4, 6,8,18,21;146:6,11; 151:6;152:25;156:12, 13;157:4,21;158:2,12; 164:18;173:17,22</p> <p>goes (7) 7:17;31:6;42:19; 68:24;85:24;143:25; 164:7</p> <p>goeth (1) 11:22</p> <p>gold (7) 115:17;116:6,17,19, 25;117:1,3</p> <p>Good (9) 3:18,21,23;4:2; 32:13;34:20;40:7; 51:10;124:25</p> <p>goods (1) 86:7</p> <p>Google (2) 46:12,14</p> <p>grammatically (1) 165:3</p> <p>granted (2) 153:15;168:22</p> <p>great (1) 11:24</p> <p>greater (1) 45:3</p> <p>green (1) 155:6</p> <p>grossly (1) 24:18</p> <p>GROSSMAN (398) 3:2,14,20;4:1,4,10, 14,19;5:2,3,11,14,16, 18;6:1,10,13,22;7:8,11,</p>	<p>14,19,25;8:4,8,11,14, 17;9:2,5,13,16,18,20, 24;10:3,7,9,12,15,19; 11:1,7,17,19,23;12:5,9, 13,16,19,21;13:2,4,7, 22;14:6,14,17,21,25; 15:4,18,21;16:3,10; 17:4,7,13,25;18:2,7,18; 20:16,19;21:25;22:7, 10;24:3,22;25:6,10,20, 25;26:8,13,15;29:10, 25;30:25;31:3,13,21; 32:1,3,7,13,18,24;33:2, 12,14,21;34:8,13; 36:18;37:3,5,9,12; 43:15,16,18;45:23,24; 46:21;52:20;53:10,16; 54:22,25;55:3,13,19; 57:3,11;58:20;59:3,11; 61:23;62:3,20;63:4,8, 23;64:15;65:10,23; 66:2,4,7;68:19,22;69:2, 11,14;70:4,7,9;71:7,22, 24;72:15,20,23;73:2,6, 24;74:9,12;76:17; 77:15,18;78:20;82:15; 83:1,4,6,15,22;84:9,13, 22;86:5,16;88:15,19; 89:12;90:6,14,17,20, 22,25;92:4;94:20;95:1, 4,6,13,21;96:1,5,9,13, 15,20,23;97:2,5; 101:22;102:5,9;104:3; 105:7,15,18,23;106:2; 107:7;108:6;110:6,17, 20;111:3,10,20; 113:20;115:19,21,25; 116:2,4,15;117:8,14; 118:7,9,13,18,20; 120:11;121:13;122:16, 20;126:1,3,7,8,10,13, 20;128:10,12;130:18, 21,22,23;131:19,22,25; 132:17,19,21;133:20; 134:5,7,14,16,24; 135:3,7,9,14,18,20,24; 136:2,4,8,10,17;138:2, 6,8,20,25;139:3,6,11, 18,23;140:2,7,17,21, 23,25;141:5,9,12,15, 23;142:2,6,13;143:15, 20,24;144:6,9,16,19, 22;145:1,5,7,9,10,12, 16,19,21;146:2,5,10, 13,18,20;147:8,11,13, 17,18;148:20;150:2,7, 8,10,12,16,20;151:25; 152:2,8,21,23;154:17, 20,24;155:2,12,14,17, 24;156:1,25;158:1,18; 159:9,11,15,18,24; 160:2,6,15,19,21; 161:11,12;162:5,9;</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>164:11,17,23;165:2,4; 166:9,12,14;167:5,12, 21,23;168:16,25;169:2, 9,17,22;170:1,9,19,22, 25;171:4,7,17,24; 172:12,18,25;173:3,5, 21;174:1,8</p> <p>Grossman's (3) 30:12;67:21;88:22</p> <p>ground (5) 42:4,6,14;44:8;47:22</p> <p>ground-based (5) 119:15;121:6;137:8; 138:14;140:5</p> <p>group (4) 52:24;53:14;77:2; 107:2</p> <p>Guckert (12) 77:2,4,7;78:2;79:19; 147:22;148:1;150:6,9, 13;151:1,19</p> <p>Guckert's (5) 77:11;80:7;81:14; 151:10;157:9</p> <p>guess (12) 24:23;46:20;82:16, 17;90:6;95:15;96:11; 98:4;115:2;143:25; 149:13;172:20</p> <p>guidance (11) 53:2;56:25;117:24; 123:18;124:1,4,5; 125:23;127:6;128:23, 23</p> <p>guideline (8) 25:25;64:2,17; 127:11,13,16,16,21</p> <p>guidelines (3) 26:2;93:25;126:17</p> <p>guides (1) 26:7</p> <p>guys (2) 145:2;164:17</p>	<p>167:18</p> <p>handwritten (1) 8:12</p> <p>handy (1) 31:24</p> <p>happen (4) 48:22;50:7;64:11; 68:11</p> <p>happened (5) 64:14;80:13;106:24; 148:9;157:9</p> <p>happening (6) 31:9,9,10;89:22; 105:21;120:24</p> <p>happens (4) 20:14;44:1;158:8; 174:8</p> <p>happy (2) 4:16;159:22</p> <p>hard (8) 13:2;47:5;58:10; 63:7;69:19,21;143:22; 157:16</p> <p>hardly (1) 171:5</p> <p>Harris (31) 3:21,21;6:23;7:1,3; 31:25;32:2,5,12;73:5; 143:3,7;151:18;153:1, 2,12,15,18,24;154:21, 25;155:11,13,18; 156:19;160:10,18,20; 167:16,22;168:13</p> <p>Harris's (1) 151:17</p> <p>hate (1) 164:11</p> <p>Hayes (1) 110:1</p> <p>HCM (1) 147:21</p> <p>head (3) 131:7;151:24;174:7</p> <p>heading (1) 129:15</p> <p>heads (1) 95:14</p> <p>health (4) 64:19;71:8,9,15</p> <p>hear (7) 116:16;137:1; 152:25;154:20,20; 158:11;160:4</p> <p>heard (10) 18:5,9;21:22;77:10, 19;84:25;117:2; 131:15,16;135:10</p> <p>hearest (1) 11:21</p> <p>hearing (11) 3:3,11,13,14;4:11; 6:3;70:25;148:14; 155:9;161:1;174:15</p>	<p>hearings (1) 77:4</p> <p>hearsay (4) 36:19;37:7,10;38:2</p> <p>heating (2) 45:4,5</p> <p>heavy-duty (5) 21:7;82:12;91:25; 163:18;165:21</p> <p>height (1) 44:6</p> <p>Heights (2) 3:25;4:3</p> <p>help (3) 51:4;132:21;136:16</p> <p>helped (1) 51:1</p> <p>helps (2) 51:1,4</p> <p>Henry (1) 4:5</p> <p>Here's (6) 22:2;32:14;63:19,19; 86:2;150:20</p> <p>hierarchy (1) 117:24</p> <p>high (14) 20:1,10;25:24;28:8, 11,25;49:11;58:15; 67:6;86:14,14;147:1,2, 5</p> <p>higher (43) 18:14,25;21:18; 29:19;42:5,5;47:22; 51:13;65:2,3,14,19,21, 25;68:1,3,7;76:15,16; 77:13,14;79:20;80:8, 15,18;82:8,11,18; 83:13,14,14;84:7,8; 89:17;90:4;91:14;92:5; 93:17;100:25;109:21; 111:18;113:3,23</p> <p>highest (19) 21:15;25:3;26:5; 38:20,21,22;40:4,20; 75:10;80:12,13; 101:16,18;103:11; 106:5;108:4,5,6;164:4</p> <p>highlight (1) 160:12</p> <p>highlighted (3) 130:7,10,17</p> <p>highly (1) 66:19</p> <p>highway (6) 20:14;21:2,10,16; 67:19;147:22</p> <p>highways (7) 17:15,20,20;20:2; 64:24;89:20,22</p> <p>himself (1) 135:17</p> <p>hit (1)</p>	<p>65:19</p> <p>Hlinka (1) 125:12</p> <p>Hold (8) 8:11;11:1;13:7;15:4, 4;83:15;144:19;155:14</p> <p>home (1) 45:16</p> <p>hope (1) 115:23</p> <p>hopefully (1) 173:10</p> <p>hour (47) 9:9;18:1;24:8,9;25:3, 6;27:4;57:13,15;58:12; 59:1;63:15;79:9;80:13, 14,23;81:2,9;102:4,14, 22,22;104:7,10,18,20, 22;106:12,12,16,18; 107:6,8,22;108:10,16, 23,25;109:1,1,2; 110:15;116:9,9,14,14; 161:19</p> <p>hourly (9) 24:6,16;100:5,5,11, 13,23;101:9,11</p> <p>hourly-based (1) 100:9</p> <p>hours (10) 24:6,6;25:7;81:3,10; 101:14;103:23;105:25; 106:15;116:13</p> <p>husband (1) 4:10</p> <p>hyperbole (1) 153:18</p>	<p>163:11</p> <p>immediate (1) 156:8</p> <p>impacts (3) 64:19;149:4,4</p> <p>implement (2) 94:4,14</p> <p>implication (1) 147:15</p> <p>implicit (1) 171:14</p> <p>important (4) 44:25;134:20; 157:25;171:23</p> <p>imports (1) 21:6</p> <p>impose (2) 170:12;171:12</p> <p>imposes (1) 172:3</p> <p>impossible (1) 119:23</p> <p>impression (1) 69:9</p> <p>improper (1) 59:5</p> <p>inadvertent (2) 149:18;151:5</p> <p>inadvertently (3) 8:2;145:23;151:7</p> <p>incentive (1) 172:6</p> <p>include (11) 3:7;66:10;74:23; 78:7;87:19;110:25; 116:4;131:17;164:7, 13;168:7</p> <p>included (4) 78:8;89:4;131:14; 168:1</p> <p>includes (1) 78:11</p> <p>including (4) 31:8;58:11;76:3; 78:11</p> <p>incorporates (1) 133:5</p> <p>incorrect (7) 15:12,17;30:3;33:7; 48:21;115:13;144:12</p> <p>incorrectly (1) 71:11</p> <p>increase (1) 80:1</p> <p>increased (1) 31:22</p> <p>increasing (1) 65:8</p> <p>index (2) 15:22;136:12</p> <p>indicate (1) 94:18</p> <p>indicated (2)</p>
I				
<p>I-710 (4) 21:4;23:8;67:19; 68:7</p> <p>I-95 (7) 20:13,21;28:25;65:3; 67:19;88:4;89:20</p> <p>idea (2) 34:20;61:12</p> <p>ideas (1) 168:17</p> <p>identified (5) 38:25;40:2;52:21; 131:19,20</p> <p>identify (5) 3:17;40:3;52:17,20; 66:13</p> <p>identifying (1) 71:19</p> <p>idle (1) 92:21</p> <p>idling (6) 19:11,20;27:15; 40:17;92:19;93:11</p> <p>II (1)</p>				

25:2;93:13 indicates (2) 7:3;147:3 indication (2) 29:5;156:23 indicia (1) 37:19 indispensable (2) 172:24;173:2 individuals (2) 161:19;163:1 indulge (1) 10:19 indulgence (1) 147:21 industrial (2) 35:17,19 industry (6) 35:8;52:16,16;68:25; 69:9;70:12 inferring (1) 171:22 information (8) 62:18;64:5;79:19; 97:11;101:4;105:11; 125:21;173:19 informed (1) 156:19 inherent (1) 93:20 initial (8) 50:1,3;89:3,13;91:3, 21;92:25;125:22 initially (3) 20:6;153:3,21 inordinate (1) 156:6 input (3) 61:7;63:22;124:2 inputting (1) 50:1 inside (10) 13:18;48:19;51:3; 53:20,21;57:17;76:20; 79:7;119:19,22 inspections (1) 169:4 instance (1) 146:23 instead (5) 8:2,12;16:20;151:7; 166:1 Institute (1) 117:9 instrument (1) 116:8 insufficient (1) 30:9 intended (2) 39:14;172:10 intent (1) 93:23 intentional (3)	157:5,15;158:7 interesting (1) 62:17 interplay (1) 133:6 interpret (1) 67:7 interpreted (1) 67:8 interrupt (1) 13:22 interrupted (1) 34:12 interruption (3) 15:5;16:8;154:21 intersection (15) 9:22;78:2,4,8,12; 148:13,19;149:2; 150:21;152:16;153:2; 154:8,13;156:2,4 interstate (3) 10:22;11:9;21:4 intimate (1) 49:15 into (18) 7:18;14:15;22:14,20; 49:3;52:1;61:17;63:15; 78:18;86:5;92:23; 106:14;109:5;110:15; 149:16;152:19;155:8; 172:12 introduce (2) 5:13,22 investigate (2) 35:22;37:22 investigated (1) 115:16 investment (1) 172:7 involve (3) 136:25;137:4;150:24 involved (6) 60:18;69:16;124:11, 11;157:12;170:17 involvement (1) 70:1 involves (1) 170:12 ISO (1) 165:18 issue (23) 35:23;36:20;37:13; 41:7;43:7;44:4,9; 49:16;58:2;67:2;80:5; 82:25;83:11;84:19; 85:16;93:2;134:5; 135:3;151:1;165:25; 169:5;171:8,10 issues (8) 25:22;27:7;28:2,20; 39:4;80:6;83:12; 149:20 item (1)	78:10 iterative (1) 153:6 J Janssen (6) 54:20;55:3,4,15; 56:2;120:9 January (9) 88:12;101:25; 102:11,11,12,12,13,13, 15 Jenson (1) 55:3 journals (1) 60:25 joy (1) 5:4 judgment (9) 25:22;29:4,4;41:18; 54:8;67:7;69:16; 115:16;125:24 July (2) 106:23,25 junction (1) 158:11 June (1) 6:19 jurisdiction (1) 170:6 Justice (1) 10:23 justify (2) 54:4;133:17 K Kalig (2) 155:4,16 Karen (2) 3:25;155:3 keep (2) 118:3;156:17 Kensington (2) 3:25;4:3 key (3) 49:16;130:3;170:8 kilometer (3) 54:9;120:5;121:5 kilometers (1) 49:6 kind (16) 13:15;29:1;46:21; 54:9;61:15;63:24;69:3; 80:11;94:11;144:2; 147:5,12;152:4;160:4; 171:25;172:2 knew (2) 116:3;159:1 Knolls (1) 45:15 knowing (1)	151:3 known (3) 3:9;127:15;148:10 Krask (12) 36:3,9,11,16,21,22; 37:2,6,23;38:6,7;97:11 K-R-A-S-K (1) 36:7 Krask's (2) 36:4;97:13 L LA (4) 21:14;23:9;67:19; 68:7 label (1) 33:3 labeled (1) 22:13 laboratory (1) 48:6 lacking (1) 173:8 land (3) 41:16;42:2;170:13 language (3) 140:18;144:1;171:17 large (5) 48:14;85:18;137:8; 138:14;140:5 larger (1) 123:5 Larry (1) 4:6 Las (4) 20:24,25;23:3;67:19 laser (1) 43:18 last (12) 4:11,15;7:21;8:15; 9:4;11:3;27:2;33:23; 36:6;142:25;163:10; 164:12 late (2) 62:6;111:14 later (6) 17:23;37:21;148:16; 150:16;152:18;154:10 latest (2) 32:8;35:2 latter (1) 73:14 laughing (1) 96:1 layout (1) 148:16 leader (2) 52:24;53:13 Leading (1) 18:16 leads (1) 49:17	learned (1) 148:15 least (11) 4:20;8:15;28:8; 37:19;57:14;60:10; 78:17;93:13;146:16; 151:11;156:4 left (4) 9:7;105:5;148:8; 167:15 left-hand (1) 9:12 legally (1) 171:22 legitimate (2) 14:22;15:2 length (1) 11:24 less (8) 19:1,17;29:7;35:3; 50:11;65:8;66:17;92:2 letter (1) 169:25 letters (1) 171:22 level (22) 16:19;24:1;27:23; 42:13;48:18,23;49:2, 15;51:13;53:24;58:22; 60:2;80:23;84:11; 90:22;119:18;120:7,8; 121:2;151:9;158:4,5 levels (50) 17:1,19;18:14,20; 20:10;23:2,11,12,21; 26:23,25;30:12,15; 34:17,22;38:12;39:21; 40:15;42:6;45:15,19; 49:11;58:7,9;62:23; 66:23;71:19;72:3;73:9, 10;74:18;77:8;78:15; 79:9,12;81:24;86:18; 87:19,21;88:23,25; 89:14;90:7,10,22;91:4; 92:15;116:10;146:23; 166:12 levity (1) 96:3 light (2) 139:12;150:5 likely (3) 65:6;73:10;113:8 limited (5) 15:19,23,23;49:19; 88:3 limiting (29) 13:14;14:4;15:6,23, 24;16:1,7,12,18;20:3; 49:19;50:25;123:12; 127:18,20;129:6,14,18; 130:8,17,25;131:6,13; 132:6,11;133:4,21; 135:16;136:12
---	--	--	--	--

<p>line (22) 28:21;31:1,7;33:23; 40:11,16;74:19;78:10; 80:12;81:13,15;82:7; 93:5,8,10;94:5,12; 110:13;129:21;131:20; 132:23;137:10</p> <p>line-by-line (2) 156:18,20</p> <p>lines (5) 33:25;34:14;121:4; 132:23;133:14</p> <p>lingo (1) 164:18</p> <p>linkage (1) 90:2</p> <p>list (6) 5:1;7:15;55:3,14,14; 173:17</p> <p>listed (2) 32:19;53:8</p> <p>listening (1) 37:6</p> <p>listeth (1) 11:21</p> <p>listing (1) 36:13</p> <p>literature (18) 19:23;45:10;49:5; 52:9;54:2,11;82:3,10; 83:12;84:6;85:19;88:6; 92:21;93:1,116:8; 120:1,4;125:21</p> <p>little (5) 4:11;34:9;54:7; 85:25;95:15</p> <p>loading (15) 57:18;58:2;91:19; 92:7;102:18;103:10; 104:5,14,19,25;105:10; 106:8,21;108:18; 163:24</p> <p>local (2) 17:18;30:11</p> <p>locate (3) 56:16;57:22,23</p> <p>located (6) 3:8;21:9;40:1;44:22; 57:5;122:11</p> <p>locating (1) 60:6</p> <p>location (24) 30:7,8;39:1,3,6;40:1, 2,6,8,10,11,14,18,19; 51:2;75:5;76:1;79:7, 18;104:21;105:13; 119:24;131:5;173:9</p> <p>locations (7) 28:24;38:25;39:11; 41:3;89:8;90:3;120:3</p> <p>logic (5) 21:19;34:1,3,8,11</p> <p>long (9)</p>	<p>4:19;14:23;21:5; 47:25;68:24;89:10; 117:16;143:13;156:11</p> <p>longer (2) 47:18;84:14</p> <p>look (36) 3:20;11:3;15:22; 20:13;22:22;27:17; 30:4;32:2,9;33:22,22; 67:2,5,5;84:6;86:12; 87:15;89:9;93:7;94:24; 101:17;103:18;107:22; 109:4;110:2;123:4; 130:7;132:16,20; 141:2;145:3;157:23; 163:13;165:8;166:20, 23</p> <p>looked (8) 4:11;24:6;94:18; 109:21;120:1,8; 136:11;154:16</p> <p>looking (34) 8:16;15:18;31:13,16, 25;32:16,19,21,23; 35:2;55:13;63:10; 85:22;88:5;97:18; 103:17;112:9;120:17; 124:5;129:1;132:9; 137:22;138:2,4;139:6, 10,24;144:16,23; 161:5;163:20;164:9; 166:5,6</p> <p>looks (6) 32:22;74:4,6;139:4; 141:7;145:22</p> <p>Los (2) 21:4;23:3</p> <p>Lot (25) 3:9;6:16;11:9;19:25; 20:15;25:23;28:8; 33:25;34:2;38:19; 48:23;49:6;50:17;51:5; 52:8;67:11;78:1;81:2; 89:7,23;92:2,3;95:14; 105:17;133:2</p> <p>lots (7) 6:20;21:14;48:20; 76:9;80:17;122:16; 157:12</p> <p>lower (30) 16:23;17:15;18:21, 21,22;19:22;21:19; 23:7;26:23;29:20;34:2; 38:22;45:21,21;65:6,8; 66:1,1,17,17;67:11; 75:8;77:8;79:13;80:10; 81:11;82:8;93:9;99:6; 111:15</p> <p>low-level (1) 42:15</p> <p>lunch (1) 95:13</p> <p>luncheon (1)</p>	<p>95:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>ma'am (1) 7:8</p> <p>machine (2) 148:8;151:14</p> <p>madness (1) 32:5</p> <p>magnitude (1) 23:5</p> <p>mail (1) 143:6</p> <p>main (5) 19:8;27:6,6;44:9; 47:10</p> <p>maintained (2) 171:15,19</p> <p>maintaining (1) 171:18</p> <p>Maintenance (1) 40:9</p> <p>major (13) 17:1,14,20;20:2; 21:1,5;40:8,10,16,16; 64:24;89:20;164:25</p> <p>majority (1) 10:23</p> <p>makes (3) 50:7;144:12;169:3</p> <p>making (7) 14:22;43:23;94:19; 134:25;146:7;150:5; 157:22</p> <p>Mall (24) 3:10;13:18,19;41:6, 10,14;43:5;44:16,16; 58:18;68:11,11,13; 69:18;73:9,11,14;76:6; 77:14;80:7,14;81:3,9; 164:5</p> <p>manager (1) 36:2</p> <p>maneuvered (1) 147:3</p> <p>manual (2) 147:22;156:20</p> <p>many (7) 14:12;21:5;50:21; 61:11;66:18;72:15; 77:15</p> <p>maps (1) 13:18</p> <p>March (4) 5:8;6:1;52:23; 147:23</p> <p>mark (2) 5:18;44:7</p> <p>marked (2) 22:1;160:11</p> <p>markup (1) 146:7</p>	<p>Martin (1) 3:13</p> <p>Maryland (14) 3:8;30:8;35:9,20,24; 36:5,13,16,24;38:8; 39:1;40:2;88:10;173:6</p> <p>Maryland's (1) 36:10</p> <p>master (2) 137:20;164:17</p> <p>match (2) 100:5;117:17</p> <p>matched (1) 115:14</p> <p>material (16) 81:14;143:2,16,21; 144:3,9;146:14,17; 147:9;148:2;149:1,2,9; 150:22;153:13,16</p> <p>mathematical (2) 26:18;89:13</p> <p>mathematically (1) 90:8</p> <p>matter (9) 3:3;47:9;62:18; 124:12;133:13;144:1; 150:4;172:16;173:6</p> <p>matters (3) 4:15;10:16;12:9</p> <p>max (6) 23:12,22;34:22; 67:24;90:23;165:18</p> <p>maximum (13) 24:14,21;26:7;27:3; 59:13;60:11;75:1,2; 104:7;109:9;161:20; 162:14,14</p> <p>May (41) 3:12;5:10,11,12; 24:23;31:5;37:18;38:4; 43:13,14;45:25;46:25; 66:2,4;72:1;73:5,6,11; 81:17;90:12;91:5; 97:16;116:13;143:16, 16,20;147:17,18;149:8, 8,13,13;160:15,22; 167:15;168:11,11,11; 171:4;173:9;174:14</p> <p>maybe (13) 15:24;33:7,7;63:16; 71:11;80:3,15,16; 83:11;84:5,7;120:4; 152:12</p> <p>mean (63) 5:11;19:10;20:2,12; 26:9;30:25;39:2,3; 45:17,18;46:10,23; 47:10;48:4;51:9;56:24; 57:25;60:23;61:23; 64:12;65:12,20;66:11; 68:11;82:1;86:25;87:5, 15;88:17;89:2;91:20; 93:2,5;94:4,15;101:23;</p>	<p>108:5,6;115:5;116:7; 117:2;118:21;119:6; 122:21;124:5;128:19; 136:15;137:15;139:14; 147:10,13;148:20; 152:13;156:23;158:22; 159:8;160:10;162:6; 170:3,5;172:15; 173:21;174:12</p> <p>meaning (2) 44:6;127:21</p> <p>meaningful (2) 149:11;171:5</p> <p>means (6) 3:14;42:18;61:6; 63:2;96:16;113:23</p> <p>meant (2) 75:17;135:10</p> <p>measure (6) 23:21;46:9,9,14; 48:15;122:21</p> <p>measured (27) 16:24;17:1,12,14,17; 20:2,10;21:2,11,11; 23:3,11,25;28:14,23, 23;29:5,8;67:10,13,15; 68:14;83:14;89:20; 90:2;91:2;103:4</p> <p>measurement (2) 29:18;47:1</p> <p>measurements (7) 24:7;29:19;64:24; 83:18;89:7,23;90:4</p> <p>measures (2) 149:3,4</p> <p>measuring (3) 67:6;72:3;88:8</p> <p>mechanism (1) 49:12</p> <p>mechanisms (1) 49:10</p> <p>meet (4) 50:19;72:2;124:14, 17</p> <p>meeting (1) 155:3</p> <p>meetings (2) 39:12,17</p> <p>members (1) 39:11</p> <p>memo (4) 52:10,13,15,17</p> <p>memorandum (2) 52:11,23</p> <p>mention (1) 131:25</p> <p>mentioned (17) 27:21;55:16;66:14; 85:13;87:12;92:19,24; 99:1;102:21;109:19; 125:20;129:5,7;131:6, 23;135:19,22</p> <p>mentioning (1)</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>129:8 met (3) 44:12;95:7;97:17 meteorological (4) 63:3;64:6;102:1; 107:21 meteorology (1) 21:15 meter (22) 17:22;19:3;20:23; 21:2;28:15;31:20;33:9; 16:44:5;60:5,12;74:21; 75:9,11;77:25;79:7; 80:3;103:5;117:16,16; 119:24;166:13 meters (17) 21:9;42:13,21;54:1, 2,14;120:4,20,24,25; 121:5,11,22;122:9,12, 21;123:4 method (58) 13:14;14:4;15:7,19; 16:1,7,12,19;20:4; 32:5;49:19,20;50:15, 25;52:11;53:18;54:1, 11;61:5;114:25;115:3, 3,11;116:10,20,21; 117:4,19,20;119:14,16; 127:18,20;129:6,14,16, 18,24,25;130:9,17,25; 131:7,13;132:6,8,11; 133:4,22,22;134:1; 135:16,25;137:18; 138:18;140:8,12,25 methodology (16) 13:16;15:15;93:25; 94:2;119:2,5,6,7; 123:13;127:5;129:11; 134:10,21;138:18; 140:11,19 methods (6) 55:24;61:1;115:18; 117:21,22;134:2 Metropolitan (2) 33:22;38:21 Michele (1) 4:2 microgram (3) 17:10;28:18;93:14 micrograms (30) 17:22;19:3;20:22; 21:2;28:8,10,15;29:7; 31:19;33:9,16;60:5,12; 66:17;68:6;74:21;75:3, 4,8,11,20,21;76:10; 77:25;79:6;80:1,3,15; 93:16;103:5 mid (2) 44:13;111:14 middle (5) 39:2;57:4,6;75:6; 76:1 midpoint (2)</p>	<p>42:22;92:21 might (16) 51:6;61:14,14;66:10; 71:19;73:20;77:8; 79:15;83:3;98:5; 135:13;139:20;145:2; 147:14;170:11,25 Mike (1) 3:23 Mill (4) 3:8;35:15;78:9;80:9 mind (2) 59:16;126:6 Mine (11) 11:6;46:6,7;141:2, 11,14,17,17,25;142:7, 15 Mine's (1) 139:16 minor (1) 159:12 minute (3) 55:8;73:23;89:12 minutes (16) 57:14;58:8,8,15,23; 72:19;145:13;156:22; 161:21,21,23;162:1,1; 163:2;164:10;165:22 miracle (1) 5:8 misread (1) 164:15 missing (5) 147:24;148:2;151:1, 13;173:2 misstate (1) 152:11 misstating (1) 158:7 mistake (2) 157:13;164:19 mistakes (6) 157:16,22,22;158:2, 6;164:19 mix (5) 48:18;85:18;86:11; 87:4;120:19 mixed (1) 50:8 mixing (11) 45:8;48:14,24;49:2; 50:6;53:23;55:22;56:3; 119:17,23,24 Mobile (1) 84:15 Mobile6 (16) 82:8,13,16,19;83:7, 13,19,25;84:7,11,16; 85:2,3,9,20;86:11 Mobile6.1 (1) 81:23 model (54) 16:19;20:9;22:25;</p>	<p>24:13;25:16;26:3;27:2; 28:11;35:4;40:4;44:5; 52:1;57:17;58:3;60:6; 61:10,18,22;62:1;64:4; 67:7;74:17;75:4;77:22; 79:4;91:25;92:6;94:6; 101:21;102:11;104:20; 105:8;106:11,18; 123:3;125:25;127:6, 11,11,13,16,17,17,24; 128:3,4,5,5,6,19,19; 132:8;133:4;161:25 modeled (14) 18:15;28:18;73:15; 76:9;88:23;89:1; 102:11,14;103:6; 104:21;105:17;106:4; 107:22;110:12 modeler (2) 50:14;51:6 modeling (86) 16:16;18:23;19:1,24; 20:6,7;21:20;24:12,17; 25:2;26:4,5;38:23; 42:13;43:2;49:23; 50:22,22;51:21;52:24; 53:1,14;56:20;60:19; 63:2,5,15,25;64:13,24; 65:16;66:9;67:5,8,12; 70:16,18,19,20,23; 76:20,25;78:4;79:13; 80:24;81:12,13;82:9; 87:4,12;89:3,5,6,11,13, 18;90:2,3,5;91:21; 92:16;93:6,25;95:8; 101:13,25;104:9; 106:12,16;109:2,5,9; 119:8,12,20;122:10; 124:1;125:5,8,24; 127:19;128:23;135:17; 140:15;163:14;164:4 models (6) 14:12;19:18;64:2; 126:18;128:13,17 modification (1) 165:21 modified (2) 46:25;47:5 molecular (11) 48:18,23,24;49:2,15; 53:23;54:7;119:18; 120:7,8;121:2 molecules (2) 49:15;71:13 moment (4) 34:18;73:4;95:5; 112:8 moments (1) 133:24 money (3) 96:23,24;97:1 monitor (37) 20:15,21;21:1,8;</p>	<p>29:14;31:22;32:25; 33:22;35:6,14,18,20; 36:17;39:3,5;40:12; 68:9;87:18,21;88:17; 93:16;97:23;99:14,21; 104:15;109:13,18; 110:1;111:7;112:4; 113:1;114:18;115:3,3, 5;146:24;147:1 monitored (1) 38:20 monitoring (17) 29:17;30:12;34:18, 19;36:3,10,14,24;38:9, 11,14,24;39:10,14; 44:16;88:16;114:14 monitors (23) 35:8;39:13;40:24; 87:24,25;88:2,3,8; 97:23;99:21;110:22; 111:7;112:4;113:3,24; 114:19,22,25;115:1,7, 8,14;174:4 monoxide (2) 81:16;113:21 Monte (8) 61:1,4,6,22;63:11; 94:1,11;95:9 Montgomery (1) 6:3 month (2) 6:7;149:15 moral (1) 45:9 more (80) 5:4;6:14,20;16:24; 17:18;18:23;19:1,15; 21:20,24;23:5,6,6; 27:18,23;28:8;33:19; 35:3;38:5,18;40:2; 42:5;45:8,8,10;46:13, 13,15,17;47:1,19,21; 48:17;50:20;51:1,12, 12;54:9;62:17;66:15, 16;68:5,5;70:18,20,22; 71:7;72:16;81:4,4; 84:13,16;87:7;89:17, 18,23;90:15,17;91:22, 23;92:20,22;93:1;94:5, 13,14,95;16:96;23; 109:3;110:19;111:17; 114:18;116:13;120:5; 121:4;129:14,24; 156:2,8;166:15 morning (9) 3:18,21,23;4:2,9;8; 40:14;88:23;102:1; 157:17 most (26) 19:2;21:3,11,23; 27:8,21,23;28:5;30:7; 31:8,18;34:6;40:4; 60:9;65:5;69:16;78:17;</p>	<p>79:17;88:9,12;97:21; 98:6;113:8;119:21; 123:2;127:16 motion (5) 81:24;152:2,5; 172:22,23 motive (2) 152:24;153:20 motor (1) 40:17 move (4) 38:10;118:4;134:13; 146:13 movement (1) 19:21 MOVES (19) 81:23;82:8,16,18; 83:7,14,19,24;84:6,7,8, 10,15,17;85:2,4,9,24; 86:2 MOVES10 (1) 82:16 moving (2) 48:25;70:15 much (34) 9:21;16:23,24;19:17, 22,22;21:19,19;23:5,6, 28;24:40;12;47:9,11; 48:17;50:4,24;65:6,8; 66:17;72:15,16;81:3,4; 82:11;84:15;94:5,13, 13,14;107:3;110:13; 120:19;130:15 multiple (1) 8:19 multiplied (1) 80:1 multiply (2) 25:8;86:13 multi-year (1) 24:7 must (1) 72:2 mutual (1) 168:13 mutual-agreed (1) 167:19 mutually (1) 168:15 mutually-agreed (2) 167:25;168:2 myself (1) 136:19</p>
N				
<p>N-631 (1) 3:9 name (3) 3:13;36:6;133:5 national (4) 53:2;60:2;72:5; 117:9</p>				

<p>nationally (1) 31:10</p> <p>nature (1) 31:6</p> <p>near (15) 17:1,14,19,20;15,21; 29:1,40;12:42;9;68:11; 87:19,21;88:4,17;89:8; 91:2</p> <p>nearby (1) 78:11</p> <p>nearest (1) 45:15</p> <p>nearly (1) 149:15</p> <p>near-road (2) 87:25;88:2</p> <p>necessary (4) 16:3;50:20;51:14,19</p> <p>need (8) 44:12;65:18;96:19; 119:8;120:6;130:4; 156:20;167:25</p> <p>needed (3) 53:19;96:4;119:14</p> <p>needs (3) 70:19,21;119:16</p> <p>negative (3) 123:16,19,23</p> <p>neighborhood (3) 43:22;75:7;172:10</p> <p>network (1) 36:10</p> <p>neutral (1) 44:15</p> <p>new (11) 4:16;10:4,24;12:3,7; 26:14;118:6;126:10; 128:16;170:21;172:18</p> <p>newer (3) 30:18;34:2,4</p> <p>next (20) 3:12;6:7;21:9,16; 28:25;40:12,18;41:4; 42:4;62:14;63:16; 64:24;89:23;99:20; 137:6,12,14;140:4; 156:21;164:3</p> <p>nice (1) 71:4</p> <p>night (1) 11:3</p> <p>NIST (2) 117:5,8</p> <p>NIST-certified (1) 117:7</p> <p>nitrogen (1) 128:14</p> <p>NO2 (127) 14:10;16:19;17:25; 18:1,21;19:1,9,12,17, 21;21:1,23;11,15,16, 21;26:6,23;27:7,15,23;</p>	<p>28:4,5,20;29:9,11,15; 30:2,14,14;33:20;34:1, 3,5;39:21;40:6;47:24; 48:11;49:9,11,13,25; 50:3,18,25;51:10;53:2, 24;55:24;57:21;59:13, 20;60:1,11;64:23; 65:20;67:15;69:18; 71:14;74:7;78:15;79:9; 81:15;82:25;83:2,9,22, 24;84:10,11,15;85:6,7, 24;87:3,7,19,21,24; 89:4,14,21,22,23;90:7, 9,22;91:2,10,11,12,24; 92:13,18;93:1;97:25; 99:24;100:14,18,19,20, 20;102:3,24;109:14,14, 17;110:13,15,25;111:1, 3,11,13,15,15,16; 120:15,19;128:16,23; 129:23;132:8;161:4; 162:2;163:14;164:5; 165:18</p> <p>NO2/NOX (1) 120:23</p> <p>nobody (2) 9:24;37:12</p> <p>nobody's (1) 36:19</p> <p>none (1) 35:4</p> <p>nonetheless (1) 147:21</p> <p>non-reference (1) 117:19</p> <p>non-stop (1) 155:25</p> <p>nor (1) 173:6</p> <p>normal (1) 44:18</p> <p>northwest (1) 78:3</p> <p>note (1) 8:22</p> <p>noted (1) 31:21</p> <p>notice (2) 9:22;169:5</p> <p>noticed (1) 29:16</p> <p>notices (1) 118:1</p> <p>November (5) 90:9;118:24,25; 124:14,16</p> <p>NOX (21) 18:23;19:9;20:7; 23:15;24:13,17;25:2; 26:4;27:8,15;28:21; 34:2,6;50:3;65:16,16; 89:4;91:11,12;93:1; 120:15</p>	<p>nuances (1) 157:8</p> <p>number (63) 6:15;8:8;9:8,10,11, 11,22;10:4;25:15,24; 26:5;27:18;28:3;46:16, 18;61:9,11;62:15; 63:16;65:6,8;66:16; 73:23;76:13,24;79:16, 20,21;80:15,20;86:12; 88:3;92:23;97:12,14, 22,24;98:15;99:11; 100:13;101:12;102:17; 103:8,11,12;105:2,4, 20,21;113:1;114:6,6; 129:10;131:20,20; 139:20;157:2;158:4; 161:9;162:3,6;163:24; 165:20</p> <p>numbers (33) 5:24;7:4;10:14;19:2, 2;21:22;25:4;28:7,11, 13;29:6;30:20;58:10; 67:23,25;76:6;77:11, 12;80:22;81:11;83:12; 86:9;87:11;89:19; 99:22;104:1,24; 105:17;141:19;148:6; 151:23;164:9;165:10</p>	<p>47:9,17;106:22</p> <p>occurred (4) 45:11;91:8;104:8; 133:19</p> <p>occurring (1) 75:1</p> <p>occurs (1) 81:9</p> <p>o'clock (4) 8:18;95:16,17;102:1</p> <p>odds (1) 68:8</p> <p>off (10) 9:14;10:14;34:4; 73:9,13;122:21;131:7; 145:10,12;174:6</p> <p>offering (1) 36:20</p> <p>office (4) 53:14;99:11;156:19; 157:9</p> <p>official (2) 96:11;117:16</p> <p>offline (1) 97:2</p> <p>Ohio (1) 11:12</p> <p>Old (2) 12:2;34:4</p> <p>OLM (44) 13:15,23,24;15:7; 49:17,18;50:15,20; 51:6,16,20;52:4,9,11; 53:18;54:3;103:7,7; 119:2,4,5,7,13,16; 121:6;123:16,19,23; 125:4,9;127:5;129:11, 16,25;132:3,8;133:10; 134:1;135:25;136:22; 137:18;138:18;140:11, 25</p> <p>omitted (1) 9:8</p> <p>once (2) 25:15;58:17</p> <p>one (118) 5:6,25;6:7,11;8:23; 9:8;11:1;13:22;14:13; 15:19;18:1;19:8;21:23, 23;22:2,2;27:13,13,13; 33:6;35:10,12;39:8; 40:20;41:13,13;42:2; 54:21,21;55:5,15,21; 56:11;58:6,25;59:19; 61:23,24;68:2;69:19; 71:16;72:6;73:4;75:5; 77:15;79:17;80:2,2; 81:22;86:19;87:17; 89:3;95:5;97:22,22; 98:14,15;104:18,20; 105:19;106:4,8,8,11, 16;108:14,14,18,23; 109:2,3,8,21,23,25;</p>	<p>112:15;114:17,18,21; 115:1;116:3;117:4; 118:16;119:15,24; 120:13;122:25;125:14; 128:17;134:2;135:20, 24;139:6,21;141:5,10, 22;142:4,7,17;144:21, 23;145:2;146:16; 147:1,2;149:7;150:6; 151:3;153:23;154:6,7, 15;155:14;166:14,15, 16;172:7</p> <p>one- (3) 42:17,18;79:8</p> <p>one-hour (34) 23:11,21;24:14,20; 26:7,23;29:11;50:20, 25;53:2;58:22;59:6,9, 13,20;60:1,11;64:23; 67:15;69:18;75:14; 78:15;89:14;90:7,10, 22;91:24;92:19;104:3; 132:8;161:4;162:2; 163:14;165:18</p> <p>one-page (2) 154:7,13</p> <p>ones (15) 7:6;38:22;113:24; 119:21;139:14;157:21; 158:24;159:20;167:24; 168:5,8,8,12,14,21</p> <p>one-sidedly (1) 157:23</p> <p>one-to-four (1) 44:11</p> <p>one-to-one (1) 50:4</p> <p>one-year (1) 111:23</p> <p>online (1) 89:8</p> <p>only (22) 5:9;25:14;35:12; 44:11;49:14;50:12; 54:5;57:13;58:22;76:4; 82:20;86:10;91:25; 104:18;106:11,15; 109:1;111:13;120:25; 135:15;157:21;163:1</p> <p>onto (1) 122:12</p> <p>open (8) 27:4;61:9;80:14; 81:3,9;87:13;91:16; 93:9</p> <p>operate (1) 3:6</p> <p>operation (1) 61:12</p> <p>operations (3) 23:8;36:10;76:9</p> <p>opinion (19) 10:23;22:25;34:15,</p>
O		<p>oath (1) 12:17</p> <p>object (8) 37:14;68:15,17,19, 20,23;94:17;158:17</p> <p>objected (3) 8:23;36:19;37:13</p> <p>Objection (12) 18:16,16;37:16;69:3, 6;70:6,8,9;94:22;95:4; 168:4,22</p> <p>objectionable (1) 94:22</p> <p>objections (2) 4:24;8:22</p> <p>objective (2) 29:7;39:23</p> <p>objectives (1) 13:21</p> <p>observation (5) 33:8,18;58:23,24; 59:8</p> <p>observed (2) 33:20;161:22</p> <p>obtain (1) 128:15</p> <p>obvious (1) 136:24</p> <p>obviously (3) 81:13;147:15;156:21</p> <p>occur (3)</p>		

<p>16,19;36:16;37:4,5; 38:5;51:20,24;59:22; 62:17;66:24;69:4,4; 70:10,17;94:1 opponents (1) 153:10 opportunity (3) 15:1;16:4;37:22 opposed (3) 9:10;34:11;48:11 opposite (2) 29:17;157:16 opposition (12) 13:17;37:21;39:12; 57:25;77:7;95:7,22; 130:3;167:13;168:3,9, 19 option (4) 52:1;109:8;127:21, 21 oral (1) 171:9 order (12) 17:10,21,21;19:15; 23:5;29:6;46:13;48:22; 66:16;80:15;84:5; 96:10 Ordinance (1) 3:5 original (6) 5:22;118:24;139:22; 146:2;147:1;148:18 originally (3) 149:1;153:23,24 others (2) 124:22;125:1 otherwise (2) 89:22;146:15 ought (1) 134:3 ours (2) 11:5;167:19 out (40) 4:11;5:9;6:20;8:23; 17:16;22:1;30:13; 32:19;55:1;59:4;104:9, 11;106:15;107:1,5; 108:5;110:6;122:9; 126:2,22;131:14; 132:21;139:14;141:16; 143:25;145:22;151:7, 24;152:12;157:13,17; 158:24;159:12,19; 160:13;161:1;167:2; 169:13;171:23;172:7 outcome (1) 150:24 outcry (1) 52:16 output (5) 24:13;26:6,8;106:20; 107:2 outrage (1)</p>	<p>151:8 outraged (1) 149:25 outside (8) 48:19;53:24;54:2; 119:18;121:20;158:13, 19;170:13 over (23) 9:7;22:23;24:7; 25:14;26:25;29:15; 30:18;31:22;32:2; 33:23;34:3;46:4; 111:22;114:6;145:6,9; 149:21,21;157:10,10; 167:15;168:21;169:17 overall (3) 6:21;16:17;85:21 overrule (2) 94:22;95:4 overstated (2) 19:14;87:11 overstatement (10) 19:4;20:3;27:25; 28:6;60:10;68:9;87:15; 91:17,22;93:14 overstates (2) 81:13;85:13 overstating (1) 24:18 overview (1) 119:2 own (3) 8:24;150:16;168:11 owner (2) 170:16;171:12 oxidation (1) 56:4 ozone (50) 13:14;14:3;15:6,19, 25;16:6,12,18;20:3; 21:14;48:18;49:12,19; 50:5,9,11,25;53:24; 100:14,17,23,24;101:7; 102:2;103:6;109:14, 18,20;110:25;119:18, 23;120:16,17;123:12; 127:18,20;129:5,13,18; 130:8,16,25;131:6,13; 132:6,11;133:3,4,21; 135:16</p>	<p>79:2,3,5;114:4;127:1; 128:9,10;129:1,12,12, 15;130:7,9,17,20,20; 131:2,20;132:7,7,22; 136:21;137:7,12; 138:6,7;139:1,2,4,6,7, 9,11,15,17,20,21; 142:2,7,10;151:1,15; 153:23;154:6,7,15; 157:1;159:16;161:9, 16,16;162:12,19,22,23; 163:2,4,13,16,21,25; 164:3,3,12;165:15,23; 166:20,24;167:2 pages (11) 7:11;22:14,20;30:5; 31:23;139:20;147:23, 24;148:2;154:8;161:11 paid (1) 96:23 paired (11) 100:6,8,11;101:9,11, 19,22,24;102:8,22; 109:10 pairing (1) 120:13 Panel (1) 62:5 papers (3) 60:24;62:13;148:7 paragraph (14) 22:17;136:22; 137:15,17;138:9,22,24, 25;140:1;162:3,18,19, 22,24 parameter (1) 61:7 parameters (1) 66:13 paraphrase (1) 129:20 paraphrased (1) 131:17 paraphrasing (1) 129:25 Parcel (1) 3:9 Pardon (2) 96:13;170:22 park (8) 40:13;148:14; 152:18;153:4,7;154:1, 16;155:4 parking (8) 6:16,20;42:9;44:2; 76:4,9;80:16;81:2 part (16) 7:21;15:16;28:22; 64:3;72:11;78:5; 106:14;136:4;145:24; 157:5,15;163:7,10; 169:11;170:6;171:8 participate (1)</p>	<p>39:16 particular (29) 6:21;11:10;13:21; 16:18;31:14;32:19; 33:2;38:1;40:14,18; 42:24;54:12;75:25; 92:10;98:25;101:10; 102:4;104:10,21,23; 105:12,25;106:13; 107:5;108:10;114:11; 120:21;121:21;165:25 particularly (2) 120:9;144:7 particulates (1) 86:14 parties (2) 3:17;4:22 partners (1) 125:14 party (2) 172:24;173:2 passage (2) 161:22,23 passed (1) 157:17 passenger (2) 9:6;82:12 passive (1) 165:2 past (6) 13:16;42:20,23; 50:16;57:16;170:15 Pat (1) 3:21 path (3) 169:7;171:14,18 pattern (7) 150:6,9,11;152:10, 19;157:6,15 paved (2) 42:9;44:1 pay (1) 96:24 PDF (1) 156:14 PDFs (1) 156:15 peak (17) 9:9;17:10;77:11; 80:10,13,18,22;81:2,8, 11,12;91:8;92:4,10; 104:8;113:14;120:18 pedestrian (5) 5:5;6:4,21;169:7; 171:14 pedestrians (1) 149:5 peer (1) 52:3 people (6) 10:4;57:4;67:5; 155:9;157:12;172:19 per (18)</p>	<p>17:22;19:3;20:23; 21:2;25:7;28:15;31:19; 33:9,16;60:5,12;74:21; 75:11;77:25;79:6;80:3; 103:5;161:23 percent (41) 18:25;19:11,19,23; 25:8;27:14,15,18,19, 21,23,24;41:19,20; 51:10;65:16;79:24; 80:1,20;84:5,5,7,8,16; 85:5,25;87:3,4;89:4; 91:10,11;92:20,22,25; 93:2,11;120:23; 129:22;132:25;133:1, 16 percentage (1) 66:10 percentages (1) 86:19 percentile (66) 17:11,21;18:1;20:22; 21:12;23:24;24:4,8,10, 13,15,20,25;25:5,11, 11,12,18;26:1,6,9,10; 28:16;29:7;31:19;60:4; 61:2;62:10,22,23;63:2, 7,19;67:16;68:10; 73:22,24,25;93:16; 94:12,13;99:15,15; 103:19,23;104:1,7,8, 11,14,15,20;105:20; 106:5,12,22;107:7,17; 108:7,8,19,21;112:10; 165:18;166:4,9 perfect (1) 153:20 perfectly (1) 150:4 performed (1) 70:16 perhaps (6) 5:21;21:3;119:21; 158:24;159:15;170:18 perimeter (1) 122:3 period (21) 24:7;29:15;31:8,23; 54:2;57:5;75:15;92:20; 98:17,21,22;99:5,13; 100:15;102:2,3;104:3; 105:20;111:22;114:6, 11 periods (1) 120:18 permission (1) 68:20 permit (1) 64:9 permits (2) 4:23;64:7 Permitting (1) 169:3</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>package (2) 90:1;128:4 page (102) 22:17,18;30:21; 31:15,17;32:17,22; 34:14;43:12,13,14; 46:1;53:8;54:22,23; 55:2,11,12,13,14,19; 59:17;73:23;74:2,3,8,9, 13;78:11,20,22,23,24;</p>				

<p>persuasively (1) 65:1</p> <p>pertain (3) 86:9;98:21;101:6</p> <p>pertained (2) 98:6,7</p> <p>pertains (1) 98:25</p> <p>perturbing (1) 61:16</p> <p>petition (1) 3:4</p> <p>petitioner (1) 3:6</p> <p>phone (2) 97:12,13</p> <p>photograph (2) 33:15;78:3</p> <p>photographs (1) 32:23</p> <p>phrase (1) 131:17</p> <p>phrased (1) 69:5</p> <p>physical (1) 148:12</p> <p>pick (3) 39:2;40:20;61:10</p> <p>picked (1) 24:7</p> <p>picture (5) 13:20;33:1,6;154:7; 168:10</p> <p>pictures (3) 32:20,22;33:3</p> <p>pipe (1) 50:2</p> <p>place (5) 49:6,14;58:3;62:15; 135:15</p> <p>places (2) 88:4;89:20</p> <p>plan (2) 48:19,20</p> <p>planning (10) 53:14;148:15; 152:18;153:4,4,8; 154:2,16;155:4;167:24</p> <p>plant (7) 35:15;51:2;120:22, 22;136:25;137:4,19</p> <p>plants (3) 11:12;136:23;140:9</p> <p>players (1) 66:5</p> <p>playing (2) 66:2,4</p> <p>Plaza (1) 3:9</p> <p>please (10) 3:17;68:18;78:15; 95:5;127:1;128:1,9; 137:20;162:21;166:23</p>	<p>plot (1) 163:13</p> <p>plots (1) 164:6</p> <p>plotted (1) 122:12</p> <p>plume (8) 50:9;55:22;56:3; 119:17,19,19;120:8,22</p> <p>plumes (3) 56:2;120:2,22</p> <p>plus (3) 71:15;98:11;166:24</p> <p>PM (6) 29:24;95:19;112:13; 116:10;145:14;174:15</p> <p>PM10 (1) 114:19</p> <p>PM2.5 (25) 40:22,25;41:3;71:15; 72:6;73:8,9,19;74:1, 17;77:21;81:15;82:18, 22;83:4,16,18;85:4,6; 86:1;111:4,5,11,16; 112:5</p> <p>point (53) 5:20;10:17;14:22; 15:19;19:19;21:13,13, 19;23:24;24:17;35:13; 38:9;39:8;42:20;43:23; 44:4,14,19;47:1,10; 50:1,13;57:12;58:13; 59:3;65:21;67:22; 72:14;77:11,12;78:2; 83:9;88:22;92:6;98:6; 101:2;105:22;118:16; 121:15,23;128:16; 133:20,23;134:24; 139:24;140:3;149:17, 18;152:9;161:17; 162:21;163:5;171:5</p> <p>pointed (1) 8:23</p> <p>pointer (1) 43:19</p> <p>points (9) 15:2;17:16;51:15; 57:24;60:14;64:22; 81:22;86:19;87:17</p> <p>Police (1) 6:4</p> <p>policy (2) 26:17;94:15</p> <p>pollutant (2) 85:11,12</p> <p>pollutants (4) 40:23;71:9;118:2; 164:6</p> <p>polluting (1) 11:13</p> <p>pollution (4) 10:22;11:10;35:15; 71:4</p>	<p>pool (1) 45:16</p> <p>pops (1) 37:17</p> <p>Port (5) 21:5,5,8;23:3;89:10</p> <p>portion (3) 136:19;169:14; 170:12</p> <p>portions (4) 130:3;158:12,18,23</p> <p>position (6) 53:11;61:3;82:22; 150:1;171:25;172:21</p> <p>possibility (3) 96:6,10;152:25</p> <p>possible (1) 40:4</p> <p>post- (1) 171:18</p> <p>potential (1) 158:14</p> <p>power (11) 11:12;35:15;51:2; 120:22,22;136:23,25; 137:4,19;140:9;169:17</p> <p>practical (1) 172:15</p> <p>practice (2) 44:20;157:6</p> <p>preceding (1) 161:16</p> <p>predicted (1) 165:17</p> <p>preferred (1) 133:22</p> <p>prejudice (2) 158:14,16</p> <p>prejudiced (1) 158:17</p> <p>preliminarily (1) 7:10</p> <p>preliminary (8) 4:15;5:5;6:12;7:4, 20;10:16;12:9;97:10</p> <p>prepare (1) 13:10</p> <p>prepared (7) 4:22;12:24;13:11; 134:11;153:25;154:12; 159:4</p> <p>preparing (1) 143:12</p> <p>present (3) 155:4;164:13,16</p> <p>presented (1) 65:11</p> <p>Presumably (1) 98:7</p> <p>presume (2) 40:13;122:17</p> <p>pretty (9) 20:14;25:24;40:12; 50:18;65:1;67:6;86:12; 88:21;121:1</p> <p>previous (3) 10:10;25:1;84:19</p> <p>previously (5) 18:22;39:8;52:21; 113:6;167:1</p> <p>pre-weight (1) 116:11</p> <p>primarily (6) 21:8;31:11;74:24; 119:14;136:23;137:18</p> <p>primary (4) 21:13;49:12,13,13</p> <p>principle (3) 42:1;44:19;67:1</p> <p>print (1) 143:9</p> <p>printed (2) 141:16;143:5</p> <p>printer (1) 143:8</p> <p>printout (1) 7:7</p> <p>prior (5) 26:24;44:3;45:11; 84:10;92:21</p> <p>probability (1) 65:8</p> <p>probably (18) 5:21,22;27:18,25; 28:7,8;29:6;32:9,11; 96:16;97:21;121:4; 141:5,15;144:23; 145:1;151:4;160:11</p> <p>problem (4) 16:9;151:13;152:13; 156:8</p> <p>problematic (1) 69:6</p> <p>problems (1) 156:14</p> <p>procedure (13) 49:20;50:8;56:18; 57:17,19;59:6;64:3; 65:17;68:4;105:6; 121:7;172:23;173:6</p> <p>proceed (4) 4:14;73:3;158:11,17</p> <p>proceeded (1) 158:20</p> <p>proceeding (3) 96:8;172:6;173:7</p> <p>proceedings (1) 129:17</p> <p>process (13) 24:5,24;49:5,8,9; 51:8;93:21;111:13; 113:5;125:4;146:6; 153:4,7</p> <p>processes (1) 48:17</p> <p>produce (5) 45:8;67:23;119:17; 120:2;172:24</p> <p>produced (8) 52:15;103:23; 134:21;143:2;151:12, 20;155:5,6</p> <p>producing (1) 50:23</p> <p>productive (1) 149:24</p> <p>profession (1) 68:12</p> <p>proffer (2) 69:10,11</p> <p>proffered (3) 148:3,13;149:2</p> <p>programs (2) 36:3,14</p> <p>projection (1) 64:20</p> <p>promotes (1) 94:10</p> <p>proof (1) 147:6</p> <p>properly (1) 82:9</p> <p>property (1) 170:17</p> <p>propose (1) 158:10</p> <p>proposed (7) 23:1;59:23;60:7; 88:16,17;136:24;156:4</p> <p>protect (1) 172:10</p> <p>protection (1) 172:11</p> <p>protocol (11) 38:23,24;39:12;95:8; 113:4,5;124:3,15,18; 125:5;127:19</p> <p>protocols (1) 109:5</p> <p>prove (1) 36:21</p> <p>provide (8) 7:21;36:12;45:21; 61:2;101:3;110:21; 161:13;173:15</p> <p>provided (24) 9:23;34:16;43:7; 54:19;56:5,12;120:14; 129:10;132:4;147:25; 148:11,13,14,17,19,20, 25;149:1,1;152:17,18; 153:8,9;158:3</p> <p>provides (3) 35:3;172:13,14</p> <p>providing (1) 126:19</p> <p>provisions (2) 170:8;171:23</p> <p>public (1)</p>
---	--	--

<p>3:2 published (1) 52:11 publishing (1) 60:24 pull (6) 63:16;104:9,11; 105:11;107:1;108:5 pulled (1) 103:8 pumps (1) 3:7 pursuant (1) 3:5 pushed (1) 6:19 put (23) 5:5;38:23;51:25; 56:17,21,21;58:1,1,4; 59:4;62:15;64:4;67:4; 88:4;89:17,25;90:1,1; 116:11;135:11;139:20; 146:2;161:23 putting (5) 30:11;35:5;56:16,25; 61:16</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>radius (2) 121:13,14 radiuses (1) 154:11 rail (4) 40:11,11,16,16 railways (1) 93:12 raise (1) 37:13 raised (6) 20:5;57:24,25;81:22; 171:9,10 raising (1) 15:12 ran (2) 51:19;63:9 random (1) 31:6 range (9) 27:24;61:3,14,15,16; 63:13,20;66:10,23 rank (1) 25:3 rate (3) 48:11;63:12;96:25 rates (5) 48:15;76:18;101:12; 125:22;163:17 rather (6) 46:4;59:19;88:5; 89:21;110:2;168:20 ratio (12) 19:12,14,17,21; 27:14;42:18;44:11; 50:1,3;92:20,25; 120:15 ration (1) 120:21 ratios (4) 28:21;52:9;120:23; 125:22 raw (1) 27:17 reach (2) 68:10;86:1 reached (1) 37:5 reaching (1) 44:4 reacting (1) 49:12 reaction (4) 48:21,22;49:13,14 read (13) 11:16;22:16;55:23; 75:12;108:20;125:20; 134:20;136:15,16,17, 18,19;143:19 reading (9)</p>	<p>34:9;112:9;138:20; 149:14;161:17;163:18; 165:7,8,8 readings (1) 31:22 readout (1) 105:8 ready (4) 8:19;73:2;95:21; 145:16 real (4) 100:14,14;149:20; 156:8 realism (1) 35:3 realistic (2) 65:6;91:23 realistically (1) 158:22 reality (6) 28:9,19;58:14;67:5, 25;152:17 realized (1) 9:7 really (14) 49:3;51:18;61:6; 62:20;65:7;71:6;86:25; 93:1;102:7;141:3; 149:19;151:2;163:19; 170:7 real-world (1) 18:14 reanalyze (1) 116:13 reason (10) 10:3;14:6;35:2,5,7; 36:25;40:18;82:11; 124:10;136:18 reasonable (2) 59:22;151:4 reasonably (1) 84:20 reasons (1) 35:1 rebuttal (47) 4:22;12:20,24;13:4; 15:9,10,16;16:13,16; 18:21;19:6;26:22; 27:10;30:21;31:18; 35:3;52:7;53:8,18,19; 54:18;65:12;73:15; 74:3,10;79:11;81:25; 82:23;85:1;91:6;118:9, 11;119:3;123:9,15; 125:8;130:4,6,20; 138:4;149:6;156:10; 158:19;159:6,7;160:1; 173:11 recall (24) 17:10;23:24;24:5; 29:12;31:13;41:9,12; 59:5;60:17;80:6;89:16; 95:11;98:5,25;101:1;</p>	<p>113:16;116:1;117:23; 129:6;130:1;131:8; 148:5;166:8;171:20 receive (2) 8:19;148:24 received (1) 6:2 recent (7) 21:11,20,24;29:19; 31:8,18;89:17 receptor (8) 25:4;56:16,17;104:5; 105:11,12;106:23; 108:15 receptors (15) 44:8;51:3;53:20,21; 56:21,21;57:1,22,24; 58:1,4;76:20;105:9; 119:21,22 recess (3) 72:25;95:19;145:14 recognize (1) 69:3 recognized (1) 24:15 recognizing (1) 58:2 recollection (17) 13:23;14:1,2;15:7; 30:4,6;36:20;53:5,6; 76:16;80:21;99:12; 112:17;162:10;165:12; 166:19;171:11 recommend (3) 14:12;56:25;64:2 recommendation (3) 3:15;133:18;136:7 recommended (3) 128:15;134:22; 170:15 record (31) 10:9;11:16;16:6; 22:8;58:4;95:22;118:4; 122:17;126:12,18; 129:17,21;130:1; 132:10,13;133:16; 142:20,22,23;145:11, 12,17,24;148:18;149:7, 16;152:19;165:24; 166:2,25;167:8 records (2) 98:19;110:2 rectangle (3) 121:18,20;123:5 red (5) 5:25;7:1,7;130:8; 155:6 redline (1) 149:11 reduce (2) 19:6;163:17 reduced (2) 85:5;162:15</p>	<p>reducing (1) 164:10 reduction (1) 133:2 reductions (1) 165:10 refer (8) 13:14,24;15:19; 52:13;107:19;113:4; 118:6,24 receptor (8) 16:7;44:14;52:22,23; 54:21;55:13,17,19; 114:25;115:2,4,7,11, 14;116:16,18,20,21; 117:5,19,21,22;127:15; 129:9;132:1;133:7; 135:20;136:13 referred (7) 20:25;27:22;54:20; 55:5;116:5;120:10; 128:21 references (15) 19:15;43:8;54:4,16, 16,19,22;55:2,14,16, 24;120:9;126:14; 131:12;159:16 referred (7) 13:24,25;14:9; 116:18;118:13,16; 166:7 referring (19) 14:18;20:11;23:24; 29:23,23;32:17;43:21; 52:23;54:17,23;63:10; 67:14;87:25;92:5,11, 18;104:16,17;137:10 refers (1) 14:3 refine (1) 85:23 refined (13) 19:2;27:7;68:5; 90:16,18;91:20; 129:14,25;161:25; 163:14,25;164:5; 165:17 refinements (2) 50:21;164:8 reflect (3) 133:10;162:3,5 reflected (1) 161:9 reflects (1) 133:19 refresh (2) 80:21;92:17 regarding (10) 6:4;8:22;10:4;13:23; 52:9;53:1;105:11; 124:15;125:21;152:2 regional (2) 34:17;52:25</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>quadrant (1) 109:7 Quality (16) 20:18,20;35:21; 36:10;44:23;52:24; 53:2,13,14;59:24;60:3; 62:9;64:8;69:17;72:5; 126:17 quantify (1) 23:4 quantity (1) 26:1 queue (58) 27:3,3;42:11,22,22, 23;43:2;44:4,5,22; 45:12;48:8;51:3;53:21, 22,22;54:3,6;56:17; 57:6,18,25;58:7,8,15, 18;74:25;75:2,6;76:1; 79:7;82:23;86:10;87:5; 91:8;92:22,23;105:5; 106:9;109:13;121:18, 23;122:1,11,17,18; 123:4;161:19,20,22,24; 162:1,14,16;163:1,3; 164:8;165:11 quite (9) 23:18;63:18;75:7; 82:14;85:17;90:5;92:2; 93:8;115:11 quote (5) 11:15;132:8,9,10,11 quoted (2) 10:24;12:6</p>				

<p>Register (2) 117:3;118:1 regulations (1) 94:4 regulators (3) 69:16;70:12;124:9 regulatory (5) 20:21;26:19;56:14; 64:13;94:6 relate (1) 115:8 related (4) 38:19;58:5;76:5; 103:22 relates (2) 125:9;167:17 relative (4) 67:9;87:1;93:14; 121:1 Relatively (5) 17:18;50:19;137:7; 138:14;140:5 release (1) 50:1 relevant (2) 10:25;67:10 reliability (1) 37:19 relied (2) 109:22;110:11 relies (1) 159:25 rely (4) 64:6;94:9;116:21; 117:21 relying (1) 68:4 remain (1) 92:16 remaining (1) 50:4 remember (13) 23:19;47:24;80:6; 98:4,18,18;113:9; 118:2;129:7;131:7,18; 155:7;167:7 remembered (1) 136:11 remembering (2) 71:11;170:24 remind (3) 12:16;44:25;60:2 remove (1) 66:12 Renee (2) 155:4,16 repeat (4) 17:7;23:17;130:12; 133:15 repeated (1) 151:17 repeatedly (1) 154:10</p>	<p>reply (3) 155:9,12,14 report (117) 3:15;5:6;6:3,17; 12:24;13:4,10,11,21; 15:9,10,16;16:13,16; 17:9;18:21;19:6,16; 20:25;21:13;23:10; 25:1;26:22,24;27:10; 30:22;31:16,18;35:3; 39:7;43:4,6;52:7,14; 53:8,18,19;54:18; 56:12;58:11,17;59:12, 17;65:13;71:17;73:16; 74:3,10;78:23;79:11; 81:25;82:23;85:2;89:1, 16;90:9,12;91:3,6; 97:19;98:4;99:2;114:5; 118:5,6,10,12,17,24, 25;119:3;120:10; 121:11;122:5,24; 123:9,9,15;124:14,16; 125:8;129:9;130:2,4,5, 6,20;131:11;132:3,4,7; 134:9,20,21;136:22; 137:21;138:5;145:24; 149:7,10,14;151:23; 156:10;158:13,20; 159:8,22;160:1;161:2, 4;162:11;163:15,22; 165:15;168:2;173:11; 174:4 reported (2) 99:16;116:8 REPORTER (3) 96:12,14;145:10 reports (9) 19:7;23:21;38:14; 67:23;73:21;88:24; 89:1;120:14;149:21 represent (3) 76:6;81:2;101:20 representation (1) 65:18 representative (14) 30:7;38:25;39:24; 40:3,21;64:5;98:17; 102:2,3,24;111:18; 113:3,24;115:17 represented (2) 39:25;125:25 representing (1) 39:5 requested (2) 13:15;147:24 requests (1) 13:17 require (2) 64:2;94:1 required (14) 34:20;35:9,14,16,18, 20;36:14;38:8;49:8; 50:17;62:16;71:5;</p>	<p>120:5;121:3 requirement (3) 172:3;173:23;174:1 requirements (3) 36:24;38:1;72:11 requires (2) 36:17;133:2 resemblance (1) 152:17 reservations (1) 51:22 residual (1) 65:4 resolution (2) 51:13;172:20 resolve (1) 135:3 resolved (1) 168:7 respect (3) 16:18;125:8;146:23 respecting (1) 37:10 respond (4) 20:4;39:22;58:9; 86:23 responded (1) 13:16 responding (1) 67:2 response (9) 23:23;38:16,22; 60:22;65:21;71:2; 129:11;132:4;133:25 responsibility (1) 169:13 responsible (1) 36:9 rest (1) 11:5 restrictions (1) 14:13 result (3) 37:6;64:6;159:21 results (5) 13:13;94:9;108:16; 149:24;164:4 resume (1) 95:17 retain (1) 27:9 retained (1) 27:21 retake (1) 12:11 reverse (3) 84:4,9,14 reversed (1) 84:2 review (7) 29:8;52:3;55:24; 73:22;95:2;128:17; 148:15</p>	<p>reviewed (8) 39:7;54:2;72:6,6,7; 120:1;125:23;162:11 revoked (2) 169:19,22 revoking (1) 172:5 reword (3) 69:7,14,15 Richmond (3) 20:15,22;67:20 right (129) 4:14,18,20;5:2;6:2; 7:5,5,11,12,14;8:20; 9:18;10:11,15,15; 11:17;12:5,10,19,19; 15:18,24;16:8;21:9; 25:10,20;26:15;31:3; 32:1,14,24;33:4,14; 35:13;37:16;40:10,11, 17;44:2;48:25;50:6,9; 56:17;57:11;60:17; 63:4,8;65:23;66:6,15; 72:12,20;73:2;74:16; 75:1,17;78:6;81:21,21; 84:24;85:12;86:16; 88:10;89:8;90:14,17; 92:23;95:3;97:5,5; 101:8;104:25;105:18, 23;106:2;110:20; 112:12;113:22;116:2; 117:14;118:3,18; 126:3,13;135:6,18,20, 22;136:1,3,6,14;139:3, 23,25;141:1;143:13, 15;144:19,20,23; 145:16;146:13,20; 149:25;152:22,22; 154:17,18;155:24; 156:25;158:18;160:6, 22,23;162:22;163:12, 21;165:5;166:5,11,14; 167:21;168:16;171:23; 172:25;173:17,19,21 right-hand (1) 9:12 ring (29) 19:13,24;21:17;23:7; 27:20,25;42:9;44:13, 22;46:4;65:2;76:8,20; 77:21,22,24;78:7; 79:17,18,25;80:17; 81:1,1;86:7;87:3; 92:24;93:11;104:12; 105:10 risk (2) 5:3;169:19 Road (33) 3:8;19:13,24;21:6, 17;23:7;27:20,25;34:4, 5;42:9;44:13,22;46:5; 76:8,21;77:21,22,24; 78:7;79:17,18,25;</p>	<p>80:17;81:1,1;86:7; 87:3;89:8;92:25;93:11; 104:12;105:10 roads (11) 76:4,8;78:6,6,10,11; 80:5,5,9,16;103:22 road's (1) 65:2 roadway (2) 21:9;57:5 roadways (12) 17:2;19:13,14,24; 27:20;28:1;56:22;78:7; 87:19,19,22;92:25 Rockville (16) 29:23;30:9;39:15; 41:2;76:15,16;100:25; 111:9,11,16,19;112:7; 113:8;114:6,13,14 role (1) 36:4 room (1) 3:13 ROSENFELD (253) 4:2,2;5:10;8:23; 31:15;36:6,8;46:15; 52:17;53:4;55:7,9,11, 18,21;56:1;69:10;79:2; 97:6,7,9,15,18;98:1,10; 99:7,10,17,20,25; 100:4,7,10,17,22; 101:3,8,15;102:10,16, 20,23,25;103:9,16,25; 104:14;105:1,3,4; 106:3,10,15,18;107:11, 15,17,24;108:1,4,8,11, 17,24;109:3,12,17,25; 110:5,21,24;111:2,5,7, 21;112:1,3,8,13,15,19, 22,25;113:7,10,13,17, 22;114:1,4,13,17,21; 115:4;116:16,22; 117:1,23;118:3,8,11, 15,23;119:7,11;121:10, 14,19,22;122:2,7,15, 23;123:8,11,15,21,25; 124:6,8,13,18,21,24; 125:3,7,11,14,17,19; 126:1,5,9,11,14,17,22; 127:1,4,9,12,18,23; 128:1,8,11,13,20; 129:1,9;130:2,13,15, 19;131:2,9,11,24; 132:2,15,22;133:8,13; 134:8,19;135:2; 136:21;137:3,6,12,17, 23;138:1,4,7,11,13,17; 139:12,16;140:4,10,14, 16,24;141:1,3,11,14, 17;142:15,19,22;143:5, 8,12,18;146:4;147:17, 20;148:9,22,24;150:3, 8,10,15,18,23;152:1,</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>15,22;153:14;154:4; 156:23;157:1;158:21; 159:4,7,10,14,17,20, 25;160:7,25;161:8,13, 15;162:8,15,18,23; 163:5,9,12,21;164:2, 15,25;165:3,6,14,17, 20;166:3,11,17,20,23; 167:2,7,9 Rosenfeld's (2) 157:5;160:4 roulette (1) 61:8 round (1) 17:19 ruled (2) 150:21;156:3 rules (5) 42:16;172:22;173:5, 5,6 run (15) 61:11;64:4;94:6,6,6, 8;100:12;101:19; 104:6;106:8,8;107:1; 109:15;110:14;111:25 running (5) 19:14;48:14;86:7; 114:8,10 runs (10) 92:6;100:2;106:6,7; 107:3,20,21;108:13,13; 165:18 rural (11) 41:5,19,20;44:24; 45:1,4,9,21;47:16,19; 164:6</p>	<p>169:14 sat (1) 153:6 satisfied (1) 134:12 Saturday (1) 81:8 save (1) 46:21 saw (4) 15:7;151:21;154:2; 155:5 saying (31) 18:10;25:23;29:11; 33:10;41:12;46:17; 58:20;59:4;64:13;67:2; 69:15;71:10,12;82:15; 83:23,25;84:2,13,16, 23;90:7;104:1;134:9,9, 21,25;135:7;154:23; 162:7;171:7;174:12 scale (2) 65:19;122:8 scaled (2) 122:24,25 scalars (1) 81:4 scaling (1) 85:8 scheduled (1) 4:20 school (2) 40:17;45:15 Science (1) 62:5 scientific (3) 26:17;59:22;62:13 screen (4) 13:1;17:1;74:16; 78:3 screening (1) 128:15 scribbles (1) 8:13 second (21) 3:12;8:11;11:2; 13:23;21:24;22:17; 35:7;83:15;136:22; 137:15,17;138:9,22,22, 24,25;140:24;141:1; 144:19;155:14;162:18 secondly (1) 68:6 seconds (2) 48:1,2 Section (11) 3:5;107:21;128:13, 14;163:16,16,20;164:2, 3,6,8 sections (2) 43:6;163:15 seeing (2) 23:25;33:7</p>	<p>seek (2) 124:1,4 seemed (1) 170:5 seems (4) 168:17;172:9,11,19 select (1) 40:24 selected (4) 25:17;26:10,11;41:1 selection (1) 38:10 selections (1) 38:14 selling (1) 85:23 send (2) 6:23;173:17 sense (4) 29:2;48:21;93:17; 170:10 sent (1) 151:7 sentence (7) 59:19;137:6,12,14, 15;138:23;140:4 separately (3) 63:6;72:6;107:2 series (2) 97:20;148:12 serve (1) 30:10 services (2) 21:4;169:3 servicing (1) 21:8 session (3) 3:12;4:15;160:22 set (14) 16:13;54:1,10;63:7; 108:18;110:11,11,15, 15;114:9;117:24,25; 127:22;128:6 sets (1) 23:25 setting (2) 47:16;123:23 Seven (4) 96:12,14,15,16 seven-page (2) 154:2,3 several (4) 35:1;45:10;49:10; 173:13 shake (1) 159:19 shakes (1) 159:12 shaking (1) 95:14 Shall (1) 95:13 share (1)</p>	<p>156:15 shared (1) 153:3 shattering (1) 5:4 sheets (1) 151:15 short (2) 59:19;72:13 shorter (1) 130:15 shortly (1) 151:11 show (32) 5:24;13:13,17;17:19; 18:14;19:16;23:25; 30:21;33:8,19;43:9; 61:14;63:19;68:6;81:5; 84:11,16;107:20,22,24; 108:4,9,19,22,23; 114:25;120:4;122:10, 17;139:15;155:13,18 showed (18) 17:8;18:22;19:15; 20:25;41:21;45:10; 57:13;60:11;65:15; 73:16,21,23;89:5,14; 90:9,15;114:23,24 showing (30) 16:25;17:5,10;19:2; 20:1,1;21:16;27:22; 29:14;30:14;34:10; 44:3;58:11;62:11; 74:20;77:24;83:24; 84:15;98:17;103:14, 21,21;104:22;105:5, 25;114:8;128:22,24; 146:7;163:14 shown (17) 29:18;44:15;75:7; 79:5;82:13;88:6;99:6; 106:19,19;108:13,16; 118:1;120:21;127:13; 147:2;162:3;163:25 shows (24) 7:7;28:24;33:6; 43:10;49:5;73:21;82:3, 10,10;83:13;89:18; 92:21;93:1;108:18; 116:8;120:3;121:11, 15;122:3,6;147:4; 161:20;162:13;166:6 shutting (1) 172:16 side (5) 58:23,24;104:25; 105:5;160:19 side-by-side (3) 156:11;160:8;173:10 sidewalks (1) 56:21 signal (1) 44:18</p>	<p>signed (12) 141:10,14,17,22; 142:11,12,15,17,24; 143:4,17;145:24 significance (1) 52:13 significant (9) 25:11;27:8;73:10,11, 14;79:17;92:8;120:2, 24 significantly (2) 80:19;81:11 Silver (1) 3:8 SILVERMAN (52) 4:6,6;10:17,20,21; 11:8,18,20;12:3,6,8; 15:17;37:14,15,17,24; 38:3;46:7;53:5,7; 68:17;72:13;79:1; 81:17,21;94:17,23; 95:3;96:5,18;97:16; 117:13;138:22;139:5; 143:23;144:4;158:21; 160:2,3;168:23;169:1, 6,16,21,24;170:2; 171:13,21;172:9,15; 173:1,4 similar (1) 117:18 simpler (1) 94:5 simplicity (2) 51:10;87:4 simplifies (1) 81:12 simply (3) 133:19;135:16;174:3 simulate (1) 61:11 simultaneously (1) 8:20 sit (1) 149:24 site (16) 3:7;34:20;39:25; 41:6,10;43:5;46:13; 70:16;73:9,11;76:15; 79:14;85:14;111:17; 114:14;170:13 sites (2) 38:11;39:14 sitting (2) 87:24;149:6 situation (2) 42:8;53:20 Six (2) 154:4,8 six- (1) 154:2 size (2) 88:16,18 slide (4)</p>
S				
<p>S-2863 (1) 3:4 safety (2) 6:21;82:24 sales (1) 27:4 same (33) 15:6,14;19:12;26:4; 31:23;40:13;46:24; 63:9;66:22;87:5;93:12, 12;97:20;104:12; 105:6;109:1,1,1; 110:11;112:3;113:5, 18,19,23;114:11; 115:18;117:21;128:5; 137:7;154:5,6,15; 155:23 samples (1) 18:14 sampling (1) 30:13 sanction (1) 172:4 sanctions (1)</p>	<p>screen (4) 13:1;17:1;74:16; 78:3 screening (1) 128:15 scribbles (1) 8:13 second (21) 3:12;8:11;11:2; 13:23;21:24;22:17; 35:7;83:15;136:22; 137:15,17;138:9,22,22, 24,25;140:24;141:1; 144:19;155:14;162:18 secondly (1) 68:6 seconds (2) 48:1,2 Section (11) 3:5;107:21;128:13, 14;163:16,16,20;164:2, 3,6,8 sections (2) 43:6;163:15 seeing (2) 23:25;33:7</p>	<p>seek (2) 124:1,4 seemed (1) 170:5 seems (4) 168:17;172:9,11,19 select (1) 40:24 selected (4) 25:17;26:10,11;41:1 selection (1) 38:10 selections (1) 38:14 selling (1) 85:23 send (2) 6:23;173:17 sense (4) 29:2;48:21;93:17; 170:10 sent (1) 151:7 sentence (7) 59:19;137:6,12,14, 15;138:23;140:4 separately (3) 63:6;72:6;107:2 series (2) 97:20;148:12 serve (1) 30:10 services (2) 21:4;169:3 servicing (1) 21:8 session (3) 3:12;4:15;160:22 set (14) 16:13;54:1,10;63:7; 108:18;110:11,11,15, 15;114:9;117:24,25; 127:22;128:6 sets (1) 23:25 setting (2) 47:16;123:23 Seven (4) 96:12,14,15,16 seven-page (2) 154:2,3 several (4) 35:1;45:10;49:10; 173:13 shake (1) 159:19 shakes (1) 159:12 shaking (1) 95:14 Shall (1) 95:13 share (1)</p>	<p>156:15 shared (1) 153:3 shattering (1) 5:4 sheets (1) 151:15 short (2) 59:19;72:13 shorter (1) 130:15 shortly (1) 151:11 show (32) 5:24;13:13,17;17:19; 18:14;19:16;23:25; 30:21;33:8,19;43:9; 61:14;63:19;68:6;81:5; 84:11,16;107:20,22,24; 108:4,9,19,22,23; 114:25;120:4;122:10, 17;139:15;155:13,18 showed (18) 17:8;18:22;19:15; 20:25;41:21;45:10; 57:13;60:11;65:15; 73:16,21,23;89:5,14; 90:9,15;114:23,24 showing (30) 16:25;17:5,10;19:2; 20:1,1;21:16;27:22; 29:14;30:14;34:10; 44:3;58:11;62:11; 74:20;77:24;83:24; 84:15;98:17;103:14, 21,21;104:22;105:5, 25;114:8;128:22,24; 146:7;163:14 shown (17) 29:18;44:15;75:7; 79:5;82:13;88:6;99:6; 106:19,19;108:13,16; 118:1;120:21;127:13; 147:2;162:3;163:25 shows (24) 7:7;28:24;33:6; 43:10;49:5;73:21;82:3, 10,10;83:13;89:18; 92:21;93:1;108:18; 116:8;120:3;121:11, 15;122:3,6;147:4; 161:20;162:13;166:6 shutting (1) 172:16 side (5) 58:23,24;104:25; 105:5;160:19 side-by-side (3) 156:11;160:8;173:10 sidewalks (1) 56:21 signal (1) 44:18</p>	<p>signed (12) 141:10,14,17,22; 142:11,12,15,17,24; 143:4,17;145:24 significance (1) 52:13 significant (9) 25:11;27:8;73:10,11, 14;79:17;92:8;120:2, 24 significantly (2) 80:19;81:11 Silver (1) 3:8 SILVERMAN (52) 4:6,6;10:17,20,21; 11:8,18,20;12:3,6,8; 15:17;37:14,15,17,24; 38:3;46:7;53:5,7; 68:17;72:13;79:1; 81:17,21;94:17,23; 95:3;96:5,18;97:16; 117:13;138:22;139:5; 143:23;144:4;158:21; 160:2,3;168:23;169:1, 6,16,21,24;170:2; 171:13,21;172:9,15; 173:1,4 similar (1) 117:18 simpler (1) 94:5 simplicity (2) 51:10;87:4 simplifies (1) 81:12 simply (3) 133:19;135:16;174:3 simulate (1) 61:11 simultaneously (1) 8:20 sit (1) 149:24 site (16) 3:7;34:20;39:25; 41:6,10;43:5;46:13; 70:16;73:9,11;76:15; 79:14;85:14;111:17; 114:14;170:13 sites (2) 38:11;39:14 sitting (2) 87:24;149:6 situation (2) 42:8;53:20 Six (2) 154:4,8 six- (1) 154:2 size (2) 88:16,18 slide (4)</p>

<p>43:9;59:17;74:13; 78:14</p> <p>slow (1) 49:4</p> <p>slowly (1) 89:22</p> <p>small (6) 10:17;11:19,20; 86:12;121:1;161:9</p> <p>smog (2) 48:6,13</p> <p>SO2 (2) 72:7,10</p> <p>society (1) 70:5</p> <p>software (1) 128:4</p> <p>solve (1) 127:22</p> <p>somebody (1) 69:11</p> <p>somebody's (1) 156:17</p> <p>somehow (2) 147:3,4</p> <p>some'll (2) 33:24,25</p> <p>someone (4) 69:8;147:3,4;160:14</p> <p>Sometime (1) 111:14</p> <p>sometimes (2) 33:24;109:22</p> <p>somewhat (1) 153:6</p> <p>somewhere (4) 44:13;139:19,19; 142:24</p> <p>soon (2) 5:13;146:12</p> <p>sorely (1) 96:4</p> <p>sorry (20) 7:25;9:12;12:13; 16:8;17:4;18:4;20:17; 53:10;55:7;74:1,7; 88:14;98:20;99:15; 100:10;107:16;108:8; 138:1;145:2;161:5</p> <p>sort (2) 66:22;125:22</p> <p>sorts (1) 4:11</p> <p>sound (1) 11:21</p> <p>sounds (2) 72:1;147:13</p> <p>source (18) 51:3;53:21,24;56:24; 92:10;104:23;107:2; 111:13;119:15,22; 121:7;122:1,11; 123:25;128:17;137:8;</p>	<p>138:14;140:5</p> <p>sources (15) 42:14,15;45:5;57:1; 74:20,22,25;80:25; 98:10;105:21;108:12; 123:20;128:16;136:23; 137:18</p> <p>south (2) 43:23,24</p> <p>southern (2) 13:19;79:18</p> <p>speak (4) 124:8,9;125:11; 157:8</p> <p>speaking (2) 36:15;130:10</p> <p>speaks (1) 136:19</p> <p>special (14) 3:4;39:4;64:16; 107:1;121:24;168:2,4, 19,22;169:11,18,22; 171:8;172:5</p> <p>specific (9) 76:8;78:4;82:25; 84:18;88:21;111:23; 123:19,20;127:14</p> <p>specifically (9) 19:5;20:11;37:1; 38:18;39:21;73:15; 85:22;129:7;167:17</p> <p>speculation (3) 68:24;70:6,8</p> <p>spell (2) 36:6;115:19</p> <p>Spencerville (1) 170:23</p> <p>spend (1) 75:6</p> <p>spent (2) 9:21;158:25</p> <p>spin (1) 61:8</p> <p>spoken (1) 97:10</p> <p>spot (3) 115:18;117:21; 139:25</p> <p>spreading (1) 49:1</p> <p>Spring (1) 3:8</p> <p>stack (4) 50:2;51:2;136:23; 137:18</p> <p>stacks (5) 119:14;136:25; 137:5,19;140:9</p> <p>staff (7) 148:15,17,17,21,25; 152:18;153:5</p> <p>stage (9) 19:3;51:12,13;60:11;</p>	<p>78:16;81:18,20;93:6; 110:14</p> <p>stand (9) 12:11;15:1;16:1; 20:16;59:25;65:17; 115:25;151:21;174:9</p> <p>standard (47) 26:6,8,14;35:5; 50:17,18,20;53:3; 56:18;57:15,17,19; 59:6,9;60:3;62:23; 64:10;68:3;69:18;75:5, 18,19,20;82:12;89:6, 14;90:10,23;92:5; 94:11;115:18;116:5,6, 17,19,19,20,25;117:1, 4;127:22;128:17,18, 19;137:9;138:14;140:6</p> <p>standardization (1) 94:10</p> <p>standards (11) 53:15;59:25;62:9,10, 14,21;64:17;72:5; 73:17;115:8;117:9</p> <p>standing (1) 57:4</p> <p>stands (2) 115:24;117:12</p> <p>start (15) 7:10;12:23;42:8,11, 21;77:21;88:11; 107:25;108:25;119:1; 120:22;121:6,23; 142:3;160:14</p> <p>started (4) 51:9;88:10,11; 111:12</p> <p>starting (1) 44:4</p> <p>starts (5) 6:8;7:18;121:23,25; 122:1</p> <p>stat (1) 6:17</p> <p>state (11) 20:20;35:9,14,20; 36:13,24;38:8;59:24; 69:16;88:3;136:24</p> <p>stated (2) 151:6;156:16</p> <p>statement (16) 12:1;14:2;24:9; 29:21;43:25;44:20; 59:21,25;69:7;73:15; 82:3;84:12,20;125:2; 130:24;157:6</p> <p>statements (3) 13:12;83:17;132:7</p> <p>States (5) 21:6;31:10;56:20; 79:1;88:12</p> <p>stating (1) 168:20</p>	<p>station (36) 3:7;21:18;23:2,8; 27:4,16;29:1,17;34:21; 40:1;42:7;59:23;60:8; 65:3;69:19;73:19; 74:18,20;75:3,24;76:5, 24;82:4,5;88:18;93:9; 107:4;122:18,20; 123:17,19,23;136:24; 170:19;171:1;172:16</p> <p>stations (4) 29:21;88:16;109:21, 25</p> <p>station's (3) 87:13;91:15;169:21</p> <p>status (1) 148:10</p> <p>statute (4) 64:18,18;172:13,14</p> <p>steel (1) 35:15</p> <p>step (1) 18:20</p> <p>Stephen (1) 45:15</p> <p>still (19) 6:12;7:4;12:17;19:3, 10;20:1;24:22;25:23; 27:16;28:3;46:13;65:3; 73:10;86:14;89:18; 92:1,16;93:3;158:25</p> <p>Stop (6) 4:6,8;11:12;36:18; 107:25;109:1</p> <p>story (1) 174:11</p> <p>straight (3) 31:1;118:4;165:9</p> <p>Street (1) 40:19</p> <p>strictly (1) 158:24</p> <p>striking (1) 37:21</p> <p>strong (1) 172:6</p> <p>structures (1) 45:8</p> <p>studies (6) 23:20,25;27:17,22; 123:22,22</p> <p>study (2) 22:3;23:10</p> <p>stuff (2) 11:4,16</p> <p>Subject (4) 3:7;37:20;170:6,13</p> <p>subjective (1) 94:14</p> <p>submissions (1) 38:13</p> <p>submit (1) 149:23</p>	<p>submitted (7) 46:25;64:7;152:19; 153:3,7,21;154:14</p> <p>subset (1) 6:16</p> <p>substantial (1) 120:6</p> <p>substantially (1) 58:19</p> <p>substantiate (1) 133:16</p> <p>substantive (1) 149:3</p> <p>substitute (1) 8:7</p> <p>substituted (2) 7:24;144:1</p> <p>subtract (1) 10:13</p> <p>suburban (7) 30:8;39:1,6;40:1,2; 41:2;111:13</p> <p>successful (1) 172:20</p> <p>sufficient (4) 70:17,18,21;119:25</p> <p>suggest (4) 26:2;95:9;134:1; 168:12</p> <p>suggested (8) 70:24;77:7;85:24; 129:18;130:6;132:11; 134:1;168:10</p> <p>suggesting (1) 152:24</p> <p>suggestion (1) 158:15</p> <p>suggestions (2) 129:11;132:5</p> <p>suggests (2) 129:15;132:9</p> <p>Sullivan (460) 12:10,12,14,15,17, 18,23;13:10,11;16:9, 10,11,14,17,22;17:6,8, 14;18:1,3,6,11,22,25; 19:8;20:12,17,20; 21:23;22:2,3,5,12,15, 18,21,23,24;23:4,13, 20,23;24:12;25:1,7,13, 21;26:3,12,14,19,21, 25;27:11,13;28:12,20; 29:4,22;30:6,16,24; 31:4,15,17;33:21; 34:19,23;35:1,12,19, 24;36:2,7,9,12;38:7,15, 18;39:13,18,23;40:7, 23;41:1,8,12,16,24; 42:1;43:1,6,12,14,17, 20;45:3,17,20;46:1,2,8, 17,20,23;47:4,8,15,21; 48:1,4,13;49:10,19,23; 50:16;51:8,18,22,25;</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>52:5,8,15,19,22;53:12,17,19;54:14,18,23; 55:1,4,15,23;56:2,9,12,15,18,24;57:8,12,23; 58:10,24;59:10,12,15,18;60:4,9,16,20,23; 61:6,21,25,25;62:4,8; 63:1,5,9;64:1,21;65:15,25;66:3,6,11,25;67:15,18;68:2,25;69:7,13,15; 70:20;71:3;72:4,10; 73:8,13,21,25;74:5,7,11,15,19,24;75:13,16,20,22,25;76:7,14,19; 77:1,5,10,17,19,24; 78:5,13,16,22,24;79:3,6,10,16,22,24;80:25; 81:8,19;82:1,21;83:3,5,8,21;84:4,12,18;85:3,7,11,16;86:9,22,25; 87:23;88:2,9,17,20; 89:2,15,25,90:11,15,19,21,24;91:1,7,10,13,20;92:9,13,18;93:23; 94:3,25;95:11,18;97:9,13,25;98:3,13,23;99:9,12,18,23;100:2,6,8,12,19,24;101:5,11,17,24; 102:7,14,19,21,24; 103:1,13,17;104:2,4,16;105:2,14,16,19,24; 106:6,11,17,19;107:9,14,16,18,25;108:2,9,12,22,25;109:7,15,19; 110:2,10,18,23;111:1,6,9,12,24;112:2,6,12,14,17,21,24;113:2,8,12,15,19,25;114:3,8,16,19,23;115:6,20,23; 116:1,3,7,18,24;117:2,9,12,15,25;118:15,19; 119:1,4,10,13;120:12; 121:17,20,25;122:4,10,19,23;123:2,10,14,18,24;124:4,7,10,17,20,23,25;125:6,10,12,15,16,18,20;126:16,23,25; 127:3,7,10,14,20,25; 128:3,18,22;129:5,20; 130:12,24;131:3,10,15; 132:13,16,18,20;133:1,12;134:11,17;136:15; 137:1,4,10,14,20,25; 138:9,12,16;140:8,13,15,18;142:2,12; 143:10;144:2;149:15; 156:16;161:3,7,14; 162:10,17,21,25;163:7,10,19,23;165:12,16,19,24;166:5,13,15,18,22,25;167:4,6,8</p>	<p>59:21;71:17;132:3; 134:20,21;145:23; 149:6;156:9;173:13 summary (2) 22:13,20 supplemental (1) 89:16 supply (3) 173:23;174:12,12 support (3) 27:17;43:8;54:16 supports (1) 17:17 supposed (2) 88:11;164:19 Supreme (2) 10:22;11:4 Sure (31) 6:25;7:2;10:6,7,8; 14:18;15:5,13;16:5; 31:25;32:13,18;34:21; 49:7;84:23;95:6;99:9; 101:1;112:21;137:16; 141:23;144:11,20; 160:11,25;161:17; 163:19;167:8;168:18; 173:1,18 surface (2) 44:2;45:6 surprised (1) 28:13 surrebuttal (3) 4:22;15:2;16:5 survey (1) 123:21 suspect (4) 9:24;145:5;159:9,18 sustain (2) 69:2,6 Sustained (1) 18:18 switch (1) 111:10 switched (2) 111:3;113:20 synergistic (7) 70:25;71:4,8,12,14,18;72:3 synonyms (1) 102:8</p>	<p>55:21;62:2;71:7,14; 83:1,4;84:1;85:10; 93:21;100:13,20; 101:12;104:17;106:20; 122:18;128:6;144:14; 146:22;150:25;152:19; 161:15;162:19,20; 163:6,8 talks (1) 64:18 tall (1) 140:9 team (1) 140:15 teased (1) 8:24 technical (1) 60:24 Technology (2) 117:11,13 telling (3) 21:3;59:7;105:12 tells (2) 40:14;116:9 tend (5) 25:16;44:18;45:8; 88:4;91:16 tends (1) 90:3 tens (1) 48:1 TEOM (7) 115:2,10,12,15,17, 19;116:20 T-E-O-M (1) 115:20 term (9) 15:8,11,22;101:22; 102:6;116:22,24; 136:12;144:2 terminology (1) 14:11 terms (16) 15:14;24:12;39:19; 60:1;64:19;71:9,19; 72:2;73:8;76:23;77:20; 81:23;124:2;133:2; 153:2,19 Testament (4) 10:24;12:2,3,7 testified (34) 10:4,10;11:24;14:19; 15:9;18:20;34:15,18; 41:7;56:15;60:15,24; 73:9;77:4;82:17;83:18; 86:21;92:14,15;93:24; 94:20,21,23;124:13; 129:13;131:16;132:5; 133:24;135:9;147:23; 148:1,7;151:2,11 testify (2) 16:4;161:3 testifying (1)</p>	<p>22:4 testimony (41) 5:8;12:20;13:13,24; 14:3,17;15:11,20; 17:24;18:13;29:12; 34:9;36:23;38:13; 41:21;47:24;48:3; 51:15;59:5;60:14,18, 22;80:7;83:23;84:10; 95:2;129:4,10;130:3,5; 131:14;134:12,16; 135:11;143:13;148:1; 151:25;152:10;158:13; 159:21;161:6 Thanks (1) 24:2 That'd (2) 88:21;112:7 theirs (1) 117:18 theory (1) 71:3 There'd (1) 35:5 therefore (1) 37:25 therein (1) 37:18 there'll (1) 31:4 thereof (1) 11:21 thinly-veiled (1) 37:7 third (1) 58:22 this'll (1) 9:18 thou (1) 11:21 though (7) 69:3;80:6;85:18; 87:25;148:7;161:19; 163:1 thought (6) 18:5,9,12;118:21; 154:22;171:2 thoughts (1) 160:4 three (12) 114:7,19,22;128:20, 22,24;129:2,7;133:10; 155:9,12;157:17 three- (3) 29:15;42:18;132:24 three-tier (1) 132:24 three-year (2) 31:8;114:11 thresholds (1) 72:2 throughout (2) 81:5;152:14</p>	<p>thrown (1) 9:13 thrust (1) 39:7 thumb (1) 42:16 tier (25) 14:22;51:8,10;52:2; 65:21,25;66:1,1;68:3,4, 4,4;81:18,20;89:17; 129:2,2,2,6,8,23; 132:25,25;133:1,2 tiered (5) 13:25;14:9;128:15, 24,24 tiers (6) 128:20,22,25;129:2, 7;133:10 tier-three (1) 14:12 times (11) 25:8;29:19;31:4; 63:9;80:1;82:18;87:7; 103:10;108:2;120:2; 129:10 timing (2) 162:14;163:3 title (1) 53:13 titled (1) 55:22 today (16) 4:21;5:7;12:24; 13:14;29:8;118:16; 131:4,18;132:13; 139:15;149:24;158:15; 159:2,5,22;167:14 today's (1) 96:8 together (3) 38:23;90:1;135:12 told (5) 38:7;147:24;151:19; 154:11;156:13 tomorrow (6) 99:8;101:4;112:22; 160:16;173:10,16 took (2) 24:5;25:2 tool (1) 67:8 top (6) 9:11,12;32:8,10; 131:7;174:6 total (4) 75:2,3,23;79:4 towards (1) 75:7 traffic (18) 20:14;76:5,6,7,24; 77:2,7,8,14,21,23; 79:12,16;80:8,9,22,23; 149:4</p>
<p>Sullivan's (12) 4:21;12:20;15:9;</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>talk (6) 15:6;36:1;37:22; 41:4;49:7;146:24 talked (5) 36:2;62:22;78:1; 86:17;135:16 talking (37) 12:24;14:7,8;15:5, 14;32:22;37:6;43:20; 48:5,7;51:1;52:18;</p>	<p>10:4,10;11:24;14:19; 15:9;18:20;34:15,18; 41:7;56:15;60:15,24; 73:9;77:4;82:17;83:18; 86:21;92:14,15;93:24; 94:20,21,23;124:13; 129:13;131:16;132:5; 133:24;135:9;147:23; 148:1,7;151:2,11 testify (2) 16:4;161:3 testifying (1)</p>	<p>114:7,19,22;128:20, 22,24;129:2,7;133:10; 155:9,12;157:17 three- (3) 29:15;42:18;132:24 three-tier (1) 132:24 three-year (2) 31:8;114:11 thresholds (1) 72:2 throughout (2) 81:5;152:14</p>	<p>thrown (1) 9:13 thrust (1) 39:7 thumb (1) 42:16 tier (25) 14:22;51:8,10;52:2; 65:21,25;66:1,1;68:3,4, 4,4;81:18,20;89:17; 129:2,2,2,6,8,23; 132:25,25;133:1,2 tiered (5) 13:25;14:9;128:15, 24,24 tiers (6) 128:20,22,25;129:2, 7;133:10 tier-three (1) 14:12 times (11) 25:8;29:19;31:4; 63:9;80:1;82:18;87:7; 103:10;108:2;120:2; 129:10 timing (2) 162:14;163:3 title (1) 53:13 titled (1) 55:22 today (16) 4:21;5:7;12:24; 13:14;29:8;118:16; 131:4,18;132:13; 139:15;149:24;158:15; 159:2,5,22;167:14 today's (1) 96:8 together (3) 38:23;90:1;135:12 told (5) 38:7;147:24;151:19; 154:11;156:13 tomorrow (6) 99:8;101:4;112:22; 160:16;173:10,16 took (2) 24:5;25:2 tool (1) 67:8 top (6) 9:11,12;32:8,10; 131:7;174:6 total (4) 75:2,3,23;79:4 towards (1) 75:7 traffic (18) 20:14;76:5,6,7,24; 77:2,7,8,14,21,23; 79:12,16;80:8,9,22,23; 149:4</p>

transaction (1) 161:20	65:25;66:2,4	12:17;37:25;38:2; 64:10;75:4,8;89:6; 108:17;127:6;128:13, 14,21;152:16;163:16; 169:8	98:12;110:18;166:15	116:12
transcript (14) 30:5;31:24;32:16; 34:14;96:7,17;130:18; 131:6;132:18,22; 134:18;135:5;136:18, 20	truth (3) 36:21;37:17;151:5	underestimated (3) 58:7;82:13;85:19	upon (28) 13:17;30:20;45:9; 51:14;54:1,10;57:16; 64:6;68:5,14;76:14; 82:10;94:9;98:15; 99:14;109:10,22; 110:11;111:9;116:21; 117:22;120:14;166:7, 22;167:20;168:15; 172:3,5	value (32) 20:22;24:14;25:3; 28:16;31:19;42:24; 60:4;61:2;63:19,20; 64:23;68:7,10;73:22, 24;74:2;75:4,4;80:13; 81:9,11,12;86:15; 92:21;101:21;102:3; 103:2;104:8,9;107:1; 116:7,9
transform (1) 49:9	try (9) 5:23;10:1;12:15; 20:4;86:1;139:5; 149:19;160:10,13	understandable (1) 158:4	upper (2) 65:5;66:14	values (23) 16:25;17:4,11;24:16; 28:25;29:1;33:1;35:4; 40:20;61:3;75:6;82:17; 83:14;89:10,19;91:2, 15;99:15;103:4,6,24; 115:15;123:16
transient (3) 56:24;57:1,18	trying (11) 9:3;25:13,22;37:11; 66:12;123:6;131:13; 133:23;150:15,18; 164:1	understands (1) 14:7	upset (1) 143:16	variability (1) 61:8
transition (8) 41:18;42:3,17,21; 43:24,25;44:10;45:11	Tuesday (3) 148:1,9,11	understood (5) 16:6;24:4;34:8; 36:23;129:3	urban (23) 13:17;41:5,14,17,19, 19;42:8;43:2,11;44:23, 23;45:1,3,7,13,20; 47:16,19;76:17,22; 98:11;164:6;166:24	variable (1) 61:16
transition's (1) 44:12	turbulence (6) 47:16;48:8,16,24,25; 49:3	undertaken (2) 87:18,21	use (30) 11:10;19:12;26:2; 35:18;38:20;39:11,14; 41:16;42:2;43:18; 44:11;52:9;66:21;67:7; 80:22,23,24;97:23; 99:21;101:22;102:6; 110:7;111:8,16; 120:18;133:4;134:10; 138:19;140:12,25	variables (1) 63:22
travel (11) 42:10,12;44:3;46:4, 4;49:6;119:17,25; 120:1,16,20	turbulent (1) 11:25	unexpected (1) 31:6	used (48) 15:11;24:15,15,24; 27:19;38:11,14,21; 39:20,25;44:14;58:13; 76:25;79:17,18,21; 80:22;81:2,4;85:3,3; 86:2;92:20;95:9;98:18; 99:1,13;103:2,6,7; 109:13;110:9;111:18; 113:5;115:9,10;119:5, 12;121:5;123:12; 127:16;129:13,18; 132:6,10;133:1;134:3; 140:9	variance (1) 116:6
traveling (4) 19:17;79:14;87:3; 92:24	turn (5) 60:13;127:1;128:9; 136:21;139:2	unfair (1) 157:23	using (24) 19:20;24:20;27:14, 15;28:4;41:19;46:19; 50:22;52:4;65:16; 76:17;85:13;87:13; 91:13;93:6,6;98:10; 101:13;116:23;127:7, 10;128:5;165:25;174:4	varied (1) 81:5
traverse (2) 42:19;44:3	Turning (7) 47:23;148:12;154:8, 9,11;155:20,22	unit (1) 116:12	usually (7) 42:17;96:10;120:5; 140:9;169:2;173:23; 174:11	various (6) 71:13;74:18;88:24; 117:25;118:1;120:3
treat (1) 45:1	turnover (2) 30:20;31:11	United (1) 21:6	vacuum (1)	vary (1) 63:14
treated (4) 27:7;41:11;43:11; 91:12	turns (2) 30:17;152:12	units (1) 63:12		vaunted (1) 43:18
treatment (8) 45:20,21;85:23;87:7; 90:16,18;92:2,3	twice (5) 83:24;84:11,15; 151:11,15	University (5) 78:9;80:10;87:20,22; 88:5		Vegas (4) 20:24,25;23:3;67:19
treatments (1) 49:24	two (23) 7:11;14:11;29:21; 41:12;55:23;68:2;80:6; 81:9;89:3;93:2;106:7; 109:21;111:18;114:22, 23;115:17;117:20,22; 146:11;147:23;148:2; 157:20;163:6	unless (4) 17:22;95:23;96:10; 168:16		vehicle (2) 84:19;161:23
tremendous (1) 91:21	Tyler (1) 52:24	unlikely (1) 65:1		vehicles (14) 27:15;30:18;31:11; 34:2;76:25;79:19;82:6, 8,20;84:1,24;87:2; 163:18;165:21
trend (23) 28:5,21,21;29:11,17, 20;30:14,14,16,21,25; 31:5,7,33;20,23,25; 34:11;91:14,14;93:5,7, 10;110:13	type (3) 39:25;95:9;127:17	unreliable (1) 25:17		vein (1) 159:13
trends (2) 87:11,13	typical (5) 17:1;42:16;58:2; 103:21;127:19	unsigned (2) 142:21,23		Veirs (3) 3:8;78:9;80:9
tried (2) 11:9;87:8	typically (2) 19:22;120:22	unstable (2) 44:17,17		ventilated (1) 48:6
troubling (2) 141:3;150:6		unwilling (1) 149:9		verb (1) 144:5
truck (5) 148:12;154:8,9,11; 155:22	U	up (59) 5:24;11:3;14:6; 18:20;23:1;26:5;28:4, 6;29:21;31:6;33:11,17, 24,24;40:14;42:19,21; 43:14;44:11;46:10,14; 48:14;61:9,12,15,22; 64:12;72:8;74:14;80:2, 15,20;82:22,23,24; 86:1,2;91:14;93:13; 101:17;103:12;110:16; 111:19;117:6;119:12; 123:5;125:23;128:6; 131:4;147:9;150:21; 151:21;159:21;160:11; 165:9,24;170:21,23; 172:4		verbiage (2) 149:8;157:2
trucks (16) 21:7,8;30:19;31:12; 34:2,4,4;75:1;86:6; 91:19,20,21,24;92:1,4; 163:25	ultimate (1) 16:15	update (2) 27:1;99:4		version (26) 7:22;8:6,13,21;9:20; 10:12;46:9,24,25;47:5; 137:21,23;139:21,22; 140:17,18;142:12; 143:1,17,17;144:11,11, 12;145:20;154:13; 173:11
true (1) 169:9	ultimately (3) 148:24;153:7;169:18	updated (6) 6:16;7:15;79:19;		versions (1)
truly (1) 33:19	uncertainty (21) 60:18,25;61:2,7; 62:12;63:13,22,24; 64:3,11,19;65:4,4,7; 66:10,13;67:3;86:18; 93:21;94:18,24			
trump (3)	under (15)			

<p>146:11 versus (13) 27:7,15;29:23;30:1; 41:5;81:23;82:16; 84:24;93:11;115:10; 117:19;141:6;156:24 via (1) 143:4 views (1) 63:3 violate (1) 59:24 violated (1) 169:20 violation (4) 24:1;69:17;169:5,5 Virginia (3) 20:15;40:5;67:20 Virginia's (1) 20:20 visually (1) 122:7 volumes (2) 77:14;126:21 volunteered (2) 173:22,22</p>	<p>50:24;54:11;59:6,7; 64:14;68:24;69:5; 71:21;25:94:4,7,8; 96:21;109:9;123:2; 138:3;140:17;151:3; 152:24;157:2;158:23; 159:18;164:23;165:4; 168:18;169:2;172:13 ways (3) 58:25;89:3;114:23 we- (1) 6:24 weak (1) 172:11 week (3) 81:6,10;96:11 weekday (4) 77:12;80:10;81:2,5 weekdays (1) 161:21 weekend (2) 80:13;81:5 weekends (3) 77:13;80:8;161:21 weeks (3) 142:25;148:16; 154:10 weight (3) 70:13;116:11;170:3 weights (1) 82:14 well- (1) 48:5 well-mixed (1) 48:6 Wes (1) 155:19 Westfield (7) 3:9;154:15;169:8,10; 170:5;171:22;172:1 what's (24) 16:24;22:1;36:21; 37:18;44:9,15;50:12; 66:3,24;75:15;82:5; 83:13;88:6;102:5; 105:25;106:24,25; 115:25;116:14;126:14; 135:4;136:18;138:12; 146:20 Wheaton (8) 3:9,10;30:8;39:1,6; 40:15;68:13;69:18 wheel (1) 61:9 whence (1) 11:22 whenever (1) 5:15 whereas (1) 110:8 Whereupon (4) 72:25;95:19;145:14; 174:15</p>	<p>wherever (1) 105:10 whither (1) 11:22 Who'd (1) 36:1 whole (7) 58:12;90:1;105:16; 108:20;132:18;133:2; 161:13 Wholesale (1) 3:3 wide (1) 116:5 wiggles (1) 31:1 win (1) 117:18 wind (5) 11:20;47:16;109:4,5, 8 wire (1) 126:3 wishes (1) 95:22 within (9) 36:24;44:6,7,7; 47:17;59:22;64:18; 71:9;73:16 without (6) 90:8;154:21;158:17; 164:9,10;165:21 witness (5) 4:20;133:24;136:9; 173:24;174:9 witnesses (1) 152:10 witness's (1) 71:9 wonder (1) 173:1 wondered (2) 33:17,18 wondering (2) 96:7;172:18 word (1) 144:1 words (3) 101:24;105:9,16 word-smithing (1) 147:14 work (5) 43:10;49:9;95:17; 156:14;159:13 worked (1) 157:16 working (1) 157:10 works (3) 125:13,15;169:2 worksheet (1) 146:7 worried (1)</p>	<p>44:21 write (3) 3:15;54:4;167:3 written (1) 8:2 wrong (3) 90:7;139:2;146:25 wrote (1) 10:23</p>	<p>51:10;68:4;83:6,19, 24;95:16,17;97:19,23; 102:1;105:2;107:20; 108:13,17;110:8; 114:24;115:1;129:2, 23;132:23,25;161:8; 162:20;163:6;166:7,12 1.43 (1) 80:6 1.5 (2) 42:13,21 10 (26) 3:9;8:18;19:15,22; 23:6,7;27:23;33:23; 54:5,5;75:8;82:18,24; 83:6,19;86:1,14;87:3; 91:25;93:2,12;96:11, 11;120:23;156:21; 167:5 10.77 (2) 75:11;76:11 10.8 (1) 75:4 100 (14) 21:1;28:15;31:23; 51:10;63:9,12;65:16; 89:4;91:10,11;93:15; 129:22;132:25;133:16 10-fold (1) 121:1 11 (1) 6:3 11:18 (1) 72:25 11160 (1) 3:8 113.4 (2) 162:14,15 11th (2) 5:5;147:23 12 (8) 10:14;75:20;164:7,9, 13,13,16;165:9 12.0 (1) 75:21 12:04 (1) 95:19 120 (3) 19:3,25;89:19 121 (11) 20:1;28:12;60:11; 61:14;63:20;64:24; 65:6,12;66:15;79:6; 80:3 122 (2) 80:3,3 123 (1) 80:16 13 (6) 78:22,23,24;79:2,3,5 130 (2) 15:23;132:22 14 (3)</p>
W			Y	
<p>Wait (12) 55:8,10,10,10;73:4; 89:12;140:24;141:1; 142:19,19,19,19 waiting (1) 57:9 waiving (1) 168:3 walk (1) 37:11 wall (4) 169:7;170:17; 171:14,18 wants (2) 15:2;124:11 warehouse (4) 76:4,9;104:12;107:4 warehouses (1) 86:8 warm (1) 40:14 warmer (1) 45:6 Washington (4) 39:2,20;164:18; 165:4 waste (4) 149:12;156:1,5; 160:5 watch (1) 126:5 way (35) 5:21;8:22;16:20; 17:1;42:20,20,20,23;</p>			<p>yardstick (1) 117:17 year (29) 6:8;9:16;21:11,24, 24;25:3,8,15;26:5; 31:5,8,18;75:6;98:24, 25;103:10,19;104:11; 105:19;106:8,13,23; 108:14,15,15;112:15; 113:14;157:11;158:9 years (17) 25:4;27:1;33:23; 61:11;98:18;101:18, 19;103:19;106:4; 107:10,13;110:7; 111:22;112:1,23; 114:7;115:15 yesterday (3) 5:9;6:18;10:21</p>	
			Z	
			<p>zero (1) 161:8 zone (8) 42:3,17;43:24,25; 44:10;58:16;76:21; 121:21 zoned (1) 3:10 Zoning (1) 3:5</p>	
			0	
			<p>0.028 (1) 77:25 0.92 (1) 75:24 02 (1) 25:8 03 (1) 77:25 05 (1) 19:15 06 (1) 120:21</p>	
			1	
			1 (26)	

<p>74:3,5;133:14 142 (1) 63:17 14th (4) 31:17;74:3;79:11; 118:17 15 (8) 21:9;22:13,20;72:18; 81:10;133:14,14,14 150 (2) 63:14,14 153 (3) 21:11,21,24 155 (1) 151:15 156 (3) 21:16,21,23 1565 (1) 9:11 157 (1) 151:16 15A (1) 118:23 16 (18) 3:7;34:14;74:8,9,14; 78:2,8,11,12;133:15; 148:13,19;150:21; 152:16;153:2;156:2,4; 161:20 160 (13) 17:10,22;61:14; 63:21;65:15;68:6; 89:15;161:5,7,16; 162:3,6;165:23 160.2 (1) 161:14 161 (1) 130:20 168 (3) 161:5;165:18,22 16th (2) 159:22;161:2 17 (1) 133:15 174th (1) 24:9 175 (1) 25:9 175th (4) 24:8;25:2,3,6 18 (4) 34:14;132:23; 163:21,25 190 (1) 60:4 190,000 (1) 21:6 1986 (2) 54:20;56:4 1st (11) 52:24;88:11,12; 101:25;102:11,11,12, 12,13,13,15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 (29) 25:8;51:12;68:4; 80:15;83:24;99:21; 100:13;101:6,12; 102:17;103:10;105:4; 107:20;108:13;110:8, 10;114:24;115:1; 129:2,12,12;132:7; 133:1;140:1;162:11, 20;163:4,4,6 2.5 (1) 29:24 2:04 (1) 145:14 20 (24) 27:18;28:8,10,17; 55:13;57:14;58:8,15, 22;72:18;78:8;82:13; 84:16;85:5,25;92:22; 93:11;103:4;161:21; 162:1;163:1;164:10; 165:22;166:21 20- (2) 85:19;93:13 2004 (2) 62:5,6 2006 (20) 98:11,17,20;100:3, 15;101:13,25;102:11, 15;104:4,19,23; 106:21;110:9,12; 112:2,7;113:10,12; 114:2 2007 (5) 55:6,17;102:12; 104:23;120:14 2007-2009 (1) 114:10 2008 (2) 33:9;102:12 2008-2010 (1) 114:11 2009 (2) 99:2;102:13 2010 (22) 50:19;93:6;98:7,11, 17,21;99:5;100:3,16; 101:13;102:13,15; 104:24;109:16;110:7, 9,12;112:2,7;113:11, 12;114:2 2011 (7) 31:9;52:19,24;99:2; 103:2;109:11;111:14 2012 (16) 28:4;33:11,15;87:14; 90:9;93:7,8;98:7,9;99:5; 109:16;110:8,16; 118:24,25;124:14,16 2013 (18)</p>	<p>3:11;6:8,12;7:16,18; 17:9;20:22;31:9,18; 33:9,11,17;89:16; 90:12;98:4;159:22; 161:2;162:11 2014 (16) 3:12;5:24;6:1,3,9; 7:6,18,20;74:9;79:11; 88:11;97:19;118:5,21, 22;141:18 2016 (1) 161:4 20-minute (1) 162:7 21 (9) 53:8;54:22;55:2,14, 20;74:9;97:19;118:22; 141:18 21st (2) 118:5,17 23 (6) 79:24;80:1,20; 112:10;164:3,12 235 (1) 128:12 24 (8) 30:21;31:17;106:15; 112:13;116:12;165:15; 166:24;167:3 25 (10) 19:11,19;27:14,15, 19,21;87:4;92:20,25; 93:11 255A (1) 161:2 26 (2) 114:4;157:1 26th (1) 3:11 27 (7) 54:23;55:11;139:5, 11,17;142:2,10 28 (14) 55:12;136:21; 137:13;138:7,8;139:1, 2,6,7,9,16,17;142:7; 157:1 2820 (1) 15:24 285 (2) 126:12,24 29 (2) 4:16;6:14</p> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 (23) 11:15;14:22;19:3; 51:13;52:2;60:11;68:4; 78:16;79:10;81:18,18, 20;93:6;101:6;109:12; 110:7,14;115:1,2; 129:2,6,8;133:2</p>	<p>3:01 (1) 174:15 30 (5) 42:12;84:5,7,8,16 30- (1) 82:13 300 (3) 7:23;8:2;120:4 30-fold (1) 85:19 31 (1) 157:11 312 (2) 7:23;8:2 31st (2) 3:2;102:15 32,000 (1) 21:7 342 (2) 22:2,11 35 (3) 43:13,14;46:1 365 (2) 103:10;108:19 3rd (2) 106:23,25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>4 (11) 110:21;161:16,22; 162:20,23;163:15,16, 17,20;164:6,8 40 (23) 42:12;54:1,2,10,13, 14;58:8;84:5,7,8,16; 120:20,24,25;121:5,5, 11,22;122:9,12,21; 123:4;162:1 404E (1) 32:14 404F (4) 31:21,24;32:15,25 40-car (1) 161:22 40-hour (1) 91:8 40-meter (2) 121:16,20 40-queue (1) 57:13 410-537-3756 (1) 97:14 46 (4) 130:7,9,17,20 465 (1) 147:21 466 (9) 12:25;13:8,9;118:6; 141:13;144:14,16; 145:2,25 47 (1) 131:2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 (21) 14:19;15:10;19:22; 27:23,24;87:3;93:2,11; 111:2,6,22,24;112:9; 120:23;161:10;163:2, 13,15;164:2,3;165:23 5.2.4 (2) 128:13,21 50 (20) 41:19,19;42:12;44:3, 10;46:4,11,14,15,17; 47:3,5,7,9,10,11,17,18; 63:13,14 50/50 (1) 41:22 50-foot (1) 156:24 512 (1) 5:22 512A (2) 5:21;7:15 550 (1) 157:11 553 (2) 9:7,24 553A (1) 9:18 554 (4) 8:10,11,20,21 59-G-2.06 (1) 3:5 5th (1) 130:22</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>6 (16) 6:1;11:14;14:19; 15:11;32:10,10;84:15; 112:4,23;128:10; 129:15;132:7;145:2; 161:8;162:12;163:4 60 (2) 42:10,11 639 (2) 79:18,22 65 (1) 42:11 67 (1) 33:11 67.68 (1) 33:15 68.82 (2) 103:9,12 68232 (1) 127:2 68235 (2) 128:9,11 68236 (1) 129:1</p>
--	--	---	---	---

<p>6th (3) 30:5;31:24;132:23</p>	<p>166:6,17,18,23 9.29 (1) 80:2</p>			
<p>7</p>	<p>9.3 (1) 80:2</p>			
<p>7 (5) 32:11;112:25; 113:23;145:3,5</p>	<p>9.8 (1) 76:10 9.30 (2) 3:13;173:9</p>			
<p>7.6 (1) 79:25</p>	<p>90 (15) 17:21;18:11;98:11, 16,19,21,25;166:1,7, 14,17,22,24;167:1,2</p>			
<p>70 (7) 42:10,11;46:3,11; 47:3,7,10</p>	<p>90s (1) 64:25</p>			
<p>70-foot (1) 156:24</p>	<p>90th (4) 17:13;18:5,10;73:24</p>			
<p>710 (1) 21:4</p>	<p>92 (4) 21:2;34:14;74:20; 75:3</p>			
<p>72 (2) 30:5;91:24</p>	<p>95th (2) 25:18;61:2</p>			
<p>73 (2) 33:9,13</p>	<p>96 (1) 32:17</p>			
<p>73.32 (1) 33:17</p>	<p>97th (2) 25:11,19</p>			
<p>75 (1) 44:5</p>	<p>98 (14) 24:15;25:23;31:18; 99:1,1,6;103:19; 107:15;166:6,6,12,18; 167:1,3</p>			
<p>75th (1) 94:13</p>	<p>98th (63) 17:11,13,14,21;18:1, 5,6,10,12;20:22;21:11; 23:24;24:4,8,10,13,15, 20,25;25:5,11,18,21; 26:1,6,9,10;28:16; 29:7;60:4;62:22;63:2, 6,19;67:15;68:10; 73:22,25;93:16;99:15, 15;103:23;104:1,7,8, 11,14,15,20;105:20; 106:5,12,22;107:7,17; 108:6,8,19,20;112:10; 165:17;166:1,4</p>			
<p>783 (1) 79:20</p>	<p>99 (1) 32:22</p>			
<p>79 (1) 63:16</p>	<p>99.99 (1) 94:12</p>			
<p>8</p>	<p>995 (1) 93:17</p>			
<p>8 (7) 3:12;5:10,11;27:24; 97:20;113:18;173:9</p>	<p>999 (1) 26:5</p>			
<p>8:00 (2) 106:23,25</p>	<p>99th (1) 25:12</p>			
<p>80 (6) 29:6;33:8;61:14; 63:20;66:16;133:1</p>				
<p>80s (1) 64:25</p>				
<p>81 (1) 31:19</p>				
<p>85 (1) 17:21</p>				
<p>86 (6) 20:22;30:5;31:23; 55:4,15;120:9</p>				
<p>8760 (1) 25:7</p>				
<p>8th (8) 5:8,12;96:6,17; 160:16,22;167:15; 174:14</p>				
<p>9</p>				
<p>9 (14) 164:7,9,12,13,16; 165:6,9,15,23,25;</p>				