

OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY

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

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on
May 22, 2014, commencing at 9:44 a.m., at the Office of
Zoning and Administrative Hearings, 100 Maryland Avenue,
Rita Davidson Memorial Hearing Room, Rockville, Maryland
20850 before:

Robert Grossman
Hearing Examiner

A P P E A R A N C E S

On Behalf of the Petitioner:

Pat Harris, Esq.

Michael Goecke, Esq.

Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered

3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460

Bethesda, Maryland 20814

On Behalf of the Respondent:

Michele Rosenfeld, Esq.

The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld, LLC

11913 Ambleside Drive

Potomac, Maryland 20854

C O N T E N T S

Rebuttal Witnesses:	Direct	Cross	Redirect	Recross
Henry Cole				
By Ms. Rosenfeld:	7	--	--	--
By Mr. Goecke:	--	142	--	--

E X H I B I T S

Exhibit No.		Marked/Received
602	December 2011 summary of results from near road NO2 monitoring pilot study, prepared by Sonoma Technology, Inc., for the EPA	70
603	Emission inventories development using Moves model, a Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas area case study and North Central Texas COG	133
604	1983 NO2/NOX ratio and emissions from gasoline-powered cars by Lerner and Lindquist	175

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the 35th day of a public
 2 hearing in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Court
 3 of Appeals No. S-2863, OZAH No. 13-12, a petition for a
 4 special exception pursuant to Section 59G2.06 to allow
 5 petitioner to construct and operate an automobile filling
 6 station which would include 16 pumps. The subject site is
 7 located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silver Spring, Maryland.
 8 That's Lot N-631 in Wheaton Plaza, Parcel 10, also known as
 9 Westfield Wheaton Mall. And it is zoned C-2, general
 10 commercial.

11 The hearing was begun on April 26, 2013, and the
 12 next session will be on May 29, 2014. There possibly will
 13 be one on June 6, 2014, here in the second floor hearing
 14 room of the Council Office Building at 9:30 a.m.

15 This hearing is conducted on behalf of the Board
 16 of Appeals. My name is Martin Grossman. I'm the hearing
 17 examiner, which means I am taking evidence and I'll write a
 18 report and recommendation to the Board of Appeals which will
 19 make the decision in this case. Will the parties identify
 20 themselves, please?

21 MR. BRANN: Good morning. Erich Brann for Costco.
 22 MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris for Costco.
 23 MR. GOECKE: Good morning. Mike Goecke for
 24 Costco.
 25

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld for Kensington
 2 Heights.
 3 MR. SILVERMAN: Larry Silverman for Stop Costco
 4 Gas Coalition. Good morning.
 5 MS. ADELMAN: Abigail Adelman, Stop Costco Gas
 6 Coalition. Good morning.
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning.
 8 MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View.
 9 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm missing Mr.
 10 Sullivan. Looking in the background and on the witness
 11 stand already is Dr. Cole. All right. Let's -- a couple of
 12 preliminary matters.
 13 One is, since our last session on May 20, the
 14 following additional exhibits have been filed. They're
 15 labeled as having been received at the hearing. They were
 16 actually proffered to me at the hearing, but I had to leave,
 17 so at the end of May 20, so these were then handed in in my
 18 office. It's Exhibit 596, comments of the American Lung
 19 Association on EPA's integrated science assessment for
 20 oxides and nitrogen health criteria; 597, received at the --
 21 well, these were all received at the hearing, short-term
 22 exposure to air pollution and lung function at the
 23 Farmingham Park study; 598, nitrogen dioxide and mortality
 24 review and meta-analysis of long-term studies; 599, review
 25 of the primary NAA QS for nitrogen dioxide CASAC review. It

Page 6

1 says nitrogen dioxide, but then it says NO1, I think, and
2 NO2. 600 is review, repeated review of the integrated
3 science assessment for oxides and nitrogen and other
4 criteria first externally graphed, March 12-13, 2014; and
5 then 601 was an email from Ms. Cordry clarifying her hearing
6 statements on the budget approval date.
7 All right. The witness for today is Dr. Cole in
8 sur rebuttal and hopefully our final planned day will be May
9 29, possibly June 6th. Did we resolve the question of
10 additional witnesses, or did --
11 MR. GOECKE: We haven't spoken with Ms. Rosenfeld
12 yet, but we are prepared to accept your offer that the, Dr.
13 Jison and Dr. Bunn, or Dr. Chase will not testify about how
14 the exchange for having exhibits submitted into, into the
15 record. The one caveat which I have not communicated to Ms.
16 Rosenfeld yet is we have a few, probably about five more
17 articles that we would like to submit, and I'll show them to
18 Ms. Rosenfeld before she agrees to this, obviously, but that
19 would be just the one loose end in terms of resolving this.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. We don't want any loose
21 ends.
22 MR. GOECKE: I don't, either.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. And if we finish
24 in time today, we'll discuss objections. I keep on having
25 my, my staff lay out all the files that have the objected to

Page 7

1 documents in them so we can go through them. But in any
2 event, let's proceed. Any other preliminary or procedural
3 matters?
4 MS. HARRIS: No, sir.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Seeing none, all right. You may
6 proceed, Ms. Rosenfeld. I take it you're calling Dr. Cole
7 in his rebuttal, sur rebuttal capacity?
8 MS. ROSENFELD: That I am. Thank you.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: And, Dr. Cole, let me, well, from
10 the first, state your full name for the record.
11 MR. COLE: Dr. Henry S. Cole.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: And, Dr. Cole, let me remind you
13 that you're still under oath.
14 MR. COLE: Yes.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. You may proceed.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q Good morning, Dr. Cole.
18 A Good morning.
19 Q And happy birthday.
20 A Thank you.
21 Q Have you reviewed Mr. Sullivan's February 2014
22 rebuttal report?
23 A Yes, I have.
24 Q And have you been present during the course of his
25 testimony on the rebuttal report?

Page 8

1 A Yes.
2 Q Are you aware of the fact that Mr. Sullivan has
3 said that you testified that the ozone limiting method,
4 quote, should be, end quote, used to determine a
5 concentration one hour NO2 on the mall parcel?
6 A I'm aware he said that.
7 Q And do you agree with that characterization?
8 A No, not at all.
9 Q Okay.
10 A As a matter of fact, I cautioned against its use.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you know, the testimony
12 itself speaks for itself. I have read it and so go ahead.
13 He doesn't have to --
14 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not spending a lot of time on
15 this.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: We had Mr. Sullivan's view of
18 those comments. I just wanted to offer for the record --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Dr. Cole's.
21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22 Q In your review of the rebuttal report, is it your
23 opinion now that Mr. Sullivan has performed the analysis
24 necessary to justify the use of the ozone limiting method in
25 achieving his new, lower NO2 emission levels on the mall

Page 9

1 parcel?
2 A Well, I, I think it's, it's an appropriate tool,
3 but I have, but one must meet many criteria and provide
4 justifications for the way in which that tool is used. And
5 in my, in my judgment he has neither provided the, the
6 justification for many of the choices that he made. And in
7 once case, the case of the so-called tail pipe box or 40
8 meter zone, he departs from the ozone limiting method in a
9 substantial way by fixing the percentage and assuming that
10 there is no ozone conversion in that zone from sources in
11 that zone. In my judgment, that's a substantial departure
12 from EPA's guidance. And so in, in the very zone where
13 concentrations, NOX concentrations are highest, we don't get
14 the benefit of the ozone reaction. And we'll get into that
15 in further detail, I'm sure.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: You said we don't get the benefit.
17 Now, what does that mean? You said we don't get the benefit
18 of the ozone reaction. What does that mean, by the way?
19 THE WITNESS: It means that, it means that
20 according to EPA's guidance, and according to my use of this
21 model and my development of this model, there's no
22 exclusionary zone where the ozone reaction with nitric oxide
23 doesn't take place. In other words, there's no assumption
24 that there's a zone where there's no chemical reaction
25 between NO and ozone. And in the way that he treats this,

Page 10

1 there is no ozone reaction.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me get to the heart of that for
3 a second. Mr. Sullivan testified, it was my understanding
4 of his testimony, that he said that for the conversion to
5 take place from NO to NO₂, it has to be, there has to be
6 contact at a molecular level with ozone and there has to be,
7 there's a time element involved and that within the box that
8 there isn't that time for that to occur. Now, regardless of
9 what you say is the approved method, is he scientifically
10 incorrect?
11 THE WITNESS: I believe he is.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you.
13 THE WITNESS: And I will present further evidence.
14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15 Q In September of 2012, you met with Mr. Sullivan
16 and his employee, Mr. Hlinka to discuss modeling issues with
17 the aim of identifying areas of agreement and disagreement
18 on modeling, is that correct?
19 A That is.
20 Q And was the ozone limiting method discussed at
21 this meeting?
22 A Not to my recollection.
23 Q Are you familiar with Mr. Sullivan's modeling
24 protocol document for November of 2012?
25 A Yes, I am.

Page 11

1 Q And did that protocol generally reflect the
2 modeling issues that you and Mr. Sullivan had discussed?
3 A Yes.
4 Q And you and Mr. Sullivan, did you reach agreement
5 on certain matters and agree to disagree on others?
6 A That's the case, yes.
7 Q And are you familiar with Mr. Sullivan's November
8 2012 and August 2013 reports?
9 A Yes.
10 Q And was the ozone limiting method applied in
11 either of those reports?
12 A No.
13 Q Turning generally to some overriding principles of
14 EPA guidance, are you familiar with EPA guidance on how
15 modelers should estimate one hour NO₂ concentrations?
16 A Yes, I am.
17 Q And in your opinion what are the governing EPA
18 documents for modeling one hour NO₂?
19 A Okay. Well, there's quite a bit of guidance in
20 Appendix W of the modeling guideline. And secondly, there
21 are two memorandum that came out of EPA; first in, I think
22 it was June of 2010 by a Mr. Fox, who was the head of the
23 modeling section there. And the second was a further
24 enhancement and clarification with some additions in March
25 2011, by the same Mr. Fox.

Page 12

1 MS. ROSENFELD: And for the record, Mr. Grossman,
2 Appendix W is Exhibit 285, the March 2011 memorandum is
3 Exhibit 407, and the 2010 memorandum is Exhibit 391(a). And
4 I know you're familiar with them because we've talked about
5 them in some length already in this case.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: I am. They're burned into my mind.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q When -- Dr. Cole, when the third, when the second
9 memorandum from Mr. Fox, the March 2011 memorandum was
10 issued, did that memorandum rescind or retract the earlier
11 2010 memo?
12 A No. I would characterize it as clarification with
13 some changes, some improvements.
14 Q In your opinion, what is the purpose of EPA's
15 guidance as reflected in Appendix W and the 2010 and 2011
16 guidance memos, in particular with respect to NO₂?
17 A Well, I think that can be addressed by my giving
18 you an excerpt from Appendix W. It's page 68230.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, which page?
20 THE WITNESS: 68230.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: And I think this quote gets to the
23 heart of the purpose of the guidance. In all cases, the
24 model applied to a given situation should be the one that
25 provides the most accurate representation of atmospheric

Page 13

1 transport, dispersion, and chemical transformations in the
2 area of interest. However, to ensure consistency,
3 deviations from this guide should be carefully documented
4 and fully supported.
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q That reference that you just quoted talks about
7 atmospheric transport. Does atmospheric transport play a
8 role in this case?
9 A Now, by transport, we're talking about the
10 transport of emissions, let's say, or pollutants with the
11 average wind speed. So, it's the flow that dictates where
12 the pollutants will go.
13 Q And it also talks about dispersion, the most
14 accurate representation of dispersion. Does dispersion play
15 a role in this particular case?
16 A Yes. Dispersion comes from turbulence in the
17 atmosphere, turbulence of different scales. At the surface
18 there are obstacles. The wind flows over the obstacles and
19 that imparts swirls and whirls and changes of direction and
20 changes of speed. And you can think of dispersion as
21 putting some chocolate in the bottom of a glass of milk and
22 mixing it up; so the more turbulence there is, the faster
23 the mixing and voila, you have a uniform chocolate milk at
24 some point.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: What if your martini is shaken, not

Page 14

1 stirred?

2 THE WITNESS: Same principle, but the ice in the

3 martini or the olive may further enhance the turbulence.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. You posed that.

5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

6 Q The guidance for the EPA that you referenced a

7 moment ago also talks about chemical transformations in the

8 area of interest. Are there chemical transformations at

9 issue here?

10 A Yes, there are. The most important one is the

11 reaction between ozone and the NO, and the product of that

12 reaction as a criteria pollutant is nitrogen dioxide, or

13 NO2. So, that's the most important. There are other

14 reactions as well, but that would be the dominant chemical

15 reaction that affects the emissions in this particular case.

16 Q And in prior reports, the reports that pre-date

17 the rebuttal report, has Mr. Sullivan considered chemical

18 transformations as part of his model and assessment?

19 A The first time that comes up is in the rebuttal

20 report. It was not part of either the November, December,

21 or January 2013. It was not part of the August 2013

22 modeling.

23 Q And so how is it different, for example, from his

24 modeling of PM2.5 or some of the other pollutants that he,

25 he has modeled?

Page 15

1 A Well, I think the guidance is clear that for

2 something like carbon monoxide or PM2.5, the modeling --

3 even though those things do react in the atmosphere, the

4 modeling guidance doesn't address that. So, it's the NO

5 that is very reactive, particularly with ozone, and that's

6 why that chemistry is considered, for example, in the ozone

7 limiting method or other kinds of models that include

8 chemistry.

9 Q So those other chemicals didn't -- the modeling

10 didn't rely on chemical conversion? We'd simply be looking

11 at the chemical isolation, correct?

12 A You're talking about the modeling applications

13 prior to the rebuttal report?

14 Q Yes, correct.

15 A That is correct.

16 Q How does EPA guidance instruct modelers to address

17 the conversion of NOX to NO2? Is there a hierarchy?

18 A Yes, there is. There are three tiers that EPA

19 mentions. The first is total conversion, which is the most

20 conservative method. And this assumes that all of the NOX

21 that's emitted into the atmosphere becomes NO2 from start to

22 go. Second is a retreat from that conservatism, which is

23 the 80 percent conversion default that they give if you want

24 to take a step back from the tier one. So, tier two you

25 allow for the conversion and you assume that 80 percent of

Page 16

1 what's emitted in terms of the oxide nitrogen becomes NO2,

2 which is the criteria pollutant of concern.

3 The third tier is, includes the ozone limiting

4 method and a second model called the plume molecular volume.

5 I'm not going to get it right, it's the PM -- it doesn't

6 matter, because Mr. Sullivan did not choose to use that. So

7 we have the ozone limiting method as tier, tier three, which

8 Mr. Sullivan applied, although I have serious questions

9 about the method that was used. He did apply that in the

10 rebuttal report.

11 Q And can you review generally how the ozone

12 limiting method works?

13 A Sure. Basically, you have two pollutants that

14 have to interact; and one is NO and the other is ozone. If

15 there's a lot more ozone than there is oxides of nitrogen or

16 NO, then the ozone -- let me get this right. If, if there's

17 more NOX than there is ozone, then the ozone limits the

18 amount of NO that can convert to NO2. If there's a lot of

19 ozone, more than the NO, then the NO, all of the NO can

20 convert to NO2. That's the basic assumption of the ozone

21 limiting method.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: I take it that the reason for this

23 is that you have to have an available oxygen molecule to, to

24 combine with the NO?

25 THE WITNESS: That's exactly right. And the ozone

Page 17

1 is, is a more reactive form of oxygen, has that extra oxygen

2 and the NO is a convenient place for the electrons to

3 commingle.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.

5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

6 Q And then in addition to the NO2 that is, that

7 becomes converted in the presence of the ozone, is there

8 also other NO2 present in vehicular emissions?

9 A Yes, there is. There's what is called in-stack

10 NO2, which is actually formed in the hot exhausts of a

11 stack. In the case of a power plant, it would be a great,

12 big stack. In the case of a car exhaust, it's really, I

13 would call it the tailpipe NO2, or you could call it the

14 primary NO2, it's been called. But it comes right out of

15 the stack, so it doesn't require the ozone reaction to have

16 that NO2 present. So you've got two things which are

17 contributing to the NO2. First, is the in-stack and

18 secondly is whatever remaining NO is converted by ozone.

19 Q And in the rebuttal report, there is a, what we

20 refer to as stage one --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- as I understand it came directly from the

23 August 2012 report?

24 A That's my understanding, yes.

25 Q Set that aside for a moment. Have you reviewed

Page 18

1 the analysis, other report, that's labeled stage two and
2 stage three of the rebuttal report?
3 A Yes, I have.
4 Q And in your opinion, did these methods fall under
5 the ozone limiting method or other recognized EPA
6 methodologies?
7 A Well, let me start with stage three. Stage three
8 is not, and Mr. Sullivan has acknowledged, stage three is
9 not the ozone limiting method, is not a method that is
10 included in the EPA's guidance. Stage three simply assigns
11 arbitrarily two ratios beyond the inbox. It's a 50 percent
12 ratio and within, within the close-in box, the 40 meters
13 zone beyond the queue and loading dock, it is a 25 percent
14 and that is not something that's mentioned in the guidance.
15 If you want to go to constant percentages, the guidance
16 talks about 80 percent conversion --
17 Q And --
18 A -- in the whole modeling domain.
19 Q And so under EPA guidance then, 80 percent
20 conversion factor would apply both within the tailpipe
21 box --
22 A Yes.
23 Q -- and outside of the tailpipe box equally?
24 A I believe that's correct.
25 Q Okay. And in your opinion, is the stage two

Page 19

1 analysis, does that qualify as the ozone limiting method?
2 A Let's put it this way, it kind of squeaks in by
3 the skin of its teeth. I have serious, as I said before,
4 serious problems with assigning an arbitrary 25 percent NO2
5 to NOX conversion ratio in the, in this 40 meter close-in
6 zone. One might say from the evidence that perhaps,
7 although there have been higher primary or in-stack ratio
8 observed in certain studies that go up to 30 percent, I
9 don't think there's any basis in this particular case for
10 excluding ozone conversion of NO to NO2 in that close-in
11 zone, and certainly not something that's mentioned in the
12 guidance.
13 Q So you didn't find anything in the, in Appendix W
14 or the 2010 or 2011 EPA guidance memos that precludes that
15 conversion factor within that 40 meter radius?
16 A That's my understanding, yes.
17 Q So in your view, is this a novel approach to the
18 OLM analysis?
19 MR. GOECKE: Objection. Leading.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I'll sustain that.
21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22 Q Would you elaborate on your analysis of the stage
23 two analysis? Are there other issues, are there other areas
24 in which you think that the stage two analysis deviates from
25 EPA guidance?

Page 20

1 A Okay. So we started with the exclusion zone, that
2 was number one. Number two, I think perhaps the most
3 important is the hour-by-hour matching background NO2
4 concentrations. Now that's mentioned in the EPA's 2011,
5 March 2011 guidance, but in my opinion those criteria have
6 not been met in the rebuttal report. And we can get into
7 that later, but do you want a, if you want a laundry list, I
8 can add a few more things at this point, unless you want
9 to --
10 Q In your opinion is there a correlation between
11 elevated power plant plume observations and tailpipe
12 emissions?
13 A Okay. That's an important question, because the
14 data which Mr. Sullivan relies on to show that the mixing
15 down to the molecular level happens at great distances,
16 perhaps a kilometer away or a thousand meters away, that,
17 the studies that he reference are for Powerpoint plumes.
18 And it is absolutely inappropriate to use those, that
19 information from, taken from power plants --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: You said Powerpoint. I think you
21 meant power plants?
22 THE WITNESS: Right. Power plants.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Power plant plumes?
24 THE WITNESS: Power plant, thank you. Thank you.
25 I see you're being kind to me on this day of my --

Page 21

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I always try to be kind.
2 Occasionally I get grumpy, but all right.
3 THE WITNESS: All right. So what happens at the
4 surface of the earth is very different from what happens
5 several hundred meters aloft and I can get into that in
6 greater detail and show some slides which distinguish
7 conditions at the surface and conditions aloft.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Did you previously, sir --
9 THE WITNESS: But the, in short, there's a lot
10 more small-scale turbulent mixing at the surface due to
11 surface roughness elements than there is aloft where you
12 don't have a surface.
13 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
14 Q In your opinion, is the ozone limiting method a
15 non-regulatory method?
16 A It is. It's described in the --
17 MR. GOECKE: Objection, leading.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm not, well, I'm going to
19 allow the question because I think there's enough of an
20 evidentiary base to get to that, that question that way.
21 THE WITNESS: So the guidance for March 2011, guidance
22 on NO2 modeling clearly labels this as a non-regulatory
23 model and I believe that adds to the many cautions and
24 requirements contained in the guidance for its use.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: When you say non-regulatory method,

Page 22

1 what do you mean by that?
2 THE WITNESS: Like air mod, which Mr. Sullivan
3 used for his modeling and I have no argument at all, I think
4 that's, that is specifically described in Appendix W. It's,
5 it's an official, it's been validated over many, many years.
6 It's been improved. It's been refined. It's basically the
7 state-of-the-art in terms of the model that's used for many
8 different kinds of sources. So it has a status which the
9 ozone limiting method does not. So there's, in my judgment,
10 anything that's a non-regulatory model requires adherence to
11 greater scrutiny and greater conservatism.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, whatever you think about the
13 methodology -- I'm concerned with the use of the term non-
14 regulatory because you've already testified that that
15 particular method is mentioned in Appendix W and in the two
16 subsequent memos from Mr. Fox interpreting it. So how could
17 it be non-regulatory?
18 THE WITNESS: Well, you'll have to ask EPA because
19 that's a term that I'm quoting directly from the guidance.
20 I'm giving you my interpretation, having worked in the
21 modeling office at EPA, of why they would call that a non-
22 regulatory model.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: So can you just give me a reference
24 in --
25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

Page 23

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- any of those regulations --
2 THE WITNESS: Certainly.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- as to where the OLM method is
4 called non-regulatory? I'm not sure the labeling of it
5 makes the big difference, but I'm, I am curious.
6 THE WITNESS: Okay. It's going to take me a
7 second to --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. Take your time.
9 THE WITNESS: -- take it out. Okay. On page 5
10 of, of the, of the March, the Fox memo from March 1, 2011,
11 Tyler Fox, it specifically says the June 29, 2010 memo
12 highlighted some of the potential issues that may need to be
13 addressed in the application of these less conservative
14 assumptions for estimating NO2 impacts relative to the tier
15 1 option of full conversion and clarify the status of the
16 PVMRM and the OLM approaches available as non-regulatory
17 default options within the air model. So it's, that's where
18 I'm getting the term non-regulatory.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Non-regulatory default options?
20 THE WITNESS: Yes. That would be the first --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: And, Dr. Cole, did you say that
23 was on page 5?
24 MR. GROSSMAN: That's, I think the bottom --
25 THE WITNESS: It's the, where it says approval and

Page 24

1 application. It's the --
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Got it.
3 THE WITNESS: -- that first paragraph, the last
4 sentence.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: The last sentence. Okay.
6 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7 Q And, Dr. Cole, on page 6 of that same Exhibit 407,
8 under tier 3 options for NO to NO2 conversion, does this
9 memo further reference or categorize the OLM method?
10 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry?
11 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's basically --
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Page 6, under the heading deal 3
13 options.
14 THE WITNESS: It says also since OLM and PVMRM
15 methods are currently implemented as non-regulatory default
16 options within the AERMOD dispersions model, the use
17 requires justification and approval by the regional office
18 on a case-by-case basis pursuant to Sections 3.1.2.C, et
19 cetera, et cetera of Appendix W.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I guess I, you termed it, I think,
21 a non-regulatory model. It's a non-regulatory option of the
22 accepted model, is that, is that a fair --
23 THE WITNESS: Not being an attorney, I'll accept,
24 you can correct my description relative to the text here.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just going by what Exhibit 4

Page 25

1 has --
2 THE WITNESS: Okay.
3 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
4 Q And, Dr. Cole, under these non-regulatory default
5 options, are there default inputs that the EPA guidance
6 recommends when using --
7 A Yes.
8 Q -- the OLM method?
9 A Yes, there are.
10 Q Okay. And does the EPA have a default conversion
11 ratio for NO2, NOX under the ozone limiting method?
12 A A default method?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Default conversion ratio.
14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15 Q A default conversion?
16 A It really does not. It looks at the ozone and the
17 NO in the atmosphere. There are other, let me just add
18 there are other qualifications that dictate or that at least
19 recommend how something should be done that could be
20 considered as default options. But in terms of the basics,
21 it's, you know, it's the ozone limiting method, which I
22 described earlier.
23 Q You previously served a scientist and section
24 chief with the EPA's Air Quality Modeling Group, is that
25 correct?

Page 26

1 A That's correct.

2 Q In your opinion, should the Board of Appeals

3 require the applicants to follow the EPA guidance and, if

4 so, why?

5 MR. GOECKE: Objection.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to sustain that

7 objection. He has no basis for a legal advice to the Board

8 of Appeals.

9 THE WITNESS: Mr. Grossman, could I --

10 MR. GROSSMAN: No, there's no question pending.

11 THE WITNESS: Okay.

12 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

13 Q In your opinion, has Mr. Sullivan -- earlier you

14 were, you quoted from page 68230 of Appendix W and the

15 second sentence that you read was, however, to ensure

16 consistency, deviations from this guide, meaning Appendix W,

17 should be carefully documented and fully supported. In your

18 opinion, has Mr. Sullivan satisfied the requirement that

19 deviations from EPA guidance be carefully documented and

20 fully supported in his rebuttal report?

21 A My judgment is that he has not met that criteria.

22 Q And do you have an overview or some general

23 observations to support that opinion?

24 A I do. One of the difficulties in looking at the

25 rebuttal report, for example, is that it builds, there's

Page 27

1 been a sequence of reports with many different revisions and

2 that makes it difficult to follow exactly what's going on.

3 Secondly, all of the changes or most of the

4 changes have reduced the conservatism of the modeling. Now,

5 I'd like to read a quote from the March 2011 guidance that

6 gets to the heart of this. It's on page --

7 MR. GROSSMAN: This is Exhibit 407?

8 THE WITNESS: Mr. Hearing Examiner --

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes?

10 THE WITNESS: -- can I suggest a break and I will

11 have that for you? I also need a health-related break.

12 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. A health-related break,

13 so, all right. We'll take a five minute break.

14 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

15 (Whereupon, at 10:26 a.m., a brief recess was

16 taken.)

17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We're back on the

18 record. Okay.

19 THE WITNESS: Before the break --

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: I said there was a quote that I

22 would like to read which addresses the issues which I

23 mentioned, the progressive retreat from conservatism. So

24 here is the quote. It's on page 12 --

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 28

1 THE WITNESS: -- under determining background

2 concentrations.

3 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry, which document?

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit 407 I think he's saying,

5 the March 1, 2011 memo.

6 THE WITNESS: It says the goal of the cumulative

7 impact assessment should be to demonstrate with an adequate

8 degree of confidence in the result that the proposed new or

9 modified emissions will not cause or significantly

10 contribute to violations of the NAAQS, the National Ambient

11 Air Quality Standards. In general, the more conservative

12 the assumptions on which the cumulative analysis is based,

13 the more confidence there will be that the goal has been

14 achieved and the less controversial the review process will

15 be from the perspective of the reviewing authority.

16 As less conservative assumptions are implemented

17 in the analysis, the more scrutiny those assumptions may

18 require. And the review process may tend to be lengthier

19 and more controversial as a result. We expect that by

20 providing a more detailed discussion of the factors to be

21 considered in the cumulative assessment, permit applicants

22 and permitting authorities will be able to find the proper

23 balance of competing factors that contribute to this

24 analysis.

25 I think the situation that I mentioned where we

Page 29

1 have every, with every successive report that Mr. Sullivan

2 has issued, he finds it necessary to go to more and more

3 conservative or less and less conservative analyses, such as

4 retreating from total conversion is stage one, or the work

5 from November or he, he has in his stage 3, for example, he

6 uses a non-regulatory approach which he says is more refined

7 but, in fact, is more conservative and produces lower

8 concentrations. So this progressive retreat from

9 conservatism, particularly in a complex situation like this

10 one where there's so many variables that individually and

11 interactively contain a great deal of complexity, there's a

12 strong need for conservatism. And in my judgment, this is

13 why EPA has stated that you use these more conservative

14 methods unless you can document and justify and explain that

15 your modeling application can deal with all of the

16 complexities.

17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

18 Q Dr. Cole, I think you said stage 3 uses, is a more

19 conservative approach?

20 A Did I say that?

21 Q Is that what you meant?

22 A No. It's by far less conservative because it

23 assumes, it puts caps basically on the ozone concentrations

24 and the NO2 to NOX conversion factors both in the near, the

25 near box or the close-in box and beyond. So stage 3, which

Page 30

1 is not, there's nothing like it in these regulations and it
2 produces lower concentrations and it's less conservative.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Looking at the quotes that you've
4 given us since you began to testify --
5 THE WITNESS: Yes.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- on sur-rebuttal, I mean is it
7 fair to say that there's kind of a tension in between, in
8 the regulations, between the touchstone goal of accuracy and
9 the need for conservatism to reduce uncertainty in the
10 results?
11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Because I, I see one of the quotes
13 you gave us from Appendix W, Exhibit 285, page 68230 that
14 you started out, it starts out, subsection (d), the model
15 that most accurately estimates concentrations in the area of
16 interest is always sought. So that's clearly a touchstone
17 goal of the exercise and then they go on to say the problem,
18 the need, there's a need for consistency, but then they add
19 on another pro viso that says, at the end of that paragraph,
20 such consistency is not, however, promoted at the expense of
21 model and database accuracy. So they return to the
22 accuracies and then you have the other quotes that you
23 quoted which call for more conservatism to the extent that
24 you, you have this less typical options.
25 So I'm trying to balance that all to get a sense

Page 31

1 of what is actually being required here. So is that a fair
2 way to, to look at it, what I've just said?
3 THE WITNESS: Well, if you go beyond that
4 particular statement and look at the, for example, the other
5 excerpts that I read from the applicable guidance, it's a
6 one-hour NO2. I think the guidance both recognizes the huge
7 amount of uncertainty, talks about it. Appendix W talks
8 about the many sources of uncertainty and the errors that
9 you can expect.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
11 THE WITNESS: In terms of accuracy, you never
12 really know what's accurate. You can -- in terms of model,
13 you can look at a bunch of models and see how well they
14 evaluate against monitors if you have a good array of
15 monitors. We did that in EPA when I was there. We -- so,
16 accurate in this particular case is very hard to define
17 because of all of the uncertainties. You'd have to have a
18 huge error band about what you call your answer because the
19 more uncertainties there are, the greater is that error
20 band.
21 Now in my opinion, what this guidance says is that
22 when the issue is compliance with the standard and
23 protection of human health, that you look at the error band,
24 the upper error band, that's where the conservatism comes
25 from, because with so many uncertainties you've got to be

Page 32

1 more cautious. That's what they're saying. That's the gist
2 of this regulation.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I'm just trying to
4 get a handle on what seems to be somewhat a balancing effort
5 in the, in the language, combining the language from
6 Appendix W that you referenced and the language from Exhibit
7 407, the March 2011 memorandum because they seem to say, I
8 mean it seems, appears clear to me in Appendix W that the,
9 what they're seeking is accuracy, but they're recognizing
10 that you can have variations from accuracy based on, on what
11 tools you apply and all the circumstances. So it is kind of
12 a, there's a tension between those two concepts. The more
13 conservative you are in that sense, that is, the wider you,
14 you spread out the potential results, the less close to
15 accurate perhaps you may be, but you give yourself a bigger
16 margin for safety. So isn't that, isn't that a fair way to
17 look at it?
18 THE WITNESS: Yes, but there's, there's a
19 presumption and a premise in what you said. The premise,
20 the premise is that you, that you've used the most
21 appropriate model, the most appropriate assumptions --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
23 THE WITNESS: -- that go into the model and the
24 most appropriate sets of data that you need.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. But they --

Page 33

1 THE WITNESS: So if you don't, if you, if you
2 define accuracy as a lower number, then perhaps you're
3 getting further away from it. But if you define accuracy as
4 that idyllic thing that comes down from, from above, which
5 is the truth, accurate can only mean how good are the tools
6 that you used. How good is, representative is the data that
7 you used?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. And, but you use the term
9 appropriate tools and that, that's a question, what's
10 appropriate in the circumstance is a question of scientific
11 opinion, right?
12 THE WITNESS: Yes. And that's, a lot of that
13 appropriate is embedded in these regulations they give you.
14 Three, EPA gives you three tiers.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay. Thank you.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And, Dr. Cole, in the case of, of the stage 2 and
18 the stage 3 analysis that's provided in Mr. Sullivan's
19 rebuttal report, both of those would be in permit setting,
20 would require EPA approval, is that correct?
21 A Well, there are two -- if this were a permit
22 application, Mr. Sullivan has testified this isn't a permit
23 application. But if it were a permit application, yes, it
24 would require approval.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me. Mr. Brann, can you

Page 34

1 check and see if our thermostat has been turned off again?
2 MR. BRANN: Yes.
3 THE WITNESS: Is it accurate or is it
4 conservative?
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I think it's so conservative they
6 turn it off when we're not looking. So you turned it back
7 to on?
8 MR. BRANN: It was on, it was just --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh. All right.
10 MR. BRANN: -- turned down a few degrees.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. You may resume.
12 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
13 Q And during the course of that case by case
14 approval, there would be regulatory review of any of the
15 non-default inputs that would be selected, is that correct?
16 A Yes, that's -- the greater the, the more
17 departures from defaults are from recommended methods and
18 values, the more scrutiny there would be. That's what the,
19 that was reflected in the quote --
20 MR. GOECKE: I object, Mr. Grossman. There's no
21 foundation that he's been through the air permitting classes
22 or that he's familiar with what it requires.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, first of all, actually I see
24 a different problem with the question. The question said
25 non-default. It actually said it's a non-regulatory default

Page 35

1 that is, that doesn't make it a non-default. So I think
2 those are two different things. So I think the --
3 MS. ROSENFELD: The non-regulatory default method.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: So, all right. So let's -- state
5 your question again so we make sure we have -- and then
6 we'll look at the objection after this one.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q Recognizing that we are not in an EPA permit
9 review process, if we were in a non -- in a, in an EPA
10 permit review process and Mr. Sullivan selected a non-
11 regulatory default method, would deviations from EPA
12 guidance be reviewed and approved or not approved by the EPA
13 regulators?
14 MR. GOECKE: Same objection. It's a speculation.
15 My recollection of his testimony during voir dire was that
16 he had not ever gone through the process of obtaining an air
17 permit and that -- therefore, he has no foundation to
18 testify about what EPA would or would not do. And even if
19 he has, it would be speculative as to what they would
20 require.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule that
22 objection. He served in the capacity of reviewing models
23 submitted while he was with the EPA and I think this is
24 certainly within the ambit that he can testify. The
25 question of whether or not it's entirely relevant here

Page 36

1 because it's not an EPA permit process is something else,
2 but I think it's within the broad ambit of what we've looked
3 at here. So I'll overrule the objection.
4 MR. GOECKE: But, Mr. Grossman, his experience was
5 more than three decades ago. What they do today is, is,
6 could be light years different than what they did --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: It could be and I, and --
8 MR. GOECKE: -- back in the '70's.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- you can cross-examine him on
10 that point if you wish to, but I'm going to overrule the
11 objection.
12 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
13 THE WITNESS: Can you restate your question
14 please?
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Not restate it, but repeat it.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q In its, in its regulatory capacity, as EPA reviews
18 these non-regulatory default methodologies, does the EPA
19 have the authority to approve or reject non-default inputs
20 into the modeling assumptions?
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Non-regulatory default?
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Non-regulatory default.
23 THE WITNESS: Well, my judgment is the wording is
24 clear that they can review, the fact that they have to
25 review and then approve would mean that they may say, sorry,

Page 37

1 go back to the drawing board.
2 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3 Q And would that, could that review include
4 selection of monitors?
5 MR. GOECKE: Same objection, speculative.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule once again.
7 I think that's within the ambit of what his knowledge is of
8 the EPA --
9 THE WITNESS: Okay.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- which you can address on cross-
11 examination.
12 THE WITNESS: I'm going to talk about an
13 experience that I had.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: No, let's answer the question
15 directly. Don't talk about your experience.
16 THE WITNESS: Okay.
17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
18 Q Would such regulatory review include something
19 like the selection of the monitors you used?
20 A It could.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean monitors for background --
22 MS. ROSENFELD: For background.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- as opposed to --
24 THE WITNESS: Yes.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- receptors? Okay.

Page 38

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
2 THE WITNESS: Yes, and that's an issue in the
3 guidance.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And --
5 THE WITNESS: And that's an issue that comes up
6 here and they certainly could say, well, we don't like the
7 way you did it, please do it another way.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: And --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Did it, meaning did the selection
10 of the monitors?
11 THE WITNESS: Put the, yes, select the monitors in
12 a different way or treat the data in a different way.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: Don't use paired hour-by-hour
15 analyses. They could say a number of things, absolutely.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q Could it include the selection of an urban versus
18 rural dispersion coefficients?
19 A It could.
20 Q Could it include such things as the selection of
21 meteorological data used, the selection of meteorological
22 data?
23 A Yes, it certainly could.
24 Q In your opinion, is a strict adherence to the EPA
25 guidelines necessary in this case?

Page 39

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know what that means.
2 That's, once again, necessary in a legal sense, necessary to
3 achieve accuracy? What do you mean by necessary?
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q In your opinion, is strict adherence to guidelines
6 necessary in this case to achieve accuracy in the modeling
7 results?
8 A Let me put it this, this way. There are so many
9 choices that are involved in modeling. You mentioned a few
10 of them. And so the greater the adherence to recommended
11 values and conservative choices, the greater confidence a
12 regulator or a decider or Dr. Cole or anybody would have in
13 the results. And the more uncertainty there is, the more
14 that you want to adhere to default guidance and I think
15 that's embedded in the regulations that we've cited in the
16 Fox, two Fox memos and certainly in Appendix W.
17 And I want to say that having been at EPA and
18 having followed many air quality issues and modeling issues
19 since, that they have worked for decades. What you see in
20 these regulations and in these memos is based on a great
21 deal of work. Model evaluation studies, panels with many
22 different kinds of scientists, chemists, meteorologists, et
23 cetera, people who understand technology. So they, they
24 come up, what they come up with, which is continually being
25 refined over decades, the aim is to get it better and better

Page 40

1 to get closer to that accuracy point that you're talking
2 about. So I know that they've been working on that for a
3 long time, so I would say what's in this guidance, even if
4 it's not required strictly on a regulatory basis for a
5 permit application is extremely valuable to any decision
6 maker because it's this wealth of experience.
7 I was, I was a part of it for, you know, five or
8 six years and I understand the machinations that they have
9 to go through with many different kinds of parties, tasks,
10 stakeholders involved. So what they come up with is pretty
11 solid and their goal, as I said, is always to assure that
12 something new in a case like this will meet the standards of
13 compliance and, secondly, protect human health. So I would
14 say that this is a valuable set of guidance for decision
15 makers in this particular case, even if not strictly
16 required from a regulatory standpoint.
17 Q And you've testified that modeling contains many
18 uncertainties.
19 A Right.
20 Q How does EPA's guidance handle the issue of
21 uncertainty?
22 A Well, if you look at Section 9.1.1 of Appendix W,
23 they have a very good discussion of the sources of
24 uncertainty. So, number one, they imply that even if you
25 had a model, a perfect model, there'd still be many

Page 41

1 uncertainties. So they're basically saying we know that
2 modeling is an art as much as a science.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry, what page are you
4 looking at?
5 THE WITNESS: Okay. This is Section 9.1.1 and
6 Appendix W. If you would like a page, I can find you --
7 what is on page 68246.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I've got it. Yeah.
9 THE WITNESS: So, number one, models are not
10 perfect. The choice of model is an important choice which
11 itself may or may not be the best choice. It may involved
12 uncertainty. Then there, within every model such as AERMOD,
13 or the ozone limiting method, there are choices that one
14 makes and they're based on judgment. For example, urban
15 versus rural dispersion coefficients, surface roughness, how
16 topography, how, how topography in the area may affect
17 concentrations and how do you model that. There are
18 choices.
19 There are also uncertainties associated with
20 what's measured, whether it's ozone, background, whether
21 it's NO2 background, whether it's the emissions model that
22 you've used, the emissions that you -- let me back up,
23 because the choice of emissions model is a model choice.
24 But once you choose an emissions model, there are many
25 variables and the extent to which you're uncertain adds

Page 42

1 uncertainty.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: By emission model, you mean like

3 moves versus mobile --

4 THE WITNESS: Yes. So not only is there an issue

5 of choice of model, but there is an issue of what parameters

6 you put into the model for measurements, are they

7 representative? Are they the best set of measurements? So

8 there are, in outlines those, basically those three kinds of

9 uncertainty.

10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

11 Q In your opinion, are there examples of uncertainty

12 in Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And could you highlight those?

15 A Yes. If we look at stage three to start with, he

16 arbitrarily caps the NO2 to NOX ratio at .5, says that's the

17 most you'll get from ozone limiting. So that would

18 certainly be, is that right or not, the source of

19 uncertainty. Is it based on measurements at the site?

20 Since it's not, that's a source of uncertainty.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with that

22 particular judgment in this case, the .5 cap?

23 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

25 THE WITNESS: Well, I disagree with it because it

Page 43

1 doesn't allow the atmosphere to do what it does. In other

2 words, you may have higher. He hasn't presented any

3 evidence to show that the level doesn't get higher.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. You may continue.

5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

6 Q And do you have other examples of uncertainty?

7 A Another uncertainty would be the cap in the close

8 end box of .25 and the fact that your, he's not allowing

9 ozone conversion for the sources in the box, such as the

10 queue. And I think that's an arbitrary choice, one that's

11 not mentioned in the guidance and that would certainly add a

12 level of uncertainty to the results. Also is the choice of

13 your background monitors and the way that you handle NO2

14 background. Are you going to use the more conservative

15 method of the 98th percentile averaged over several years or

16 are you going to do the hour by hour match-up which Mr.

17 Sullivan used, which introduces a great deal of uncertainty

18 to the analysis.

19 MS. ROBESON: That's pared hourly?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes, the pared hourly where he takes

21 Arlington data, the NO2 and matches on an hour-by-hour his

22 model output for the receptors. EPA guidance has a great

23 deal of caution and concern about that particular choice.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Can you reference the particular

25 regulation or what page --

Page 44

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- criticizes on the --

3 THE WITNESS: Page 21 of Exhibit 407.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: And which particular paragraph are

5 you referring to?

6 THE WITNESS: It is the middle paragraph or the

7 second paragraph.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: Beginning in since several

9 applications?

10 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

12 THE WITNESS: I can read that at this point, if

13 you would like.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. I'll leave that

15 to counsel if you want to read that portion of that

16 paragraph.

17 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.

18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

19 Q Dr. Cole, if you would, please?

20 A Since several applications have come to our

21 attention proposing to combine monitored background and

22 model concentrations on an hour-by-hour basis using hourly

23 monitored background data corrected concurrently with the

24 meteorological data period being processed by the model, we

25 feel compelled to include a discussion of the potential

Page 45

1 merits and concerns regarding such an approach. On the

2 surface, this approach could be perceived as being more

3 refined, a more refined method than what is recommended

4 above and, therefore, more appropriate. However, the

5 implicit assumption underlying this approach is that the

6 background monitor levels for each hour are spatially

7 uniform and that monitored values are fully representative

8 of the background levels at each receptor for each hour.

9 Such an assumption clearly ignores the many factors that

10 contribute to temporal and spatial variability of ambient

11 concentrations across a typical modeling domain on an hourly

12 basis. Therefore, we do not recommend such an approach

13 except in rare cases of relatively isolated sources where

14 the available monitor can be shown to be representative of

15 the ambient concentration levels in the areas of maximum

16 impact from the proposed new source.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

19 Q And, Dr. Cole, I believe we're going to get into

20 this in more detail, but while we're on this section, in

21 your opinion, does the site, the out parcel site, fall

22 within the parameters that you just read? The parameters of

23 those relatively, those rare cases of isolated sources?

24 A Okay. They're -- it does give some further

25 guidance on the criteria necessary to justify hour-by-hour

Page 50

1 less representative.
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: And still --
4 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- ultimately the question --
6 THE WITNESS: Yes.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: The question ultimately --
8 THE WITNESS: Yes.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- isn't that the sole, the real
10 sole criteria --
11 THE WITNESS: Yes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- is the most representative?
13 THE WITNESS: Yes. And I just want to add one
14 more thing --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
16 THE WITNESS: -- which is even more critical when
17 you're attempting to do an hour-by-hour match because source
18 relationships change on an hour-by-hour basis. So if you
19 have a different alignment of sources, using that hour-by-
20 hour method relative to the monitoring site, okay. You're,
21 if you don't have a site that's representative and that has
22 a very different array of sources that are affected under
23 different wind conditions, you're going to be off the mark.
24 That's why --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Now you're dealing with another

Page 51

1 question. You're dealing with the uncertainty question.
2 I'm just trying to get to what you would select as, first of
3 all, what is the criteria you use and, secondly, what you
4 would have selected as the appropriate, most representative
5 monitoring site for this modeling.
6 THE WITNESS: Let me see if I can answer your, in
7 your terms.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Because we've critiqued what Mr.
9 Sullivan chose here by the fact that at least for part of it
10 he chose Arlington, but I'm trying to get what you are --
11 THE WITNESS: All right. Let me get to it. Okay.
12 So my criteria in terms of representativeness would be
13 something that's on the same side of the Washington
14 metropolitan area and other urbanized areas. The second
15 criteria would be what I said about the geography being
16 similar. Now I took a look at the, I believe that's,
17 there's an exhibit of the different monitoring sites.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: And, Mr. Grossman, if I may
19 interrupt, I'd like to hand that out. It's Exhibit 583.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Everybody has been provided with
22 this.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: And this, this one adds one
25 monitor which was discussed by Mr. Sullivan. It adds the

Page 52

1 Richmond monitor. But aside from that, this is the same
2 exhibit, 583.
3 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
4 Q And, Dr. Cole, perhaps in reviewing this exhibit,
5 it will help you more clearly answer.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: You don't like me? You don't want
7 to give me a copy?
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Let me see if I have one more.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: That's all right. That's okay.
10 You keep it. It's more important that you have it. I've
11 seen it. I saw it when you filed it. So I can always pull
12 it out of the file here. If you have an extra, that's nice.
13 Thank you.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: That's a loan.
15 MR. SILVERMAN: That's a loan, right.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Not a keeper, huh? But let's get
17 back to the question I asked you. You don't, I don't think
18 you need to reference 583, Exhibit 583 to answer my
19 question. You reviewed the various, I presume because you
20 critiqued Mr. Sullivan about it, you reviewed the various
21 monitoring sites that are available for background
22 information, is that correct?
23 THE WITNESS: Yes.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So of those that you've
25 reviewed, which monitoring site do you choose as the most

Page 53

1 representative of the situation at the subject site if
2 you've made such a choice?
3 THE WITNESS: Well, I, I have to say I like the
4 VanBuren D.C. monitor. There was a problem with it. It's
5 only got one year of data. So that, in my opinion, would
6 be --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: So if it's only got one year of
8 data, would that be insufficient for modeling purposes?
9 THE WITNESS: Yes.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 THE WITNESS: So --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Let's --
13 THE WITNESS: So we have to eliminate that.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: So which modeling site would you
15 have recommended be chosen as the most representative for
16 this modeling purpose? Well, I didn't mean to put you on
17 the spot in making that selection now. You did not, you
18 have not previously made a determination in your own mind as
19 to which --
20 THE WITNESS: Okay. There are a number --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- modeling --
22 THE WITNESS: -- I'm going to put it this way --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me finish the question,
24 okay? Have you previously made a determination of which of
25 the modeling sites that are available and have useful data

Page 54

1 for this purpose for modeling should have been selected as
2 the most representative site for this model? Have you made
3 that selection previously in your own mind?
4 THE WITNESS: I like the area of the northern part
5 of Washington.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a particular monitoring
7 site?
8 THE WITNESS: But I don't have a particular --
9 there are a couple there I would have to go back and, and
10 look in greater detail.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
12 THE WITNESS: So I don't have the answer you want
13 and there were a number of choices that Mr. Sullivan had.
14 He could have done a sensitivity analysis or something or
15 done some averaging and made choices, but he didn't do that.
16 And I'm not sure his choices, which have lower
17 concentrations than some of the other choices, whether he's
18 defended that as being representative and, frankly, I'm not
19 the applicant here.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: No, that's not -- I'm not, I know
21 you're not the applicant, but I --
22 THE WITNESS: I don't think that he has defended
23 his choice of site.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that. I understand
25 that, but I'm just taking you at what you just said. You

Page 55

1 haven't made a selection of a site that you think is better,
2 you just feel that he hasn't sufficiently justified the one
3 he's chosen.
4 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Yes. Okay.
6 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7 Q Dr. Cole, I'd like to turn to Mr. Sullivan's stage
8 3 analysis. And would it help for you to have your slides
9 for that discussion?
10 A I'm not sure we --
11 Q Or you can let me know when we --
12 A I'm not sure we need the slides for --
13 Q Okay.
14 A -- to talk about. I mean there are some issues,
15 yes, that will come up later, but I think --
16 Q Okay. Let me know --
17 A -- let's just --
18 Q -- when we're ready for them.
19 A Yeah.
20 Q Can -- do you have concerns about Mr. Sullivan's
21 stage 3 analysis?
22 A I do.
23 Q And could you discuss them in greater detail,
24 please?
25 A Well, number one, it's not a method that's

Page 56

1 described in the guidance, March 2011, or June 2010. Number
2 two, it, it presumes, it picks arbitrarily NO2 to NOX ratios
3 without justification. And we're dealing with a particular
4 site with particular backgrounds, with a particular sources
5 and to come in and try to assign specific NO2 to NOX ratios
6 based on location just to me is not scientific, not
7 scientifically valid. And it doesn't allow the ozone
8 limiting method. It's not, Mr. Sullivan has acknowledged
9 it's not the ozone limiting method.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Excuse me. Can I ask everybody to
11 turn off their cell phones? I realize I have the advantage
12 of taking mine out of my pocket and leaving it in the drawer
13 and you don't, but you can turn them off. Of course, I
14 forgot mine the other night here and I realized how insecure
15 we all feel now without a cell phone with us. But, in any
16 event, you can turn them off. So I'd ask you to do that.
17 Thank you.
18 THE WITNESS: I have to tell you that I have a new
19 smart phone that I got a few days ago. I feel less secure.
20 I finally figured out how to make a call. There's so many
21 apps --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: The question is is it smart enough
23 to turn itself off when it comes into my hearing room? All
24 right.
25 THE WITNESS: I would have no idea.

Page 57

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I just moved into
2 that, that, the 21st century myself, basically, so --
3 THE WITNESS: Okay. So, can you repeat your
4 question?
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
6 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7 Q You were, you were discussing concerns that you
8 had with Mr. Sullivan's stage 3 analysis?
9 A Right.
10 Q And I think your last statement was that it
11 doesn't allow for the ozone limiting method?
12 A It, it assigns, my basic problem with it is it's
13 not in the guidance and it assigns arbitrarily specific NO2
14 to NOX ratios based on an arbitrary division of the world
15 and to the close end and further out zones. I just --
16 nature doesn't have strict, box-like lines, particularly the
17 air flows from one place to another. So I, and I don't --
18 if he's, he mentioned some places where he presumably gets
19 this data from. They may or may not apply to the site.
20 There are other sources of data in the literature that show
21 much higher ratios than .5. So to me it's a very arbitrary
22 choice. He calls it more refined and it, it's his, clearly
23 his least conservative choice and it gets the lowest
24 concentrations and without a whole lot of technical
25 justification in my viewpoint.

Page 58

1 Q You've mentioned that Mr. Sullivan's stage 3
2 method uses caps of .25 within the 40 meter box and loading
3 dock and .5 outside of that area. Do you, in your opinion,
4 are his caps warranted?
5 A No, I don't think the atmosphere works that way.
6 Q And do you have any, any information or evidence
7 to support your opinion?
8 A A lot of what I have to say about that is, applies
9 also to his particular stage 2 ozone limiting method. One
10 of the problems here is that a lot of his thinking, as I've
11 said before, comes from the CAPCOA document which, which,
12 I'm sorry, it's not the CAPCOA, it's the Environment Agency
13 reference that he put on the record. And they grapple with
14 this question of the time that it takes for a plume to mix
15 and the distance that it takes for a plume to mix down to
16 the molecular level. So as I said, he, I believe he draws
17 those percentages from, from that particular study, despite
18 the fact that the study is filled with caveats, and despite
19 the fact that there's a statement in that study that the
20 Environment Agency does not approve of using the Jansen
21 method, which is what Mr. Sullivan relies on, to give you
22 these huge, different distances and times that it takes for
23 molecules of NO to mix with ozone.
24 As my slides will demonstrate, what happens in a
25 parking lot, in a gas station queue is very, very different

Page 59

1 from what happens 300 meters or 400 meters up in the air
2 with a Powerpoint plume and at that, I will need the slides
3 for that.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: I think the suggestion in his
5 testimony was, if I recall, that it's actually, there's more
6 ozone mixing at those higher levels than at the lower, is
7 that not correct?
8 THE WITNESS: I absolutely disagree with that.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I may be remembering it
10 incorrectly. I --
11 THE WITNESS: I will give --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13 THE WITNESS: -- my reasoning. If that's what Mr.
14 Sullivan said, I cannot agree with it.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: All right. I'm going to hand out
17 what had been marked as Exhibit 581, which it is a copy of
18 Dr. Cole's Powerpoint slides. There have been some new
19 slides added there, all taken from other documents in the
20 record.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: While that's being done, do you
22 feel that there's any increase in the, the repetivity of the
23 conversion from NO to NO2, from NOX to NO2 after you've
24 traveled the distance, after the, the NO has traveled the
25 distance or do you feel that the traveling distance does

Page 60

1 not, is not relevant?
2 THE WITNESS: It's, it's, the distance may have an
3 impact on what, on the primary NO2. And then if you, I
4 think I agree with --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Primary being the, what you call --
6 THE WITNESS: In stack.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the in stack?
8 THE WITNESS: -- in tailpipe.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Right, what's --
10 THE WITNESS: So, yes, driving mode has a lot to
11 do with --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Not driving mode, but I, but there
13 was, in Mr. Sullivan's testimony he talked about, that's why
14 he had that for the box part, or he had, I mean he talked
15 about the time for the NOX to travel in order to mix. Is
16 that not a, or the distance of travel. Is that not a factor
17 in your evaluation?
18 THE WITNESS: Not --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Distance from the source?
20 THE WITNESS: No.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: Can I have a copy of the slides
23 please? I've added this as an exhibit, but there may be one
24 or two additions that come from sources which are
25 referenced.

Page 61

1 MR. GROSSMAN: You are going to explain to me what
2 the top one means, right?
3 THE WITNESS: Yes, absolutely, yes.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
5 THE WITNESS: I'll start with that. I testified
6 earlier today that there had been many revisions of Mr.
7 Sullivan's modeling reports and it's sometimes very hard to
8 figure out exactly what's changed as the, he uses more and
9 more complexity. So this slide is a copy of the Washington
10 Post's photo puzzle that appears in this Sunday magazine
11 section and there's photo one and photo two, and you have to
12 figure out where the differences are.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, to me, with the, with that in
14 general, but -- so I take it this is kind of an allegory in
15 your mind for, for Mr. Sullivan's various reports?
16 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
18 THE WITNESS: Okay. So we're going to go to -- in
19 order to explain my judgments on the rate of mixing to the
20 molecular level, particularly in the close in area risk
21 where Mr. Sullivan assumes there's no contact between ozone,
22 no contact between ozone and O from the queue, for example,
23 from the sources within the box. So the, I want you to go
24 to Slide No. 6, please.
25 And I'd like to give a little background on

Page 62

1 turbulent mixing. So these are three pictures of three
2 different discharges of plumes from sources. And they look
3 similar because there's a, a property of turbulence that it
4 looks the same at different scales. So if we go to the
5 second one --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if they look similar,
7 but --
8 THE WITNESS: Okay.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that's a matter of looking and I
10 suppose --
11 THE WITNESS: Right. Well, there's some --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to the difference on --
13 THE WITNESS: -- would you buy that there's some
14 similarity? Okay. Go to the second one. This is the
15 sources of these three different pictures that I've showed.
16 So the first, the first is a cigarette, the second is a
17 tailpipe and the third are plumes from power plants, from
18 stacks. And if we think about someone smoking, you see the
19 smoke, particularly of people who are walking around in the
20 room and whatnot, will dissipate pretty quickly and over a
21 short distance.
22 For car exhausts, and I'll show some slides of
23 this, the dissipation takes place maybe in a matter of
24 meters, 10 meters, five meters. But the power plant plume
25 from which the Jansen study and the environment agency

Page 63

1 graphs which Mr. Sullivan has used come from these power
2 plants. And you can look and see that these power plant
3 plumes are, in fact, dispersing. Now we're looking at
4 distances of hundreds of meters here, maybe 100 meters,
5 maybe 150, 200, depending upon the conditions. Another way
6 of looking at this is on page --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: So what do I conclude from that?
8 THE WITNESS: What you conclude from that, and I
9 will further amplify on it, is that the degree of, the rate
10 at which mixing occurs down to the molecular level is a
11 matter of scale. If you're dealing with a very small source
12 with a smaller plume, that is going to disperse and mix a
13 lot faster than the giant plume of a power plant.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15 THE WITNESS: So a basic premise of, of turbulence
16 theory is embedded in this quote from Lewis Fry Richardson.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: What page is that?
18 MS. ROSENFELD: The next page.
19 THE WITNESS: What?
20 MS. ROSENFELD: On slide, page 8.
21 THE WITNESS: That's the one after the cigarette.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Yeah. They're paginated on the
23 lower right, some of them are hard to read --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: -- but there are page numbers.

Page 64

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I see, page 8. Okay. I see
2 it.
3 THE WITNESS: Okay. Big whirls have little whirls
4 that feed on their velocity, and little whirls have lesser
5 whirls and so on to viscosity. Now viscosity is basically
6 turbulence of the molecular level.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8 THE WITNESS: Okay? Now what drives the
9 turbulence is an energy source. So it, one form of energy
10 is the flow of air over a rough surface. The energy is in
11 the kinetic flow, the kinetic energy of the moving wind, but
12 as the turbulence disrupts that, that kinetic energy is
13 dissipated and eventually it will go down to the molecular
14 level. So you're getting a very organized form of energy
15 transferring to a very dispersed form of energy is another
16 way of looking at this.
17 Now, the next slide you see the big swirls going
18 to the little swirls and whatnot, but my point of the second
19 is that here we have a power plant plume with great, big
20 swirls and a car exhaust with smaller, and my point is that
21 it takes less dissipation to get these smaller plumes down
22 to the molecular level.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
24 THE WITNESS: So if we look at Slide 10, you can
25 see the amount of turbulence that's occurring very close to

Page 65

1 these cars. Now I'm not suggesting that -- this may be
2 steam, it may be vapor, but whatever it is is dissipating
3 rapidly. The turbulence, and Mr. Sullivan has talked about
4 the roughness. He has used this argument that, that you
5 would have a lot of mixing in the, as one of his defenses
6 for using urban coefficients that there's turbulence. Well,
7 I contend that he's only looked at one part of the equation
8 in doing that.
9 That this, the turbulence has a number of effects
10 and if we go to page, well, we can look at the Slide 11,
11 which again, looks at the difference between a power plant
12 plume which the Jansen dissipation distances or distances of
13 molecular mixing, you can see this power plant that's
14 probably fairly stable conditions, conditions that Mr.
15 Sullivan says leads to the highest NOX and highest NO2
16 concentrations and you can see that there's, that plume
17 under those conditions is holding pretty firm. It's not
18 doing a lot of mixing, whereas if you look at a parking lot,
19 let's say in a cold morning when you've got a lot of traffic
20 going on, you're going to get turbulence at the scale of
21 these particular exhausts with a lot more mixing because of
22 the roughness of the surface. These cars, I believe Mr.
23 Sullivan testified that you might be looking at a roughness,
24 surface roughness value of maybe a meter or maybe more.
25 It's quite a rough surface, so it induces turbulence. But

Page 66

1 it has another effect as well which we need to look at,
2 which is Slide No. 4, which I'm sure Mr. Sullivan is
3 familiar with. It's one of the basic premises of the impact
4 of surface roughness on the wind profile.
5 It's generally known that wind profiles in terms
6 of their speed have a lot of rhythmic shape and that the
7 greater the surface roughness, the lower the velocity in the
8 lower layers. And this particular source is given here. I
9 did the two meter calculation. But it shows that the
10 greater the surface roughness, the slower the wind speed at
11 the height of these automobile exhausts and upward some.
12 Interesting, if you look at the very lowest, .1, you'll see
13 that there's a huge difference between the surface and
14 what's going on aloft. There's a tremendous drop, a
15 tremendous increase in wind speed, and that's because with a
16 smoother surface, there's less turbulent exchange and so the
17 momentum from above is not being transferred downward.
18 Whereas, if you look at the two meter curve, the
19 two meter surface roughness curve, you see it's pretty
20 uniform, but with much lower wind speeds. In other words,
21 under these conditions, the lower atmosphere tends to be
22 decoupled from what's going on aloft. And so wind speed,
23 and my point in all this is that the wind speed is less and
24 we know one of the most basic premises of air pollution
25 meteorology is that concentrations are inversely

Page 67

1 proportional to wind speed. So its surface roughness, these
2 elements are slowing down the wind speed. That means
3 concentrations will be increasing.
4 So there are other sides to the whole issue about
5 turbulence and my contention, if you look at No. 5, the
6 rebuttal report cites that Jansen formula as graphed in the
7 Environment Agency report to show that there is insufficient
8 time for car exhaust in the queue area, the 40 meter, I call
9 it the no zone, to mix down to the molecular level.
10 However, as the Environmental Agency report states, this
11 equation was determined for power plant plumes, not for car
12 exhaust occurring at the surface. And it, I can get the
13 page number, but it basically states, I think I've got this.
14 I'll give you the page number, but it states that the
15 Environmental Agency does not approve of using the Jansen
16 curves for ground level sources.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Since using the term Environmental
18 Agency, I think we should be clear, it's not the EPA --
19 THE WITNESS: No.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- you're talking about?
21 THE WITNESS: No. No. It's the, I believe it's
22 the English Agency.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I think you originally thought it
24 was Australia, but it may have been in Canada, is that --
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Britain and Wales.

Page 68

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Britain and Wales, I'm sorry.
2 Okay. Well, in any event, I understand your point. So you
3 can go on to the next point.
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q Now, Dr. Cole, you had also testified about the .5
6 cap, conversion cap, and we're still talking about stage 3,
7 the stage 3 method now. And I believe that Mr. Sullivan, I
8 think, testified that he took those caps from various
9 reports. One of them may have been the Sonoma report. Did
10 you review a report by Sonoma Technology, Inc., that Mr.
11 Sullivan referenced?
12 A Yes, I did.
13 Q And what is your opinion having, having reviewed
14 that report?
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Are we talking about the --
16 which --
17 MS. ROSENFELD: We're talking about the Sonoma
18 Technology, Inc. --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: No, I know, but --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: -- summary of results.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- but which, which ratio are you
22 talking about?
23 MS. ROSENFELD: This would be the .5 cap outside
24 of the four year freeze.
25 THE WITNESS: Well, the, the evidence that I show,

Page 69

1 let me --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, were you done with
3 the air monitor location slides? I was supposed to return
4 them. I didn't want to be accused of, of prolonging in any
5 way. What page were you, was that?
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: You're welcome.
8 MS. ADELMAN: Michele, which, what are you talking
9 about?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: This is Sonoma Technology, Inc.
11 MR. GOECKE: Could you show us that, please. Dr.
12 Cole?
13 MS. ADELMAN: Can you show --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.
15 MS. ADELMAN: -- Mr. Goecke?
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And the date on that?
18 A December 2011. It's a report called, Summary of
19 Results from Near Road NO2 Monitoring Pilot Study, December
20 2011.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Is this something that's we've just
22 referenced or is it already in --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: It was just referenced. I don't
24 remember if it was admitted into the record or not. I don't
25 see it in the exhibit list.

Page 70

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Harris or Mr. Goecke, do you
2 recall --
3 MS. HARRIS: I don't think it was.
4 MR. GOECKE: I can't recall.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think, I think it was just
6 referenced by Mr. Sullivan.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: I think it was discussed, but not
8 entered.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Do you want it?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, please.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So if I can find the exhibit
12 list, then we'll --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: And it's almost noon and this is
14 our first new exhibit.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Wow. Of course, you've, you've
16 passed 600 now, so I'm not sure it can be allowed. There's
17 got to be some, some limit on, on exhibits. All right. So
18 this will be 602 and that is the December 2011 final, well,
19 I guess it's called summary of results from near road NO2
20 monitoring pilot study, and I guess it's prepared by STI,
21 that's Sonoma Technology, Inc., for the EPA.
22 (Exhibit No. 602 was marked for
23 identification.)
24 MR. GROSSMAN: While we're, since you, you -- it
25 mentions the near road NO2 monitoring. Can you give some

Page 71

1 testimony about how to interpret EPA standards for, let's
2 say NO2 one-hour standards. And let's say the standard is
3 100 parts per billion. There's been a suggestion made that
4 that's for near road and the actual standard is below that
5 when you go further off the road. Do you subscribe to that
6 interpretation of the EPA regulations?
7 THE WITNESS: Not being an attorney --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm asking you for the way in which
9 it's to be interpreted by the EPA, not as an attorney.
10 THE WITNESS: Let me try and answer this way, that
11 is you believe that the traffic may not be, may create high
12 concentrations near the roadway. Then you might have some
13 homes that are maybe 100 or meters away.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15 THE WITNESS: So I have seen language in various
16 documents that acknowledges that concentrations within, away
17 from the road may be lower, but that the standard based on
18 maximum concentrations is set higher as -- you know, I was
19 afraid you would ask that question.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, well, I didn't know I inspired
21 to, but --
22 THE WITNESS: I, it's a very hard -- I haven't
23 seen that in the guidance, let me put it to you that way. I
24 have, I know it's, there have been a lot of reports like
25 CASAC reports and whatnot that have discussed this issue.

Page 72

1 So I think in this particular case what we're looking at is
2 the maximum concentrations associated with this particular
3 source added to background anywhere in the neighborhood and
4 that's, that, I think, is the criteria which my review of
5 all of this is based on that. Without getting into that, I
6 think it almost, it's almost an issue that is a health-
7 related issue because, you know, if you have this level
8 here, what, what level is in a micro-environment of a person
9 breathing, sensitive populations. I can't really --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: What I'm trying to get at, in, and
11 the EPA applies its NAAQS standards, if it has a standard of
12 100 parts per billion for a particular pollutant, does it
13 apply that across the board or does it have some sort of
14 metric where it lowers it in applying it further away from
15 the road?
16 THE WITNESS: I'm going to answer in the context
17 of this particular case.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, just so, first of all, let's
19 get it in general, how it applies. You've worked for the
20 EPA. How does it apply it? How do they apply their
21 standards?
22 THE WITNESS: Generally, anywhere where there's an
23 exceedence, there's an exceedence.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: An exceedence of the specific
25 standard, not of some graded level below that?

Page 73

1 THE WITNESS: I haven't seen that.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: So in a particular case, you're
4 doing a modeling study, combining it with background, and if
5 at anywhere, in this case in the neighborhood, those values
6 are exceeded, that's a problem.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, but the values being exceeded
8 you're talking about are the actual NAAQS standards?
9 THE WITNESS: That's what I'm --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you. Go
11 ahead.
12 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
13 Q Dr. Cole, we were talking about the stage 3
14 analysis and the cap in particular of the .5, I believe,
15 outside of the, outside of the tailpipe box. And you
16 testified you didn't think that that .5 was justified. And
17 do you have --
18 A Well, let me --
19 Q -- do you have studies or information that would
20 support your conclusion?
21 A Let me start first with the 40 meter zone and
22 that's where I reference the, the Sonoma Technology report
23 which we just gave the reference for. And Table 33 and
24 Figure B9 shows much higher concentrations within 40 meters
25 of the road.

Page 74

1 Q And, Dr. Cole, could you identify what page Table
2 33 is on? And this would be Exhibit 602. Or Table, page 3-
3 18, tell me if it's on that page.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: We'll let you get away with leading
5 now.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: In the interest of saving time.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Anything in the interest of saving
8 time.
9 THE WITNESS: Well, one is, the table is on page
10 318 and the graph is Figure B-9, that will be in the
11 appendix. B-9 is on page 318. And as the table shows,
12 those ratios, even the average ratios in three of the four
13 cities studied are greater than, greater than .5 and
14 certainly greater than .25. These are in the, these were,
15 there are within 40 meters. So I just put this in to show
16 that there is data out there which does not restrict a high
17 ratios cap by .25 within 40 meters.
18 Now in terms of going out beyond the 40 meter box,
19 there, there's something, there's a concept and an equation
20 known as the photo stationary state so that you get ozone
21 forming, I'm sorry, you get NO2 forming with the reaction of
22 ozone and initially you have a certain NO2 to NOX background
23 and that's dictated by, as we've said, by the turbulent
24 mixing, but the reaction itself is very fast. We're talking
25 about seconds. So the issue --

Page 75

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Once it's at the molecular contact
2 point?
3 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes. So the issue which both
4 Mr. Sullivan and I agree on is the rate of mixing down to
5 the molecular level. So here we see ratios that are much
6 higher than .25. Now when we go to beyond the 40 meters,
7 we're talking about --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. I just want to
9 ask you in terms of this --
10 THE WITNESS: Yes.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- Table 33 that we're looking at,
12 it talks about near road, it's measuring near road. How is
13 near road defined?
14 THE WITNESS: Within, I believe all of these sites
15 are within 40 meters.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Because I just want to make sure
17 we're not comparing apples and oranges.
18 THE WITNESS: It says distance from road --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Where, where does it say distance
20 from road? I just want to see --
21 THE WITNESS: Now we're looking at Figure B-9.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure B. Let's see. What page is that
23 on?
24 THE WITNESS: That is on page, oh boy --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: What is it?

Page 76

1 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, you're talking about any
2 appendix, Figure B --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: B, yeah, B-9.
4 MR. GOECKE: -- is, I think it is on --
5 MS. ROSENFELD: I think it's B-11.
6 MR. GOECKE: B-11, yes.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: B-11? Okay.
8 THE WITNESS: Right.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Distance from -- so I'm still not
10 quite sure whether, which part of these are considered -- I
11 agree that the graph appears to go out to 40 meters based on
12 the, the X axis, but which part of that is considered near
13 road for purposes of interpreting Table 3-3? That's what
14 I'm not sure of.
15 THE WITNESS: Well, I think you can say that --
16 you're talking about the table, not the graph?
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess I'm talking about
18 either one because the graph is, doesn't show distances
19 either, it just shows, compares the ratios with ozone parts
20 per billion, one, so I don't see anything on Table 3-3
21 that's telling me that that near road means within 40 meters
22 as opposed to within 10 meters. I, that's all I'm asking.
23 I'm just asking for definition of near road as it's used in
24 Table 3-3.
25 THE WITNESS: No, I think I'd look into that a

Page 77

1 little, I will look into that a little deeper, but you can
2 see that the, for Baltimore, if you look at the distribution
3 of points --
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q Are you looking at Figure B-9?
6 A B-9, Figure B-9.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: B-9?
8 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure B-9 or --
10 MS. ROSENFELD: On page B-11.
11 THE WITNESS: On page B-11.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13 THE WITNESS: The values are not terribly
14 different from what are given in the --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
16 THE WITNESS: -- table.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: So, so you can, the table on B-9,
18 on page B-11, confusing as that labeling system, okay, but
19 Figure B-9, dash 9, I, I can see there that does compare
20 ratio levels, that's NO2/NOX ratios against distance from
21 the road --
22 THE WITNESS: Yes.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- in meters?
24 THE WITNESS: Right.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So that answers my question.

Page 78

1 Okay.

2 MR. GOECKE: Can we have a brief break, Mr.

3 Grossman?

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. All right. Come back in five

5 minutes.

6 (Whereupon, at 12:03 p.m., a brief recess was

7 taken.)

8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We can resume. We're

9 back on the record.

10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

11 Q Dr. Cole, I think when we ended, you were starting

12 to talk about a photo stationary state. Is that a concept

13 that you wanted to explain further?

14 A At some point there's an equilibrium.

15 Q Could you speak up just a little?

16 A What happened -- what?

17 Q Could you speak up --

18 MR. GROSSMAN: A little louder.

19 THE WITNESS: Oh.

20 MS. ROSENFELD: -- a little?

21 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. When you're dealing with

22 a, let's say a plume, which is mixing into the atmosphere

23 and you've got NO that begins to react with the ozone as the

24 mixing comes down to the molecular level. There's a

25 theoretical limit to, based on, particularly during the

Page 79

1 daytime when the sun is out because the sun will actually

2 break down NO₂. So you've got to consider all of those

3 things and the photo station as the equation gives you an

4 upper bound that's not 100 percent, it's 85 percent. In

5 other words, the NO₂ to NOX ratio is .85. When everything

6 comes into equilibrium, the ozone, the NO, the effect of

7 sunlight, sometimes it considers other accidents which may

8 have an influence, but basically at some point you're going

9 to get to the .85.

10 Now there's also, if you're going to have an upper

11 bound in my opinion, beyond the one that you can justify

12 beyond the 40 meters in particular, it should be the photo

13 stationary state which is not too different from what EPA

14 has picked as its 80 percent default in its tier 2 method.

15 Okay. And EPA in its guidance states that it went

16 up the maximum ratio, the default value they raised from .75

17 in 2010 guidance, they raised it to .80. So, and they have

18 some justification for that in the --

19 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean for tier 2?

20 THE WITNESS: For tier 2.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: But they still have tier 1 as 100

22 percent even though, I take it that's giving a margin of

23 error because if what you're saying is correct, that it's

24 .85 is the ultimate conversion ratio, the stationary point,

25 photo stationary point?

Page 80

1 THE WITNESS: Right, but they recognize, in tier

2 1, you're basically recognizing that there are a lot of

3 uncertainty, so they're giving you some very conservative --

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay.

5 THE WITNESS: So --

6 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.

7 THE WITNESS: -- there is evidence, I would refer,

8 let's see, this is, I don't believe it's in the record, but

9 there's a report by, a 2009 report by Minoura using data

10 from Japan that they presented at the 7th International

11 Conference on Urban Climate, July 2009, where he shows NO₂

12 over NOX ratio as a function of distance and he has three

13 monitors in this study, one right at the roadside, the

14 second at 20 meters and the third at 100 meters from the

15 roadway. So the values are right at the roadside is .56.

16 At the 20 meter site it goes up to .68, and at 100 meters,

17 in other words, well beyond the 40 meter zone he has a value

18 of .65. So --

19 MR. GOECKE: Dr. Cole, do you have a copy of that

20 report?

21 THE WITNESS: I -- can I get that, well, I have

22 it --

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Where are you, where are you

24 reading from?

25 THE WITNESS: I'm reading from a table, I'm sorry.

Page 81

1 I'm reading from Table 1 of his paper. And I will provide

2 that.

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Is this something that's been

4 exchanged or are we, where did we get this from?

5 MS. ROSENFELD: I don't believe so. I don't

6 believe so.

7 THE WITNESS: Okay. My point --

8 MR. GOECKE: I would move to not allow him to

9 testify unless we are provided a copy.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah. And I don't, I don't see

11 that it's going to change anything either, so, yeah, I'll

12 strike that, that reference.

13 THE WITNESS: All right. Then let me read -- here

14 is something from something that's in the record which is

15 the environment agency report.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: The EA one --

17 THE WITNESS: Yes --

18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that's in the Wales --

19 THE WITNESS: -- which -- right, which Mr.

20 Sullivan relies on.

21 MR. GOECKE: What exhibit number is that, do you

22 know?

23 MS. ROSENFELD: You know, I don't --

24 MR. SILVERMAN: It was on the, it was on the

25 disk --

Page 82

1 MS. ROSENFELD: I don't that it was exhibitized.
2 MR. SILVERMAN: -- the ones that you sent us.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Yeah.
4 MR. SILVERMAN: You sent us a disk with a lot of
5 references.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: You provided it. It was Reference
7 No. 1 in Mr. Sullivan's report, on page 21 of his report. I
8 have a copy, but I don't believe it was ever admitted or
9 entered into the record. He testified about it, but I don't
10 believe you entered it.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: So what's your comment with that in
12 that regard?
13 THE WITNESS: Here's a quote, and please forgive
14 me, I don't have the page number, but we can get it from the
15 environmental agency report, quote, at rural sites, NO2 is
16 frequently 60 percent or more of the NOX and the NO2 to NOX
17 ratio tends towards its daytime equilibrium value associated
18 with the photo stationary state of .85. At urban sites such
19 as central London, NO2 to NOX ratios average .47 in winter
20 and .59 in summer.
21 So you're seeing data here and indications that
22 you would have to really defend that 50 percent level that
23 Mr. Sullivan uses because there are indications in the
24 literature for higher values. So I'm not convinced that,
25 either by the science or by the various reports and

Page 83

1 literature that, that there's a justification for a .50 cap,
2 which is what, what he does in his stage 3 analysis.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q And, Dr. Cole, again, still on stage 3 of the
6 analysis, in -- what is your understanding of how many years
7 of meteorological data that Mr. Sullivan uses in his stage 3
8 analysis?
9 A He uses, in stage 3 he uses three years of data.
10 Q And is that consistent with EPA guidance?
11 A Oh, that's meteorological data. No, the EPA
12 guidance states that unless you have an onsite monitor,
13 meteorological monitors station, that you use five years of
14 meteorological data. Now there's a reason for that and that
15 is that within a three year period, and one could even argue
16 for a longer period of time, but in a three year period you
17 don't really know whether you're looking at a trend, at
18 something that's representative, or whether you're really
19 looking at a particular windy year, for example, or a year
20 with a particular flow of, of air. Like this winter we had
21 a lot more northerly winds than is usual. We had some very
22 cold temperatures during the winter. All of that,
23 temperatures and wind direction and wind speed vary from
24 year to year.
25 So when I was at EPA, I was very interested in

Page 84

1 working with the guy who does trend analysis and they always
2 factor in the, when they look at a trend, they try to factor
3 out the effect of variable meteorology and say, well, this
4 was a windy year, we can't, or a rainy year, so particulate
5 monitors are going to read less or whatever. So the shorter
6 the timeframe that you choose, the less you can guarantee
7 that you're really being representative of the conditions
8 that prevail over time, okay?
9 Q And is there guidance in Appendix W on that point?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I mean it's apparent. It's sort
11 of, you're, the period you're measuring or less have an
12 indication of trend --
13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it says --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- over a period of time? Nobody
15 is going to challenge that, all right?
16 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not questioning with respect
17 to the trend analysis. I'm, I'm questioning with respect to
18 the five year --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I see, as a standard for --
20 THE WITNESS: Yes.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: As a standard.
22 THE WITNESS: It's --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: What --
24 THE WITNESS: Well, Appendix W is very clear that,
25 they give you two choices. One, if you have an onsite

Page 85

1 monitor and you can use three years, but if you don't, you
2 have, you use five years.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: But, but counsel is looking for a
4 page reference or section reference for that.
5 THE WITNESS: Oh.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Is that, is that correct?
7 MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.
8 THE WITNESS: This is the environmental, wait,
9 what are we looking at? This is the --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: You said the --
11 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the Appendix W?
13 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Okay. The
14 guidance states five years, and this is on page 68244,
15 8.3.1.2 --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: All right, page 68?
17 THE WITNESS: 244 --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: 244, section what?
19 THE WITNESS: Appendix W, 8.3.1.2, five years of
20 representative meteorological data should be used when
21 estimating concentrations within an air quality model.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
23 THE WITNESS: Okay.
24 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
25 Q And do you know if either of the EPA guidance

Page 86

1 memos further elaborates on that point?
2 A Let's see. Well, I haven't seen anything to the
3 contrary.
4 Q And in your opinion what is the effect of using
5 three years of meteorological data --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: He's already answered that.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: -- as compared -- okay.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, the next topic that
10 I'm going to get into is going to take some time. This
11 might be a good time for a lunch break.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: What is the next topic?
13 MS. ROSENFELD: NO2 monitoring.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. What's the pleasure of the
15 crowd? Do you want to break now or to struggle on?
16 MS. HARRIS: Can we have one moment?
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
18 MS. HARRIS: Struggle.
19 MR. SILVERMAN: Lunch.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman always votes for
21 lunch, even when there's liver.
22 MS. HARRIS: Michele, how much longer do you
23 expect after that topic?
24 MS. ROSENFELD: I would expect we would be done
25 within a couple of hours.

Page 87

1 MR. GOECKE: Including that topic or after that
2 topic?
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Including that topic.
4 MR. GOECKE: I'm indifferent, so why don't we take
5 lunch?
6 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So so far I only have
7 one vote here to count.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I vote.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Two votes, two votes for lunch?
10 THE WITNESS: Do I count?
11 MR. GROSSMAN: You, absolutely you count. It's
12 your birthday. You count double. What are you voting for?
13 THE WITNESS: Two hours of lunch.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: No, no, no, they don't count that
15 much. Let's not overemphasize. So but in terms of timing,
16 do you want to do the lunch break now, is that right?
17 THE WITNESS: Okay.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we'll break for
19 lunch now and come back at 1:15.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.
21 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
22 (Whereupon, at 12:29 p.m., a luncheon recess was
23 taken.)
24
25

Page 88

AFTERNOON SESSION

1
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Go back on the record. We'll
3 resume the direct sur rebuttal testimony of Dr. Cole.
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q Dr. Cole, just to clarify a few points from this
6 morning's testimony --
7 A Right.
8 Q Using the hour-by-hour method, does EPA guidance
9 have a recommendation as to what types of sources are
10 appropriate for hour-by-hour?
11 A Well, it does. It's clear that, that it wants
12 justification and it's also clear that there are only, would
13 approve that kind of method if it can be shown that the site
14 is isolated. So there's evidence from Mr. Sullivan's report
15 that the site is not at all isolated. I gave some evidence
16 but, in fact, if you look at Figures 2 and 3 --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: What are you referencing? You need
18 to give me a page reference. What page are you referencing
19 and what document?
20 THE WITNESS: Okay. If you look at the rebuttal
21 report.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: The rebuttal report?
23 THE WITNESS: Yeah, page, Figures 2 and 3.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: No, I mean for your, for your
25 reference to what EPA --

Page 89

1 THE WITNESS: Oh.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- requires, an isolated --
3 THE WITNESS: Okay. That would be, that's the Fox
4 2011.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
6 THE WITNESS: And that is --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit 407, and what's the page
8 reference you're talking about there?
9 THE WITNESS: Page 21.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So you, you read the
11 highlighted portion?
12 THE WITNESS: Right.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I see. So you're talking about
14 this last sentence in the highlighted portion, therefore, we
15 do not recommend such an approach except in rare cases of
16 relatively isolated sources, is that what you're --
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
19 THE WITNESS: So if you look at the rebuttal
20 report where it gives the results of the stage 2 and stage 3
21 modeling, you'll see that the background for stage 2,
22 accounts for 44 to 50 percent of the high 98th percentile
23 total concentrations. And for stage 3 it's even higher,
24 it's 63 percent is accounted for by the background
25 concentration. Without saying anything about the

Page 90

1 representative, most of the background, it's clear that this
2 is not an isolated source. If it was an isolated source, it
3 would have much lower background from other sources, so this
4 is not, does not, in my judgment, meet the criteria for
5 this, for the rare exceptions that they are willing to
6 endorse hour-by-hour paired matching.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9 Q And so looking at, looking at Figure 2, can you --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure 2 in what?
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Figure 2 in the rebuttal report on
12 page 12.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15 Q Looking at the blue box on the right-hand side of
16 that page, could you just read the relative numbers that
17 you're looking at to make that comparison or to reach the
18 conclusion that this is not an isolated --
19 A I think, let me make sure I have it.
20 Q And if not, I'll just --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, if you could show me, that
22 would help. Figure 2 on page 12?
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Figure 2 on page 12.
24 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
25 Q If you can take a look at the numbers? As I

Page 91

1 understand, on the upper right, those are the numbers
2 associated with the queue, of the loading dock and on the
3 lower left?
4 A Okay. The background for --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think the, the upper right is
6 at the loading dock and the lower left is at the queue?
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Correct. You're right.
8 THE WITNESS: Those are the maximum impacts where
9 those sources contribute and my point is that these, if you
10 look at the background concentrations, they're anywhere from
11 40 to 50 percent, roughly, of the total concentrations. On
12 my judgment, that does not qualify as an isolated source.
13 Then if you go to Figure 3 and you look at the background
14 concentration there, it's, I think I calculated it's more
15 than 60 percent of the total.
16 So to say that, that this is an isolated source
17 which would qualify for EPA's exception, in my judgment it
18 doesn't qualify.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: You count background in there when
20 you determine isolation of the source?
21 THE WITNESS: I would.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, is that what EPA calls for
23 when they, in that language in Exhibit 407, when they talk
24 about an isolated source, are they referring to something in
25 which you're including background as determining whether or

Page 92

1 not a source is isolated? I just don't see how -- I'm not
2 quite sure, and you can explain to me, how one is every
3 isolated if background is a factor in that determination as
4 to isolated. You always have background, right?
5 THE WITNESS: You're dealing with an urban area
6 with a lot of vehicles and a lot of NOX emissions --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
8 THE WITNESS: -- and so in my judgment it, what
9 we're looking at here is can you apply hour-by-hour pairing.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I'm not arguing with your
11 judgment --
12 THE WITNESS: So --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I'm just trying to get, to
14 understand how you factor in background in your conclusion
15 that the source here is not isolated. That's what I don't
16 understand. Wouldn't you always, well, background, I just
17 don't understand.
18 THE WITNESS: Well, your background would not be
19 reflective of these urban areas if it were isolated. I
20 don't believe that, my opinion is that this would not apply
21 to any, the exception to allow paired matching --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
23 THE WITNESS: -- modeling and monitoring hour-by-
24 hour --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

Page 93

1 THE WITNESS: -- is not appropriate in an urban
2 area with many, many sources. And the only reason I mention
3 this is that these background concentrations in my judgment
4 reflect many sources. We know there are many vehicles and
5 sources outside of the modeling perimeter and to call this
6 an isolated source --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Outside of the modeling perimeter
8 or outside of the 40 meter box?
9 THE WITNESS: No, outside of the modeling.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, then I really don't
11 understand your, your argument. You'll have to --
12 THE WITNESS: Well, this --
13 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
14 Q Dr. Cole, earlier you made a reference to, I
15 think, a power plant and a prairie?
16 A Yeah.
17 Q Is that the comparison that you're making?
18 A Yeah, if you had a source that was distinguishable
19 from anything else because there were no other emissions,
20 then I think it would be fair to do this hour-by-hour
21 matching because in an isolated area, it really doesn't
22 matter which way the wind is blowing because there aren't
23 many sources. So you can do an hour-by-hour match in that
24 kind of case because, because the, because the, you're not
25 going to have big differences. Here you're taking one

Page 94

1 monitor, okay, and, and, and expecting the source receptor
2 relationships on an hour-by-hour basis to be the same, even
3 though there are lots of sources around these different
4 monitor sites.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand your point. I think
6 what confuses it is by using the, by flowing into your
7 analysis the term background in which there's always
8 background and so that -- but your fundamental argument is
9 that there are other sources in the area here, it's not an
10 isolated source as compared to the power plant and the
11 prairie. There are other sources that are not just
12 background, included in background and so I think that's
13 your fundamental point, but I think I understand that point.
14 Okay.
15 THE WITNESS: Okay.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q Dr. Cole, were you present when Mr. Sullivan was
18 going through the Panofsky formula in his application of
19 that --
20 A Yes.
21 Q -- with his modeling analysis?
22 A Right.
23 Q In your opinion, is that an appropriate
24 methodology to use in this case?
25 A Well, it's, it's not a methodology that's included

Page 95

1 in any guidance. I think --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: You're saying the Panofsky formula
3 that Dr., that Mr. Sullivan mentioned or some other, he's,
4 he testified that that particular formula was derived from
5 others. Are you saying that any manifestation of that
6 formula, formula is not appropriate or are you just saying
7 that particular --
8 THE WITNESS: Let me just back up a little bit.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 THE WITNESS: I think Mr. Sullivan, I won't speak
11 for him, but I agree with his concept having dealt with
12 transitional barriers. It's clear that there's a, you know,
13 if wind is coming from the south, for example, it's crossing
14 one kind of area and coming into another. I testified that
15 there's going to be a transition zone.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17 THE WITNESS: With more turbulence over the
18 parking lot, over the mall surface for various reasons,
19 okay? I don't think that's the contention here. I, the
20 issue is the particular values that he gets are the
21 applicable -- is this a proven method? Is it a method
22 that's embraced in any, or even mentioned in any guidance.
23 So, and my problem with it is that he uses this, well, he
24 uses it to show that the, if you have a wind let's say from
25 the south, by the time it reaches the gas station, that

Page 96

1 you're going to have enhanced turbulence and it could be
2 characterized as urban rather than rural, okay?
3 Without taking an issue, without rehashing the
4 urban and rural dispersion thing, the problem, the problem I
5 have is twofold. One is that he doesn't give the
6 qualifications that the author gives for the equation. And
7 let me read that.
8 He gives this equation which Mr. Sullivan
9 correctly transformed. We don't have any arguments with his
10 calculus.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
12 THE WITNESS: That's fine. But here's the
13 qualification. It says considering neutral conditions in
14 the surface layer, we can substitute the logarithmic profile
15 into one and integrate with the initial conditions, which is
16 basically what Mr. Sullivan did. But it says for these
17 neutral conditions, the -- and I'm reading directly --
18 Myocki's treatment gives only the geometry of the interface,
19 but not the change of wind speed, the stress and turbulent
20 intensity after the air comes under the influence of the
21 terrain change.
22 MR. GOECKE: Excuse me, Dr. Cole, where are you
23 reading from?
24 THE WITNESS: This is from, directly from the
25 Panofsky and Dutton report. I think it was 1984.

Page 97

1 MR. GROSSMAN: It was a text, as I recall.
2 THE WITNESS: A text and it's one of the first of
3 the two, first or second of the two pages that Mr. Sullivan
4 provided.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: I'd proffer it's page 150 --
6 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: -- of the Panofsky excerpts.
8 THE WITNESS: So the problem I have with this is
9 that when, when you give a method, particularly a method
10 that's not been vetted and included in EPA's regulations --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Well it goes --
12 THE WITNESS: -- or guidance --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: -- it does not, you say it hasn't
14 been vetted, it's been around since 1984, so I don't know
15 that it hasn't been vetted, but you're saying it has not
16 been included specifically?
17 THE WITNESS: Right, not that I'm aware of.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of. And it has
20 two qualifications here. One is the fact that it applies to
21 neutral conditions. And according to Mr. Sullivan's
22 modeling, he sees the maximum concentrations occurring at
23 stable conditions; when there's very low wind speed, early
24 in the morning or later in the afternoon when you have
25 maximum concentrations. So that's one problem. The other

Page 98

1 problem is that it really doesn't give you information on
2 turbulent intensity.
3 Now having said that, as I said before, I will
4 acknowledge there's no question that when that air comes to
5 the, to the queue, that you're going to have enhanced
6 turbulence because of the increased surface roughness. So
7 that, I'm not arguing with that, and it probably reaches up
8 to the stack pipe, which is the tailpipe, which is low. But
9 I'm calling into question the use of something that without,
10 without describing the qualifications that the author uses.
11 To me that's, I would hope to do it differently if it were
12 me, let's put it that way.
13 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
14 Q If you, I think I heard you say that you can't
15 make a numeric judgment on the appropriate dispersion
16 coefficients, is that correct? You, you're not --
17 A It's hard to do --
18 Q -- opining on that?
19 A -- because you've got a lot going on here. You
20 could go either way. I think I recommended a long time ago
21 that, you know, you could use a 50/50, a halfway measure.
22 But I think that --
23 Q And a halfway measure between what and what, just
24 so the record is clear?
25 A Between rural and urban dispersion. I took that

Page 99

1 position which seemed to be something that, in his November
2 report that Mr. Sullivan, that was his idea actually,
3 intermediate value. He said it would fall between, the
4 dispersion would fall between the two is what he said in the
5 November report.
6 So I think the key point though is if you're going
7 to invoke increased roughness, as Mr. Sullivan did in his
8 testimony, increase the larger obstacles, all these cars.
9 Some of the cars are moving, some of the cars are not. If
10 you have enhanced turbulence, then you have to look at the
11 other impacts of enhanced turbulence. You have to look at
12 the decrease in speed which affects, inversely affects
13 concentrations and, secondly, you have to look at the effect
14 that that enhanced mixing, as I said before, has on the rate
15 of reaction between NO and ozone. So I don't think you can
16 do an analysis like this without looking at all the
17 implications.
18 Q So in your opinion does that have an effect or
19 qualify somehow the .25 cap on NO, NO2 in the 40 meter
20 queue?
21 A The .25 can.
22 Q Yeah.
23 A Yeah.
24 Q Does this have an effect on --
25 A Yes, I would --

Page 100

1 Q -- that analysis?
2 A I, given the amount of turbulence that we can
3 expect with the roughness surface that, and that Mr.
4 Sullivan has talked about due to these cars and everything,
5 I don't think you can talk about that without looking at the
6 enhanced mixing and the fact that you would, are likely to
7 get ozone reaction, the ambient ozone coming into molecular
8 contact with the NO much faster than he shows with these
9 Powerpoint plumes, which are not subject to these,
10 particularly under stable conditions they're not going to be
11 subjected to that level of mixing with the atmosphere. I
12 showed a photograph of that.
13 Q And as I understand it, in both stage 2 and stage
14 3, he has said that there will be no, none of that chemical
15 mixing within the tailpipe box, correct?
16 A Yes, the tailpipe box, just let's be clear about
17 it, it's pretty big because it extends about 130 feet in all
18 directions from the queue and loading dock. So, that
19 encompasses a pretty good chunk of area to say that you're
20 not going to have any contact between ozone and NO is just,
21 I don't agree with it.
22 Q So, so --
23 A I think the evidence is to the contrary.
24 Q So in your opinion will there be that chemical
25 mixing within the tailpipe box above and beyond the .25 --

Page 101

1 A Yes, I do. I think there will.
2 Q -- tailpipe emission?
3 A And I also note that in making his case, and this
4 is important, that Mr. Sullivan uses Environmental Agency
5 report and he comes to his conclusion about not insufficient
6 time to get down to the molecular level mixing. But the
7 Environment Agency as part of this report states the
8 following.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the EA, not the EPA, right?
10 THE WITNESS: This is EA.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I just wanted -- you're
12 saying Environmental Agency. I don't want the --
13 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- record --
15 THE WITNESS: Right. Right. Right. This is not
16 U.S. EPA, this is --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
18 THE WITNESS: -- England and Wales, I believe.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: So here's a quote. I hope I have
21 the, yes, page 43 of that report which has been submitted to
22 the record. Some operators have used the method of Janssen,
23 which was developed using aircraft data from plumes from
24 large power stations, but the Environment Agency has
25 rejected this for use on smaller plumes. So I think if

Page 102

1 you're going to invoke a method and a document that endorses
2 a certain method, there's a responsibility to report the
3 caveat. And there's a very strong caveat here they say we
4 don't approve of that.
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q Okay. Just very briefly. How do power plant
7 plumes and tailpipe emissions affect ground level receptors
8 differently?
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I think he's already testified to
10 that and showed pictures of it and testified about --
11 THE WITNESS: I have one more picture that I
12 didn't show.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I mean I think we've had a
14 lot of pluming evidence here. I think I understand this
15 point.
16 MR. SILVERMAN: A plethora of plumes.
17 THE WITNESS: Where are those slides? Right here.
18 Let's see. Okay. I don't know why, but it's a plume that
19 contrasts a power plant.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Which page? Which side?
21 THE WITNESS: Michele?
22 MS. ADELMAN: 11.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: I do not have a copy of the slides
24 any longer.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: You've already referenced 11.

Page 103

1 MS. ROSENFELD: 13.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: So I'm, I'm trying to show here two
4 things. One is the dispersion that's, that's affected by so
5 close to the surface compared to the power plant. And,
6 secondly, that the, without getting into health effects, we
7 know that there are people who pass in close proximity to
8 these plumes.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm looking for copies of the
11 exhibit that Mr. Goecke handed out before that hearing. It
12 had a bunch of dots on it. I seemed to have misplaced my
13 stack.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: A bunch of dots exhibit?
15 MS. ROSENFELD: A bunch of dots exhibit, yes,
16 that. Do you remember what number that is? Did you take
17 one?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the nationwide monitoring
19 inventory?
20 THE WITNESS: 593, it says.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, Exhibit No. 593.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on. I've go to go through my
23 pages here to get down to it. I'm sure I have a copy in
24 here somewhere.
25 (Discussion off the record.)

Page 104

1 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well --
2 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3 Q I believe this exhibit was entered into the record
4 to suggest that the highest NO2 levels don't exceed EPA
5 standards. And my question for you is how do you read this
6 document? And if that's the conclusion that you draw, do
7 you agree with it?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: What's the exhibit number on it
9 again?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: 593.
11 MR. GOECKE: 593.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: 593? Okay.
13 THE WITNESS: Okay. So what Mr. Sullivan has
14 shown is the distribution of points which represent 411
15 reporting sites, monitors for one hour NO2 and he's, he's
16 looking here only at the 98th percentile monitor values. So
17 this -- it's not all of the readings, but it does relate, as
18 Mr. Sullivan states, to the standard because the standard is
19 based on one hour, 98th percentile.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
21 THE WITNESS: So fair enough. He shows two things
22 on this diagram that, all of these points are below the 100
23 level standard and, secondly, that his modeling stage 1, 2,
24 and 3 are sort of in line with the upper end of, of these
25 concentrations. That's what this shows. Now in my --

Page 105

1 MR. GROSSMAN: However, you referred to 100, the
2 standard --
3 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- 100 parts per billion?
5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry. That's 100,
6 approximately 190 micrograms per cubic meter. This is in
7 parts per billion, so --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
9 THE WITNESS: -- the standard is 100.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: NO2 one hour?
11 THE WITNESS: Yes. So here's the problem I have
12 with this NO2 is it's several, one is that we've, the
13 opponents have presented a great deal of testimony about, A,
14 the level of traffic and, B, the level of congestion in and
15 around the gas station, which includes idling cars, queues,
16 the ring road, back-ups at certain peak hours and in my
17 judgment this is a unique site that may not be reflected in
18 the distribution of monitors shown here in this exhibit.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, what Mr. Sullivan testified
20 to, if I recall, in his rebuttal testimony was that some of
21 these monitors are right next to a super highways, or at
22 least one of them, as I recall. Are you suggesting that
23 what you'd characterize as a unique situation here might
24 have a higher --
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

Page 106

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- NO2 one-hour reading than
2 adjacent to a super highway?
3 THE WITNESS: Well, first of all, most of these
4 sites, I have to say that the overwhelming majority of these
5 sites are not near roadways and that's a whole other issue
6 because EPA as part of its standard recognized this problem
7 and has required the addition of hundreds of monitoring
8 sites to better reflect roadway concentrations.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but I'm just saying
10 if we look at the very highest monitoring sites reported on
11 this, on this exhibit nationwide for NO2 one hour, 98th
12 percentile values, what he's saying is that they're lower
13 than his projection in stage, stages 1 and 2 --
14 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and some of them a little higher
16 than a stage 3. But in any event, I think that's his point.
17 Are you suggesting that this particular area that is a
18 subject would produce greater one hour NO2 readings than a,
19 he suggested, a congested super highway?
20 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not sure this data
21 represents a large number of congested highways.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it doesn't have to be a large
23 number. If none of them, if even one of them is next to a
24 congested super highway and still has a lower reading, I
25 think that was the point he was making. I'm not adopting it

Page 107

1 or rejecting it. I'm just asking you is that your opinion
2 that this subject site could produce or is, I don't know
3 what to say, could produce or is likely to produce one hour
4 NO2 readings above that which is registered in, right next
5 to a congested super highway? That's the question. Because
6 a lot of these, I mean he's just saying, he's saying he has
7 a lot of readings here, a lot of monitors, but the ones that
8 are, I guess are the most directly of concern here would be
9 the highest readings that anybody has taken in any monitor
10 nationwide, assuming that he has accurately included all of
11 the, the individual monitoring stations in the United
12 States.
13 THE WITNESS: So the point I would make is that in
14 order to demonstrate the validity of this kind of analysis
15 and its applicability to the particular site, you would have
16 to show that some of these sites are, in fact, in the area
17 of a mega gas station with queues, with ring roads, with
18 congestion, with back-ups, considering the non-linear or
19 synergistic effect of increased traffic and lowering of
20 vehicle speeds. Also, there's another unique factor about
21 this that really hasn't been addressed which is that this
22 particular site has a building to the north, a building to
23 the east, and a proposed wall to the south. Now, what
24 impact do those features have on wind speed, on circulation?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think we have to go back to

Page 108

1 that.
2 THE WITNESS: What I'm saying is, well, I'm going
3 back to your point --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: April and May he did do a terrain
5 analysis that's in there.
6 THE WITNESS: That was a totally different issue.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8 THE WITNESS: Totally different issue.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: He was asked specifically --
10 THE WITNESS: He has not considered --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- about, he was asked, let me
12 finish, he was asked specifically about the effect of the
13 wall and so on. So he was asked questions that pertained to
14 that. So I don't think that it --
15 THE WITNESS: Yes, and he couldn't provide an
16 answer.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: No, but I don't think we can, well,
18 you can argue one or the other.
19 THE WITNESS: He didn't because, well, you want to
20 discuss this? Hold on.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: You can argue with what he said,
24 but, but he provided an analysis of air turbulence and
25 terrain analysis on the site. One can argue, and you can

Page 109

1 argue about it, and you can testify about it. All I'm
2 saying is that it's -- I don't think you can say accurately
3 it hasn't been addressed, but I take it from your answer,
4 you didn't directly say this, but you tell me if I'm
5 correctly giving your answer to my question. And your
6 answer, if I understand you correctly is, yes, this subject
7 site with all of its peculiarities could result in an NO2
8 one hour reading above what is being, has been monitored
9 adjacent to a congested super highway, that's what you're
10 answering? And if I got you wrong, you tell me, but I'm
11 trying to --
12 THE WITNESS: Yes.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: -- because that's my question and
14 you didn't answer my question directly, but I'm trying to --
15 THE WITNESS: But --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- trying to reach a bottom line
17 from what you've said.
18 THE WITNESS: There's a premise, I think, in your
19 question and that premise in my opinion is that, in fact,
20 there's a representative number of those particular
21 situations in this data.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just going by what Mr. Sullivan
23 testified, that at least one of those monitors, and maybe
24 more of them, but at least one of those monitors is next to
25 a congested super highway and I suspect there may be more

Page 110

1 than one, but if that's the case, if we take that as the
2 case, are you still saying that the proposed gas station at
3 the subject site could result in one hour NO2 use exceeding
4 that level?
5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I think it could.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. That was hard, harder than
7 it needed to be. Okay.
8 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9 Q Did you review the terrain analysis that Mr.
10 Sullivan provided earlier in this case?
11 A You're talking about the slope analysis?
12 Q Correct.
13 A Yes, I did.
14 Q And do you remember if that slope analysis
15 included the effect of a wall?
16 A We talked about that. I suggested that they use
17 cow puff, which he did, however, one of the problems was
18 that he, which is acknowledged in one of his reports, I
19 can't remember which, that the mesh or the grid size for the
20 cow puff was a 40 meter grid and he said that was too coarse
21 to see the effect of the wall. He, I, I do not recall any
22 presentation of data in any of these reports which
23 specifically focused on the impact of the wall or I might
24 add to that of the buildings to the north and the east. So
25 it's a complicated situation because he's got like a

Page 111

1 northeast wind with some of his maximum concentrations and
2 that would be an air flow that passes over buildings and
3 then may come down or may ride over the building, depending
4 upon the stability, the stratification. But we don't see
5 that addressed.
6 Now I, I recognize that that's a hard thing to do
7 in modeling and there are different ways to do it, but to me
8 that speaks to the need for conservatism and it speaks to
9 the, to the need to if you're going to show a diagram like
10 this and you're going to use it as evidence for this
11 particular site, I believe that to be valid you would have
12 to compare apples with apples. You would have to say, okay,
13 here's a similar site, we have the monitoring and here's
14 what it shows. Now --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: You determined a diagram like this?
16 You're referring, when you said that, to Exhibit 593?
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 THE WITNESS: So now let me add something to this.
20 It's very clear from the record, from EPA's discussion both
21 in the standard and in technical documents related to the
22 standard that they're requiring additional sites. And the
23 reason for that is they felt that these, these values that
24 they were getting reflected more of a generalized condition.
25 And part of that, you know, is because the concern has

Page 112

1 really been about ozone for decades and less so with NO2.
2 So when you collate these, when you co-locate sites, you may
3 go to places where there are ozone monitors and, in fact,
4 it's important to have the two together, but those ozone
5 monitors are generally aimed at looking at regional
6 concentrations of ozone because ozone doesn't vary as much
7 in the region, as much as NO2 does. NO2 has very sharp
8 gradients, and that's why it's necessary, in EPA's and my
9 estimation that you have more of these sites near highly
10 trafficked areas. And those sites are just being installed
11 now and they are not reflected in this data. This is 2013.
12 So --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brann, would you check our
14 thermostat again please? And whatever it is, please lower
15 it. Thank you.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q So do you have an opinion as to whether or not
18 data from those new monitors might reflect different levels,
19 different concentrations of NO2?
20 A I can't, I'm having, because of the ventilation --
21 Q Do you, do you have an opinion as to whether or
22 not when the new data from the new near road monitors comes
23 in, whether it might affect the level, the concentrations of
24 NO2 that we see here on Exhibit 593?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to stop you on that,

Page 113

1 because now you're asking him to speculate on something. I
2 have no problem with a hypothetical to an expert based on
3 facts that are in evidence or you're going to put in
4 evidence, but when you're asking him do I have the same idea
5 of whether they're going to do one thing or another when
6 they come in, I think that's problematic as a question.
7 MR. SILVERMAN: There's evidence in the record.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Pardon?
9 MR. SILVERMAN: There's evidence in the record
10 that's suggestive of allowing an informed person to make a
11 judgment.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: There's evidence in the record that
13 would make an informed person to make a judgment on what?
14 MR. SILVERMAN: On, on what, what the levels would
15 be when the monitoring system is in place.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's --
17 THE WITNESS: I'll stick to what I said.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: With the body of evidence that we
19 have here, I really try to avoid speculation. It's just not
20 necessary.
21 THE WITNESS: I can give you one non-
22 speculative --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, go ahead, non-speculative.
24 THE WITNESS: Right. That what I did when I saw
25 this was I --

Page 114

1 MR. GROSSMAN: This being Exhibit 593?
2 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry. I went back to the
3 data which is referenced here at the bottom --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
5 THE WITNESS: -- and looked at all of the hours,
6 not just the 98th percentile.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8 THE WITNESS: And there were not a lot, but five
9 or six values that were above 100 parts per billion. Now I
10 acknowledge that that's not the way the standard, that those
11 would not be included in the standard, but it is evidence
12 that higher values are possible and I would suggest that
13 locating things, locating monitors, NO2, one hour monitors
14 in more highly trafficked areas would tend to show more of
15 these points at or beyond the red line.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Your witness nicely got
17 around my question, my --
18 THE WITNESS: He did.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- my objection.
20 THE WITNESS: It's not a red line? I'm color
21 blind.
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q And going back to the, the Sonoma study that we
24 discussed earlier, Table 3-3, on page 318, which reflect
25 near road monitors --

Page 115

1 MR. GROSSMAN: That's Exhibit --
2 MS. ROSENFELD: -- near road monitor readings.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- 602?
4 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Can you, and --
6 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7 Q Do those, do those readings --
8 A I'm trying to find --
9 Q -- provide you with any additional information?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: You're on page 3-3?
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Table 3-3 on page 318.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13 THE WITNESS: This is the STI Sonoma, Table what?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: It's Table 3-3 on page 3-18.
15 THE WITNESS: Well, this doesn't relate directly
16 to the issue of the level of NO2, it relates to the NO2 to
17 NOX ratio.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
19 THE WITNESS: So I don't think this has a, has,
20 necessarily has a bearing except that to show that
21 conversion takes place, can take place very near to
22 trafficking areas.
23 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24 Q Okay. Dr. Cole, we've spent a good bit of time
25 talking about Mobile 6 versus Moves and proper conversion.

Page 116

1 A Right.
2 Q Or scaling factors --
3 A Right.
4 Q -- as between those two models. Does Mr. Sullivan
5 address Moves v. Mobile 6 in his rebuttal report and have
6 you reviewed that analysis and do you have an opinion as to
7 how he treated it?
8 A Yes, I do.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, now you asked two questions,
10 so I'm not sure what the yes is in response to.
11 THE WITNESS: Okay.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Did Mr. Sullivan --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: Did --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- address the Moves v. Mobile 6
15 issue in his rebuttal report?
16 THE WITNESS: He did.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And do you have an
18 opinion regarding his analysis?
19 THE WITNESS: I do.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21 THE WITNESS: I can't accept it as valid for a
22 number of reasons.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Could you speak up?
24 THE WITNESS: Okay.
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Thanks.

Page 117

1 THE WITNESS: Number one is that the study from
2 which he draws this, his conclusion. And his graph, his
3 graph shows that at very low speeds that Mobile 6 has
4 concentrations which are higher than Moves, which is
5 different from the evidence that, certainly that I put into
6 the record and different from information provided by the
7 Federal Highway Administration.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, just so we know what we're
9 talking about here, you're talking about NO2 now, right, as
10 opposed to PM 2.5?
11 THE WITNESS: We're talking about NOX.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, NOX, okay.
13 THE WITNESS: Emissions. We're talking about now,
14 I'm sorry, not to frame it, but --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I just want to make sure
16 you, that because we had different, we had different
17 analyses with respect to Moves v. Mobile 6, depending on
18 whether we're talking about PM 2.5 or we're talking about
19 NOX. So I wanted to make sure what you're referring to.
20 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm referring to NOX --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: -- emissions. And Mobile 6, which
23 is no longer an approved model, versus Moves, which is EPA
24 since 2010 at least has been the official regulatory model
25 for emissions. So Mr. Sullivan, as we know, used Mobile 6

Page 118

1 and evidence that I put into the record previously was the
2 Federal Highway Administration report. It was Quagit
3 (phonetic sp.), the Quagit report. It showed the opposite.
4 It was Quagit 2010.
5 And for NOX, it showed that at those low speeds,
6 Moves gave values of emissions of NOX twice those, roughly
7 twice those of Mobile 6. Now --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: What about the distinction he
9 makes, fleet mix versus solely gasoline vehicles, because
10 the gas station queues, the gas station is not proposed to
11 sell diesel fuel, so it will only have, it will only have
12 cars queuing that are gasoline --
13 THE WITNESS: Well, I --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- cars?
15 THE WITNESS: I think you could show that the
16 loading dock is part of the fleet and there are trucks --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: The loading dock is not, well, I
18 mean it factors in here, but not as part of the gas station
19 per say, okay?
20 THE WITNESS: So one issue is whether we can trust
21 this particular report which purports to separate out
22 vehicles by type.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Uh-huh.
24 THE WITNESS: And --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: That's the Appendix E, that's a

Page 119

1 report in Appendix E at page 41 of the Sullivan rebuttal
2 which is Exhibit 466, is that correct? Is this 461 or is
3 it, I can't remember, 466? I couldn't read my own
4 handwriting. What a shock.
5 THE WITNESS: Yes, there you're referring to the
6 one I've labeled here as the Ozguven or Ozguven. Let's see
7 what -- this report was produced by a civil engineer
8 professor and his post-doctoral student at Rutgers
9 University. It was not produced by U.S. EPA, number one.
10 It was not produced by a state agency. It was not something
11 that was published or peer reviewed. And I'm troubled
12 because if you look at the figures, and I've put this on my
13 slides, there's a lot of issues about the way these graphs
14 are labeled and both in terms of the kind of vehicle that's
15 being monitored, but also the particular pollutant that's
16 being monitored. And I can show that in the -- do we have
17 the slides somewhere?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Your slides?
19 THE WITNESS: Yes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: That's Exhibit --
21 THE WITNESS: Do you have a copy --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- 581.
23 THE WITNESS: I seemed to have lost everything
24 that I -- here it is. I've got it. I'm sorry.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Which side are you referring?

Page 120

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. That's Slide 15 --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: -- shows, and the issue is here that
4 for the first time Mr. Sullivan applies a scaling factor to
5 get from Mobile to Moves.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
7 THE WITNESS: He previously acknowledged that he
8 hadn't done any correction factors in his earlier reports.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think that's correct. I
10 think that he testified that he used the 10 times factor for
11 PM 2.5 upgrade from Mobile 6 --
12 THE WITNESS: That's correct.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to Moves and I think he doubled
14 it for --
15 THE WITNESS: Well --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- if I recollect, maybe I'm
17 recalling correctly, I guess I'll look back at the testimony
18 and see. Well, he --
19 THE WITNESS: Well, specifically he testified --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- well, let me, let me finish --
21 THE WITNESS: Okay.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: I thought he testified that he
23 doubled it or he took into consideration, I forget how he
24 took into consideration exactly that the Moves model showed
25 twice the level of NOX as the Mobile 6 one, but in this

Page 121

1 report, of course, in the rebuttal report, he analyzed it
2 further.
3 THE WITNESS: Okay. So my recollection is, which
4 is different than yours --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
6 THE WITNESS: -- is that he testified, I believe
7 it was on September 20th, that he had, that he agreed with
8 the factor of two difference --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
10 THE WITNESS: -- but that he did not include that
11 in his modeling.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: You may be correct. I'll obviously
13 review it when I --
14 THE WITNESS: So that's --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- review all the evidence.
16 THE WITNESS: Right. So suddenly when it comes to
17 the rebuttal report, we now get a correction factor that
18 rather than scale up the emissions, which he never did, and
19 rather to stick to his original emissions, which he did in
20 the previous reports, he now multiplies the emission factor
21 by .7. He gets this from the figure that's shown on No. 15,
22 page 15 of the slides.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. He gets it from this,
24 the --
25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

Page 122

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- based on the study --
2 THE WITNESS: The study.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that we just discussed?
4 THE WITNESS: Yes, right. Okay. Fair enough. He
5 shows Mobile 6 with a value of about 1.9, Moves with a
6 factor of 1.3 at these low speeds.
7 Now here I mentioned some problems. If you look
8 at the curve that's supposed to be passenger cars and you
9 look at it, it's labeled buses underneath. Now that could
10 be a, it's probably just a typographical error, that the one
11 that's labeled buses, it has cars underneath.
12 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
13 Q Dr. Cole, which slide are you on?
14 A 16.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm just wondering, where did your
16 charts come from in Mr. Sullivan's --
17 THE WITNESS: That would be -- do we have that?
18 MS. ROSENFELD: They, they came from the Ozguven
19 report.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
21 THE WITNESS: So that was one, one concern that,
22 as I --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: So, I just want to understand what
24 you're saying. You're saying that you took figures that
25 were, these figures that you have on slides 15, 16 and 17

Page 123

1 are directly from the Ozguven report?
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Which I don't think itself
4 is in the, in the record here --
5 MS. ROSENFELD: No, it's not.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- it's just the reference in
7 Appendix 80 of the --
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Correct. It was referenced by --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Mr. Sullivan.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: And so which of the, which is the,
12 the chart that you say conflates incorrectly? Pardon my --
13 THE WITNESS: That is Figure 4.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure 4? Okay.
15 THE WITNESS: Right.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: And let me see. So --
17 (Discussion off the record.)
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I see. This is a -- you're
19 talking about the caption underneath the --
20 THE WITNESS: Yes.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- underneath.
22 THE WITNESS: The caption is different from the
23 label.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
25 THE WITNESS: Now it could be that that's a

Page 124

1 typographical error and, in fact, the proper labeling is
2 given in the box rather than in the thing below.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Which is consistently
4 color-coded --
5 THE WITNESS: Yes.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and that is consistent
7 throughout, so --
8 THE WITNESS: Yes.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- okay. All right.
10 THE WITNESS: The next problem is that if you look
11 at Figure 6, which is supposed to be hydrocarbons, that's
12 labeled NOX and it's identical to Figure 4, which is
13 supposed to be labeled as NOX. So it --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: You're saying there's a labeling
15 issue?
16 THE WITNESS: There's a labeling issue, but it, it
17 speaks of a kind of, not attention to detail, but it makes
18 me nervous about the entire report. And also the purpose of
19 this report which was never, is not in any EPA guidance, it
20 was a suggestion that they made at a conference of, gee,
21 it's complicated to do Move 6. It's all this computer time
22 and so we want to come up with a shortcut to get you from
23 the old, obsolete model Moves to Mobile.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Who said that? Who said that?
25 THE WITNESS: That's in the report, the objective

Page 125

1 as they stated is to make things easier for agencies --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: -- recognizing that Moves, while a
4 more sophisticated tool that allows for more options and
5 better represents actual conditions, is harder to use.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: So they said then, well, let's come
8 up with a tool that makes it easier, okay, and you can use,
9 you know, you do what Mr. Sullivan does, use these tools --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 THE WITNESS: -- to come up with a correction
12 factor.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: Now I have problems with this
15 because it's not a sanctioned tool. It's at odds with the
16 evidence that I presented in the Federal Highway
17 Administration and it's also at odds with a study conducted
18 by the Texas, the Texas, the --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: There's the magnifying glass.
20 THE WITNESS: It's by an agency that's similar to
21 COG and it's, I'll give you the exact title here. But this
22 is, this chart which is specific and I'll try to get this --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: That's not a scientific study,
24 right?
25 THE WITNESS: What?

Page 126

1 MR. GROSSMAN: The COG, whatever the equivalent,
2 Texas COG study, you're not suggesting that's a scientific
3 statement? You're saying it's, that, that the Appendix,
4 Ozguven, what's the guy's name again, the --
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Ozguven.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Ozguven report has been
7 contradicted by evidence that you previously presented and
8 by this Texas COG --
9 THE WITNESS: Right. Which shows just the
10 opposite.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was the question. Is
12 the COG, a Texas COG report, is that a compilation of data
13 or is that an analysis?
14 THE WITNESS: That's an analysis based on, I
15 believe it's the Houston area. And it specific, they sorted
16 it out specifically by passenger cars.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: And they found that Mobile 6
18 understated contrary to Ozguven understated NOX from
19 passenger cars as a breakdown?
20 THE WITNESS: Correct. About a factor of, at low
21 speeds, about a factor of a little more than two, which was
22 similar to the result in the Federal Highway Administration
23 report.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: And you're sure? Have you looked
25 at that study and they didn't just base that on the evidence

Page 127

1 that you previously supplied as to how to evaluate the
2 comparison of Moves with Mobile 6?
3 THE WITNESS: As I can acknowledge, the, the
4 Federal Highway Administration appears to reflect fleet
5 averages --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Well --
7 THE WITNESS: -- which Mr. Sullivan has said,
8 well, that's different from motor vehicles in a queue, for
9 example.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I didn't make my question clear. I
11 just want to know if your reference to the Texas COG study,
12 is that reference based on your looking at the study and
13 determining that, in fact, they have analyzed results and
14 determined that cars produce by a factor of two less NO2 or
15 that their, or that the, in other words, that the Mobile 6
16 understates it rather than overstates it for cars at slow
17 speeds, or is it just based on them applying to a model the,
18 the previous assumptions about the relationship between
19 Mobile 6?
20 THE WITNESS: No, this is a different analysis
21 based on a different examination of conditions in, in
22 Texas --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And I might add that since
24 this is segregated by vehicle type --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 128

1 THE WITNESS: -- it clearly didn't come from the
2 Federal Highway Administration which looks at the averages.
3 But despite that, the two, the two are in line with one
4 another.
5 Now let me, let me make the point that Mr.
6 Sullivan had some choices. He, when the evidence seemed to
7 show that NOX from Moves was twice as high as for Mobile, he
8 didn't, did not apply that. He acknowledged that in his
9 testimony, but he didn't apply it. Then it comes to this
10 rebuttal report and suddenly he's coming up with a reduction
11 factor, another retreat from conservatism based on an
12 unpublished study that is not referenced in any EPA manual
13 on emissions that I've seen and is contradicted by other
14 evidence.
15 So one of his choices might have been to just not
16 use a scaling factor. So it's, it's interesting to me that
17 when he wants to reduce concentration, suddenly there's a
18 negative scaling factor, a scale down factor, but I, I would
19 say that this, this evidence at this point is such that he
20 should have just, if he didn't want to use a scaling factor,
21 don't use a scaling factor. But for goodness sakes, don't
22 cherry-pick the literature and use a scale-down factor when
23 there's no real basis for it in the guidance.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Now I, I don't have a basis for
25 whether he cherry-picked the literature or not, but I do

Page 129

1 question when you say that it's inconsistent, putting aside
2 the Texas COG study for a second, if, in fact, the other
3 figures that you gave were based on fleet averages and
4 didn't look at the breakdown between cars and other
5 vehicles, is it accurate to say that that is inconsistent
6 with the, with the studies cited by Mr. Sullivan which
7 looked at something different, looked at a breakdown? I
8 don't know if they're inconsistent. They may be, it may be
9 that had the Federal Government looked at the breakdown, it
10 would have come to the same conclusion. I'm just saying
11 that they're looking at, one is looking at the whole and
12 another is looking at the parts of it. So I just wonder
13 whether you say, you can legitimately say they're
14 inconsistent?
15 THE WITNESS: Well, he picked --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: It doesn't really matter to me.
17 THE WITNESS: All right. So --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Inconsistent or not --
19 THE WITNESS: We have two experts going over this
20 issue, so he comes up with one study, I come up with another
21 study. This is exactly why EPA has -- when you depart from
22 guidance, they want justification and they want to be part
23 of the -- they want to observe that process because it, you
24 can, let me tell you that --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: And that's exactly why we have

Page 130

1 dueling experts and extensive cross-examination and plenty
2 of time for people to come up with studies as part of this
3 process.
4 THE WITNESS: Okay.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: So they each have their ways of, of
6 producing some approximation of truth. All right. Go
7 ahead. I've finished.
8 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9 Q For the record, what, what does the acronym COG
10 stand for?
11 A Council of Government.
12 Q So the Texas study that you're referencing?
13 A This is, print is so small. I apologize, but --
14 Q But it was a Government-sponsored study?
15 A It is a -- this is, the Moves model, I said
16 Houston. From the Moves model, Dallas Fort Worth, Texas
17 area case study. So north, Council of Government, and it
18 says North Central Texas, I believe, Council of Government.
19 So that would fit the Dallas/Fort Worth area.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Do we have a copy of that?
21 MS. ROSENFELD: There are excerpts in the slides.
22 I don't have a full copy of the report.
23 MR. GOECKE: So you have not produced a copy of
24 this report, have you?
25 MS. ROSENFELD: I don't recall, if was in --

Page 131

1 THE WITNESS: We can do that.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: -- the prior submissions. I don't
3 have a copy with me today.
4 MR. GOECKE: Is this, is this the document
5 referring to you, Dr. Cole?
6 THE WITNESS: I believe that's it, yes. That's
7 the document.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: May I see that, Mr. Goecke? Can
9 you read to me what the name is on here for the record?
10 MR. GOECKE: Can I?
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
12 MR. GOECKE: Are you putting me on the spot?
13 Madhussudhan Venugopal.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. You got that? All right. I
15 know that's Central Texas Council Government.
16 THE WITNESS: Well, may I, may I just add a
17 footnote to the name? It's Nolastrangenobgood (phonetic
18 sp.).
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not making fun of the name, I
20 just had a problem pronouncing it. All right.
21 THE WITNESS: There are a lot of good tech people
22 that come from other places.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sure. Hold on a second. Mr.
24 Goecke, can I make this a part of the record or is this your
25 only copy or --

Page 132

1 MR. GOECKE: That is our only copy, that I know
2 of.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy --
4 MS. ROSENFELD: I do not. We don't, no.
5 MR. GOECKE: This is the one we found on our own.
6 It wasn't provided before. I mean, our concern with that is
7 it's merely a Powerpoint presentation, it's not an actual
8 report. So --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: That was what my question was going
10 to, what kind of a study was this? Was this is a, was it
11 Council of Government? Could this mean somebody didn't
12 prepare the study? I see something here called Moves
13 converter. What does that mean? I just wondered whether
14 they just did a conversion factor based on the previous
15 factors that you had testified about and did a two to one
16 conversion factor and that's how they got Mobile 6 figures
17 versus, versus Moves. That's why I was questioning you
18 about this, as to whether or not this actually was the same
19 kind of study of the, as the one cited by Mr. Sullivan.
20 THE WITNESS: So my --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: You can take --
22 THE WITNESS: -- my judgment --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I'd love to just mark this.
24 MR. GOECKE: I would, too.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let's, let's, let's mark

Page 133

1 this and then we can see, so we have something noteworthy
2 referring to. This will be Exhibit 603. It is called
3 emissions, emission inventory, inventories development using
4 Moves model, a Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas area case study and
5 North Central Texas COG. And this will be Exhibit 603.
6 (Exhibit No. 603 was
7 marked for identification.)
8 MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, just maybe it would
9 be helpful to remember that Mr. Sullivan, his reason for not
10 using the Moves was because he hadn't heard from the Council
11 of Government on their values, that the Council of
12 Government played a role.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: I recall that.
14 MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
15 MR. GOECKE: All right. But just for the record,
16 this is a different Council of Government.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Right.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Yes. Now let me show you
20 Exhibit 603. Mr. Cole, and can you tell from looking at
21 Exhibit 603, because that's the study you have been
22 discussing, can you tell whether or not, how they got their
23 various figures for cars for Moves versus Mobile 6?
24 THE WITNESS: Well, if you look at the first
25 couple of tables, you'll see that they use each, they have

Page 134

1 Mobile 6 classifications and Moves source types and the
2 second one gives you the units for each that are, that come
3 out of the model.
4 MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, can we make copies of
5 this so that we would have time to review it?
6 MR. GROSSMAN: We'll take a break. We'll take a
7 five minute break and my staff can make a copy of it. So
8 we'll make one, two, three, four copies.
9 (Whereupon, at 2:53 p.m., a brief recess was
10 taken.)
11 MR. GROSSMAN: That's it. You were the one. All
12 right.
13 MR. BRANN: I think that was intended for us.
14 David gave that to Mr. Cole.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I have one I can use.
16 MR. BRANN: Thank you.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm doing that, so that's fine.
18 Okay. So I think where we left off, I was asking -- and
19 we're back on the record. I was asking Dr. Cole if he can
20 tell from looking at the study how they came to their
21 figures for Mobile 6 for cars versus Moves 2010.
22 THE WITNESS: Well, in my judgment the model using
23 both --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Wait, on each model separately?
25 THE WITNESS: -- each one and then --

Page 135

1 MR. GROSSMAN: And compared the numbers?
2 THE WITNESS: Compared the numbers.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
4 THE WITNESS: And they segregated by vehicle
5 class.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I don't have any other
7 questions in this one. Okay. Ms. Rosenfeld.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you.
9 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10 Q And Dr. Cole, one more question on Exhibit 603.
11 It's the Texas study. In your opinion, is that, is that
12 study a reliable study?
13 A Well, given the level of detail that I see here,
14 I don't think, see anything that, let's put it this way,
15 that, that makes me suspicious. On the other hand, I want
16 to come back to my point which is --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, there's not a question
18 pending, so let's not come back to a point that's any
19 other --
20 THE WITNESS: Can you ask me if I --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: You don't have to reiterate
22 anything. We, believe me, I've been attentive. Even though
23 our copier machine had a sleep time I'm told before it was
24 awakened, but the Hearing Examiner has tried to stay awake.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 136

1 Q Dr. Cole, I have a couple questions for you about
2 Exhibit 567, which is the CAPCOA guidance document. And I
3 am going to refer you to Appendix A, page 33. And on
4 Appendix A, page 33 --
5 A Uh-huh.
6 Q -- there is a table that lists a hierarchy of 11
7 different ways to model certain emissions. Do you see that
8 table?
9 A I do, yes.
10 Q And is stage 2 as shown, as reflected in Mr.
11 Sullivan's rebuttal report, reflected in any of those 11?
12 A Stage 2 you say?
13 Q Stage 2, do you see that reflected anywhere?
14 A Yeah, stage 2 would be No. 11 because it used
15 parent matching.
16 Q And as you go from the first to the 11th modeling
17 system shown there, do you go from less conservative to more
18 conservative or more to less?
19 A This is less conservative to more conservative,
20 I'm sorry, it goes from more conservative, number one, down
21 to number 11, which is the least conservative.
22 Q And is there any particular caveat to number 11
23 that's unique to that level of analysis?
24 A Well, it says may use with the approval of the
25 reviewing agency.

Page 137

1 Q And is there any other level of analysis that has
2 that caveat?
3 A No.
4 Q Okay. In your opinion, is stage 2 analysis is
5 reflected in the rebuttal report reasonably reliable as an
6 indicator of conformance to the NAAQS?
7 A Say that again, please.
8 Q Is stage 2 --
9 A As --
10 Q -- shown in the rebuttal report --
11 A Okay.
12 Q -- reasonably reliable as an indicator of
13 conformance to the NAAQS, stage 2 NAAQS?
14 A I don't believe it is.
15 Q And you've gone through in some detail your areas
16 in which you disagree with Mr. Sullivan's approach. Could
17 you just briefly highlight those?
18 A Yes. We can start with the parent matching
19 modeling and monitoring hour by hour. I think that's not at
20 all conservative and EPA guidance cautions against its use.
21 Secondly, I'm very concerned about these, the no ozone, the
22 40 meter perimeter around the queue, there being no ozone
23 conversion of NO to NO2. I think that's not been at all
24 shown to be the case and is at odds with guidance.
25 Another would be the equation of what happens in a

Page 138

1 power plant plume in terms of mixing, comparing that, those,
2 that data and those, the evidence on the rate of down to
3 molecular mixing in an elevated power plant plume versus
4 what's happening at the surface, particularly in areas where
5 there's likely to be a lot of turbulence and mixing as Mr.
6 Sullivan has testified.
7 I talked about the fact that he introduces in his
8 rebuttal report a scaled down version to go from Mobile 6 to
9 Moves. I see no precedence or mention of that kind of
10 analysis in the guidance, his arbitrary capping of in stage
11 3.
12 Q Well, let's stick with stage 2 for the moment.
13 A Okay. Oh, you're talking about stage 2? Okay.
14 Q In, in your opinion, will the NO2 levels exceed
15 the next if stage 2 were, under the stage 2 analysis?
16 MR. GOECKE: Objection. Speculation. Under whose
17 stage 2 analysis?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: And I'm not sure what you're
19 exactly asking because it was Mr. Sullivan who did the stage
20 2 analysis. I don't understand what your question means.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Let me --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't understand what you're
23 asking.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: I'll retract the question --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 139

1 MS. ROSENFELD: -- and ask it differently.
2 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3 Q In your opinion, had the issues that you just
4 outlined, the modeling concerns that you raised been
5 properly applied, would stage 2 reflect NO2 levels that are
6 below or above the NAAQS?
7 MR. GOECKE: Objection. There's been no testimony
8 that he's done any calculations applying the, the
9 assumptions the way he thinks they should be applied.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I think he can answer that
11 hypothetical question. So I'll overrule that objection.
12 THE WITNESS: My preliminary examination shows
13 that in all likelihood if you look at the, all of the
14 factors I just mentioned, and perhaps some that I haven't,
15 that those will increase if those were handled in a
16 conservative fashion in line with EPA guidance that there is
17 a greater likelihood that the outcome would show a maximum
18 level above the national ambient air quality standard one
19 hour NO2. I stated that as a, as a scientist that there is
20 a significant likelihood or probability. I'm not prepared
21 to answer in absolute.
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q And in your opinion, is the stage 3 analysis as
24 reflected in the rebuttal report reasonably reliable as the
25 indicator of conformance to the National Ambient Air Quality

Page 140

1 Standards for one hour NO2?
2 A Well, in my judgment that's the least reliable and
3 departs the furthest from any of EPA's recommendations or
4 default options and is, in fact, at odds with the guidance.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Did you do that for stage 2 or 3?
6 THE WITNESS: Three, she said.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Three? Okay.
8 THE WITNESS: Stage three, right?
9 MR. GOECKE: Yeah.
10 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's not leave out stage 1.
12 What do you feel about stage 1 of the Sullivan analysis, the
13 rebuttal analysis?
14 THE WITNESS: Well, it's conservative. It is an
15 option, basically total conversion.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Stage 1, not tier 1, by the way.
17 THE WITNESS: Oh, you're talking about stage 1?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
19 THE WITNESS: Stage 1 is, I want to say it's
20 identical, but it's, it's, in essence, EPA's tier 1, which
21 says all of the NOX goes, is NO2.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Uh-huh.
23 THE WITNESS: And that's what Mr. Sullivan's
24 previous analyses is November, August, et cetera, use. So
25 I, I think it's a bit conservative. I would be let's say

Page 141

1 more comfortable with the tier 2, which is an 80 percent
2 conversion.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q And, Dr. Cole, when you testified at greater
6 length about the stage 1 analysis during the course of your
7 testimony, it was stage 1 analysis essentially included in
8 all these 2013 report?
9 A Yes, it was, the text of the rebuttal report says
10 we included this as a matter of, for the purpose of
11 comparison, what it calls the more refined analyses, stage 2
12 and stage 3.
13 Q And earlier in this you've, you testified at some
14 length about your concerns about the stage 1 analysis, is
15 that correct?
16 A Yes.
17 Q And have you in your subsequent review of the
18 rebuttal report read or reviewed anything that would cause
19 you to retract any of the concerns that you've testified
20 about earlier with respect to the stage 1 analysis?
21 A I would say I have a more nuanced position on the
22 issue of total conversion as opposed to let's say an 80
23 percent rate or a, one of EPA's other default options, which
24 is to say I don't think there's anything wrong with going to
25 the OLM, but many of the mistakes are, many of the judgments

Page 142

1 which I didn't agree with in the initial analyses, such as
2 August 2013 would carry over. And then there are some
3 additional concerns, such as the scale down factor.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: Now, Mr. Grossman, I have no
5 further questions.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Cross-examination? Well, I
7 guess I'll, I'll, Mr. Silverman, do you have any cross-
8 examination questions?
9 MR. SILVERMAN: No. If I did, I would have
10 whispered them to Ms. Rosenfeld.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: And Ms. Duckett is not here, so
12 that leaves the applicant.
13 CROSS-EXAMINATION
14 BY MR. GOECKE:
15 Q Dr. Cole, I'd like to start with your testimony
16 regarding the hour-by-hour pared concentrations. It's my
17 understanding that your testimony is that the EPA guidance
18 only allows for that approach in one situation, is that
19 correct?
20 A What do you mean by one situation?
21 Q Well, why don't you tell me? When does the EPA
22 allow air modelers to use the hour-by-hour combined, you
23 know, when they combine the modeling background and model
24 concentration on the hour-by-hour basis?
25 A Well, it says, as I read previously, therefore, we

Page 143

1 do not recommend such an approach except in rare cases of
2 relatively isolated sources where the available monitor can
3 be shown to be representative of the ambient concentration
4 levels in the areas of maximum impact from the proposed
5 source. That was one. Then it says another situation --
6 Q And right now you're reading from the Tyler Fox,
7 March 2011?
8 A Page 21, yes, Exhibit 407. Another situation
9 where such an approach may be justified is where the model
10 of emission inventory clearly represents the majority of
11 emissions that could potentially contribute to the
12 cumulative impact assessment. And it repeats then, except
13 in rare cases of relatively isolated sources, a single
14 ambient monitor or even a few monitors will not adequately
15 be representative of hourly concentrations across the model
16 domain.
17 Q Well, you skipped a portion of the paragraph, but
18 my point is exactly that earlier today you testified about
19 rare cases of relatively isolated sources when in reality
20 the Tyler Fox guidance says another situation where such an
21 approach may be justified is where the modeled emission
22 inventory clearly represents the majority of emissions that
23 could potentially contribute to the cumulative impact
24 assessment and where inclusion of a monitored background
25 concentration is intended to conservatively represent the

Page 144

1 potential contribution from minor sources and natural or
2 regional background levels not reflected in the model
3 inventory. Did I read that correctly?
4 A Yes, I think so.
5 Q And you did not testify about that other situation
6 earlier today, did you?
7 A I testified that in my judgment the fact that the
8 background concentrations were as high they were between 40
9 and 60 percent of the, of the model, of the concentrations,
10 the maximum concentrations as shown in Figure, Figures 2 and
11 3 of the rebuttal report, but that's an indication that the
12 source is not isolated.
13 Q Okay. Well, let's break this down one step at a
14 time. My question to you was, earlier today when you
15 testified, you said there was only one situation, rare cases
16 of relatively isolated sources, but you neglected to talk
17 about the other situation that Tyler Fox contemplates.
18 A I disagree with that. I, I, my testimony was
19 applied. Maybe I didn't read that second piece. I'm not
20 sure. You'll have to go back to the record. But Mr.
21 Sullivan has not presented an analysis showing that he meets
22 the criteria.
23 Q Okay. Well, let's talk about that. So is it your
24 testimony that this other situation does not apply here?
25 A Yes.

Page 145

1 Q Okay. And so with this other situation, it, when
2 it may be justified is when the mild emission inventory, and
3 what does that mean, mild emission inventory?
4 A That would be in this case Mr. Sullivan relied on
5 Mobile 6 to produce vehicle emissions.
6 Q Isn't the mild emission inventory all in the
7 sources that he's modeled?
8 A Yes.
9 Q Okay. And so when all the sources that he's
10 modeled represent the majority of emissions that could have
11 potentially contributed to the cumulative impact assessment.
12 So the, the modeled emission inventory that Mr. Sullivan
13 prepared, how does that compare to the background levels in
14 terms of percentage of total cumulative concentrations?
15 A If I could ask you to repeat that, please?
16 Q Sure. Let's put it this way, the total model
17 concentrations that Mr. Sullivan prepared, are they greater
18 or less than the background levels?
19 A They're about half and half.
20 Q Okay. So, so if they're 51 percent, they're a
21 majority?
22 A Well, in one case the background was 62 percent.
23 Q Okay. So if it's a majority, then it could
24 potentially been this, I'm sorry, the hour-by-hour basis is
25 appropriate?

Page 146

1 A Yeah. And nor do I accept the premise that the
2 background, the modeled area includes the gas station area,
3 the queue, the ring road, the entrances and exits and
4 parking and the area roadways. I am not conceding for a
5 moment that, that that modeling grid incorporates all of the
6 emissions that affect this neighborhood. So those are two
7 lines of answer to your question. One is --
8 Q Okay. We'll talk about that in a second, but the
9 first point I want to make with you is if the modeled
10 emissions are a majority of the total impact, then, then
11 it's appropriate to do the hour-by-hour comparison?
12 A Then you have to go, according to the guidance,
13 you then have to make that case before EPA. They require --
14 any hour-by-hour matching without getting into the legality,
15 the, if we were applying that standard here, you would have
16 to discuss that with the regulatory authority because,
17 because it's, as they point out, it's a very, very iffy
18 situation to assume that the source receptor relationships
19 under different wind conditions at a monitoring site,
20 particularly one that's far away, will reflect the source
21 receptor relationships at the site.
22 Q And so it doesn't say anything in the Tyler Fox
23 memo about seeking the EPA guidance, does it? This is just
24 your opinion?
25 A No, it's right in the guidance.

Page 147

1 Q And point to me, point that out to me, where is
2 that?
3 A You're talking about matching?
4 Q Yes.
5 A All right. I'm going to look in detail to see if
6 they have specific requirements for approval for matching,
7 but there's clear language that as you go to more, as you go
8 to the hour-by-hour match, that the, as they say, the
9 assumption clearly ignores the many factors that contribute
10 to the temporal and spatial variability of ambient
11 concentrations across a typical, therefore, we do not
12 recommend such an approach except in rare cases.
13 But there's general language in this which doe,
14 when you depart from default values that given the added
15 complexity of technical issues that, this is page 11, last
16 paragraph, that arise in the context of demonstrating
17 compliance with the one-hour NO2 NAAQS fuel dispersion
18 model, we strongly encourage adherence to the
19 recommendations in Section 12.2.1 of Appendix W that every
20 effort should be made by the regional office to be with all
21 parties involved, either in a SIP revision or PSD permit.
22 So that's one --
23 Q And this is neither a SIP revision or a PSD
24 permit?
25 A Right. I understand that, and I was clear to

Page 148

1 state that I'm not talking about the legal requirement here.
2 What I'm talking about is the level of guidance, the level
3 of supervision that is appropriate to the level of
4 complexity and to the level of, to the level of uncertainty
5 that's introduced by going to something like hour-by-hour
6 paired matching. That is clearly stated here as a,
7 something that they don't recommend without a great deal of
8 justification.
9 Q Well, as I understand, one of your criticisms of
10 Mr. Sullivan's testimony and his reports is that he should
11 not have done the hour-by-hour compared matching in part
12 because he did not get EPA approval, but given what you've
13 read on page 11, you agree, don't you, that that was not
14 applicable in this situation?
15 A No, I think --
16 Q He could not, he didn't have the option of going
17 to the EPA?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: He, it doesn't matter what he
19 answers. We know that he doesn't have the option of going
20 to the EPA in this situation.
21 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: It's not an issue. Did it switch
23 back up again?
24 MR. BRANN: It did.
25 (Discussion off the record.)

Page 149

1 BY MR. GOECKE:
2 Q Dr. Cole, I'd like to bring your attention to
3 Exhibit 602 of the STI, Sonoma Technology report. Do you
4 still have a copy of that in front of you?
5 A I do.
6 Q And if I understand you correctly, you're relying
7 on this summary to support the position that the ratio
8 between NO2 to NOX within 40 meters of the gas queues is
9 higher than .5, is that correct?
10 A Can you refer me to the particular --
11 Q Sure. Yeah.
12 A -- guideline?
13 Q You said at Table 3-3, page 318.
14 A Okay. No, this, if I didn't make it clear, let me
15 make it clear now that this data, and particularly the, what
16 was the graph, what page is that on? That was in Appendix
17 B.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: Pages 3-18, graph 3-3 on 3-18.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that was certainly one we
20 looked at.
21 THE WITNESS: The label is Figure B-9.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Oh.
23 THE WITNESS: And I hope I made it clear that this
24 data does not reflect, this reflects NO to NO2 ratios within
25 40 meters of the roadway, not, not where Mr. Sullivan has

Page 150

1 used an assumption that it's .25. And I, if I, if I said it
2 wrong, let me say it again, that this data applies to the 40
3 meter distance from the roadway.
4 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
5 THE WITNESS: So he used .25. Clearly, these
6 particular ratios are much higher than .25.
7 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
8 BY MR. GOECKE:
9 Q Do you know what the averaging times were for
10 these ratios that you're relying on?
11 A Yes. These, these are week-long averages.
12 Q I'm sorry?
13 A Week-long averages.
14 Q Okay. So these are not hour-by-hour?
15 A They're not hour-by-hour averages.
16 Q So it's a different, it's a different standard?
17 A It's different, but it's also an indication of
18 what's going on close to the roadway.
19 Q Uh-huh. And these levels here, are these mild
20 levels or are these actual data samples?
21 A These are measured, these are monitors.
22 Q Uh-huh.
23 A And so this shows the ratio for what portion of
24 NOX is actually NO2, is that correct?
25 Q Correct. And so this is from all sources that are

Page 151

1 available near the monitoring location?
2 A That's correct.
3 Q Okay. So this would include not only NOX coming
4 from emissions from the roadway itself, but other background
5 sources?
6 A It's whatever is picked up on the monitor.
7 Q Which would include background, plus what comes
8 from the road?
9 A It could.
10 Q I'm sorry?
11 A It could.
12 Q It could? Do you have any reason to believe that
13 it would not take, would not measure background levels?
14 A No, but since the concentration gradient away from
15 these roadways is rather steep, clearly the weighting of
16 these ratios would be, would be dictated, or at least
17 proportionate, disproportionately large from the roadway
18 emissions.
19 Q Meaning what? Meaning that they're going to get
20 higher as you get away from the road or --
21 A The, the concentrations are going to be higher
22 near the roadway.
23 Q The concentrations of what?
24 A Of NOX and the evidence also says NO2.
25 Q I'm sorry?

Page 152

1 A The evidence in various studies indicates that
2 where there are these concentrations of traffic and
3 exhaust --
4 Q No, I just want to talk about this, this data that
5 you're relying on right here. You're kind of getting away
6 from my question. All I want to know is what do these
7 numbers represent? This is the NO2 to NOX ratio for
8 background, plus the roadway, plus all other sources that
9 the monitor would collect, is that correct?
10 A That's correct.
11 Q Okay. And when Mr. Sullivan used the .25 ratio,
12 did that include background levels?
13 A The point, he assumed that there was no ozone.
14 He, no, he was looking at --
15 Q Just the emissions?
16 A Just the emissions.
17 Q Okay. And so if we were to add the NO2 levels
18 that could be found in the background onto the .25 that Mr.
19 Sullivan used as a conservative estimate for the emissions
20 from the tailpipes, then we would get a much higher number,
21 wouldn't we?
22 A It would depend, I believe it would depend on
23 factors such as the wind direction and what was coming in at
24 a particular time.
25 Q And it would depend on the background levels,

Page 153

1 wouldn't it?
2 A The ration, in other words, what you're talking
3 about is if you took a monitor and as they did and looked at
4 everything, it would reflect all sources that impacted the
5 monitor, right?
6 Q Uh-huh.
7 A So I agree with that. I agree with that.
8 Q Okay. So this is really an apples to oranges
9 comparison because the graphs you rely on in Exhibit 602
10 include background and roadway sources, whereas Mr.
11 Sullivan's .25 includes only the emissions from the cars and
12 not the background source?
13 A Well, the only distinction I would make with that
14 is that it would depend on meteorological conditions as to
15 what portion is background and NO2 and what portion is, is
16 from the source.
17 Q Okay.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: I think I get that point, but let
19 me also go back to another thing you raised that I hadn't
20 focused on before in terms of the apple orange question, is,
21 these are weekly monitored measurements. How does that
22 compare with one hour modeled amounts? I mean wouldn't,
23 wouldn't that be a significant distinction?
24 THE WITNESS: It is a distinction and I, I said I
25 believe this reflected and would be rated, would be weighted

1 in terms of periods when, in fact, there is conversion going
2 on which reflects, well, I think it's weighted by, like I
3 say, by the ozone, for example.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. But my, my concern is, in
5 just, in trying to figure this out, that difference, when
6 you, when you take a weekly monitored amount, then you
7 eliminate that issue, don't you, of whether, how fast it's
8 converted? You just, everything that's available is
9 converted over the week, right?

10 THE WITNESS: No, that's, no.

11 MR. GROSSMAN: Everything that's available, that's
12 why maybe I'm misunderstanding this.

13 THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me, let me get to that.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Are these weekly measurements of
15 one hour or are these a weekly measurement?

16 THE WITNESS: I think these are weekly
17 measurements.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.

19 THE WITNESS: So they integrate the measurements
20 over a week.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: So does that indicate at all what
22 happens for an NO2 one hour exposure, because doesn't that
23 take, doesn't that measurement take into account other
24 factors in terms of timing, how fast it's converted, whereas
25 the weekly, weekly monitoring would not?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, and I would, I would, I agree
2 with what you just said, but I would add that there are a
3 lot of hours when you're not going to have a high ratio and
4 those would tend to drag down the NO2 to NOX ratio. So that
5 the fact that the average for a week is as high as it is
6 suggests that there must be a lot of time during that period
7 when the ratio is fairly high. You're going to have levels
8 dragging the thing down.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you. Go
10 ahead, Mr. Goecke.

11 BY MR. GOECKE:

12 Q You mentioned a moment ago that meteorological
13 conditions would also affect the ratio between NO2 and NOX.
14 Is temperature one of those meteorological conditions?

15 A Please again?

16 Q Sure. A moment ago you testified that
17 meteorological conditions will affect the NO2 to NOX ratio.
18 Is temperature one of those conditions?

19 A It is and it can affect it in a number of ways.

20 Q Tell us about that. How can temperature affect
21 it?

22 A Well, for example, if there's cooling in the
23 surface layer as Mr. Sullivan has indicated during fall, for
24 example, or winter when you have low sun angles and you have
25 less heating of the surface, cooling of the surface relative

1 to the air above it, you get very stable conditions, maybe a
2 temperature inversion and that temperature inversion will
3 repress mixing and affect, affect NO2 concentrations. It
4 will halt and the wind speeds tend to be low during such
5 periods because there's a decoupling of the atmosphere above
6 and down. So those kinds of situations would affect things
7 like wind speed, as I've talked about, and wind speed,
8 slower wind speeds, as Mr. Sullivan has shown, that those
9 cases are often occur at low wind speed periods. That, in
10 other words, temperature has one effect. It's also going to
11 have an effect on the rate of chemical reactions. So, yes,
12 that would also be true.

13 So my point is that when you talk about
14 temperature, there are many variables which temperature
15 affects, some of which may lower conversion ratios and some
16 of them may raise conversion ratios.

17 Q Okay.

18 A But I think, you know, getting back to the point,
19 can you justify a fairly significant part of the modeling
20 regime where you don't allow the sources to intermingle
21 molecularly with ozone and I just, I don't think that Mr.
22 Sullivan has made the case.

23 Q Right. Well, we'll talk about that further, but
24 sticking for the moment on the ratio that you're relying on,
25 and page 318, Table 3-3, there's four cities listed there,

1 Baltimore, Boise, Miami and Tampa. Which of these four
2 cities do you think most closely represents what the
3 conditions are like, can you --

4 A Which, what are you, page?

5 Q Page 318.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: This is in Exhibit 602, Exhibit 3-
7 18, right?

8 THE WITNESS: Okay. You've got Baltimore.

9 BY MR. GOECKE:

10 Q You agree that Baltimore is the most
11 representative?

12 A Not necessarily. It could be. One thing that's
13 interesting about the Baltimore averages is that there is a
14 toll booth, so you've got some congestion frequently at the
15 toll booth.

16 Q And --

17 A I don't think the other sites do, so in that
18 sense --

19 Q So would the toll booth increase the NO2 to NOX
20 ratio, or do you increase that?

21 A It would certainly increase the NOX concentrations
22 and I believe it would, it would, let's put it this way, for
23 sure it would increase the NOX concentrations.

24 Q So Baltimore might be, might be higher than
25 Wheaton because of that, the toll booth?

Page 158

1 A My, you know, I'm not prepared to say which is the
2 most representative, but I think my point was that these
3 ratios are higher than .25.
4 Q And so your testimony before that proximity
5 matters wouldn't apply to this situation?
6 A I've got to, you'll have to, can you rephrase
7 that?
8 Q Earlier you testified that a modeler should select
9 a monitoring site to use background levels that was closer
10 to the location, but does that concept not apply in the
11 situation here?
12 A Well, you're talking about Baltimore here. That's
13 even further away than Arlington.
14 Q But Baltimore of the four cities is the closest?
15 A Yes.
16 Q So using your logic from earlier today, that would
17 be the most appropriate location to use, unless that you
18 point out there are other variables that render it --
19 A Well --
20 Q -- are under it --
21 A Okay.
22 Q -- inappropriate.
23 A All right. From the standpoint of meteorology,
24 the regimes of air masses, temperature, wind distribution, I
25 would think that Baltimore would be more representative than

Page 159

1 Tampa.
2 Q Thank you.
3 A Okay.
4 Q And probably Miami, too?
5 A Probably Miami.
6 Q We've got higher temperatures in Miami and Tampa,
7 generally, right?
8 A That would be right.
9 (Discussion off the record.)
10 BY MR. GOECKE:
11 Q And there's higher solar insolation there?
12 A In general, yes.
13 Q Wind speeds are typically higher there?
14 A But there's also an issue of frequency of cloud
15 cover and things that affect -- there's a lot of cumulus
16 development because of the sea breezes in, in the Florida
17 peninsula that block out the sun at times.
18 Q Is it your testimony that Miami is a cloudy city?
19 A No, it's generally a sunny city.
20 Q Right.
21 A But we're also talking about times of maximum,
22 of -- okay. I'll tell you what. Let's just say that
23 Baltimore is, we suspect is representative. Okay.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: While they're thinking, I just want
25 to go back to this question that was brought out in the

Page 160

1 cross-examination of the, that the .25 cap only pertains to,
2 within the queue area and not count, does not count the
3 other .50 that, at least in stage 3, that, that Mr. Sullivan
4 is suggesting for other sources and locations in terms of
5 the conversion rate. If you add those two together, it
6 comes out to .75. Is that not consistent with what you've
7 suggested in the rest of your testimony as would be being --
8 THE WITNESS: If you could please state that
9 slowly, I --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah, I'm just reading, go to page
11 33 of Mr. Sullivan's rebuttal report. That's Exhibit 466.
12 THE WITNESS: I, I don't have that.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: You don't have Mr. Sullivan's
14 rebuttal report?
15 THE WITNESS: I gave it -- it's in the suitcase.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So page 33 --
17 THE WITNESS: Okay. And what are you reading
18 from?
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm reading the actual title on
20 stage 3 on page 33.
21 THE WITNESS: Where it says stage 3?
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, and it says assessment of
23 expected 98th percentile peak one hour NO2 concentrations
24 using urban dispersion coefficients with a ratio of NO2/NOX
25 within the queue area of 0.25 and 0.50 for other sources and

Page 161

1 locations and current background, et cetera.
2 So he, if I understand that correctly, I mean
3 maybe they're not additive, I don't know, but if they are
4 additive, would that be consistent with ultimately what you
5 have testified, that, in fact, he hasn't really kept it? I
6 guess the assumption of what you seem to be saying before
7 was that he's kept the conversion at .25.
8 THE WITNESS: The first source --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and it seems like --
10 THE WITNESS: -- I've qualified.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
12 THE WITNESS: The sources within the 40 meters
13 is --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. But since he adds in the
15 .50 for the other sources, doesn't the overall modeling
16 estimate, isn't that then consistent with what you said
17 would be appropriate?
18 THE WITNESS: Is --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know the answer.
20 THE WITNESS: Well --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm seriously asking the question.
22 THE WITNESS: -- are you saying that, are you
23 saying then that what he's done here is appropriate because
24 he's allowed the addition of those other sources?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I'm asking the question. I'm

Page 162

1 not saying. I'm asking the question because --
2 THE WITNESS: I think the key --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I got the impression from the
4 earlier testimony you gave on direct that you were naysaying
5 his .25 figure for conversion within the box because you
6 said that was an understatement of it, but then I see he
7 does add in, as came out in the cross-examination, he adds
8 in the .50 for other sources and locations. So I'm just
9 asking you --
10 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to, whether or
11 not --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- whether or not considering all
13 of that together, is his stage 3 estimate then still
14 inconsistent in your mind with appropriate, or an
15 appropriate estimate?
16 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS: It's inconsistent because the
19 largest emissions are going to come from the queue area in
20 terms of what's modeled and even if you add in those
21 diffused sources of NO₂, remember those are dispersing
22 somewhat.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
24 THE WITNESS: You're depriving the NO_x at its
25 greatest --

Page 163

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Concentration?
2 THE WITNESS: Well, at the point of emissions.
3 You're saying that there's no ozone basically to do the
4 conversion. So I don't think, I don't think the two are
5 the, I don't think he takes care of my problem --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: -- with his assumption.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I understand your
9 answer. Thank you. I just didn't want that question to pop
10 into my mind when I was later on going over all the evidence
11 and not have an answer to it.
12 THE WITNESS: It's a good question.
13 BY MR. GOECKE:
14 Q Dr. Cole, are you familiar with the difference
15 between using OLM and OLM group?
16 A Yes. OLM group is, is an offshoot of OLM which
17 allows for the interaction of a different plumes,
18 recognizing that they may be competing for, for the ozone.
19 Q Do you know which method Mr. Sullivan used in his
20 report?
21 A He did not mention the group, I don't believe. I
22 don't recall that. If maybe you could call my attention to
23 such a section if there is?
24 Q I'm just asking what your understanding is what he
25 used.

Page 164

1 A Well, he looked at area sources for the queue
2 area.
3 Q So you don't know which one he used?
4 A To use the group, he would have looked, had to
5 look at individual exhausts, I believe.
6 Q Dr. Cole, you're not answering my question. Do
7 you know whether he used OLM or OLM group?
8 A I saw nothing, now I may -- I'm not aware of it,
9 let's put it that way.
10 Q You're not aware of --
11 A I'm not aware.
12 Q -- of what he used?
13 A I'm not aware that he used the ozone limiting
14 group --
15 Q Okay.
16 A -- method.
17 Q Okay. So assuming that Mr. Sullivan applied the
18 OLM method and not OLM group, that methodology considers
19 each source individually, correct?
20 A Uh-huh.
21 Q In other words, you don't have plumes competing
22 for the ozone in order to convert NO to NO₂?
23 A Just in the OLM without the group, isn't that what
24 you're saying?
25 Q That's correct.

Page 165

1 A Yes.
2 Q Yeah.
3 A Yes, that, so in a sense, the OLM without the
4 group is a more conservative treatment than using the group.
5 Q Right. So you agree that he applied a more
6 conservative treatment?
7 A I assume that he used OLM without the group and I
8 would call that, given this situation, an appropriately
9 conservative method.
10 Q Okay. So then I'm confused about your testimony,
11 then. So how then did the diffused sources compete for the
12 ozone, which I thought you testified to a moment ago?
13 A Excuse me, how did I --
14 Q I thought you testified just recently that the
15 diffused sources within the queued area, within the 40 meter
16 box, are competing for ozone. So if he applied OLM, that
17 seems inconsistent.
18 A OLM does not include that algorithm, let's say,
19 does not use that method, right? Do you agree with me on
20 that?
21 Q Correct. Correct, that it does not use the
22 calculation assuming that plumes --
23 A Have you --
24 Q -- are competing for ozone.
25 A Had Mr. Sullivan or someone else used, modeled it

Page 166

1 in a different way by looking at individual plumes and their
2 reaction, it may have lowered the NO2 to NOX ratio because
3 of competition for the ozone. But, remember, when you
4 change one aspect of modeling, you change other aspects as
5 well. So I haven't seen a tailpipe-by-tailpipe analysis
6 that would reflect the total NOX concentration to which the
7 ozone is titrating into.

8 So you can't parse out one variable without
9 looking at its total impact on other variables. And I, you
10 know, to me this is speculative.

11 Q Okay. I'm not sure that you understand my
12 question, but, but it sounds like we agree that there are
13 competing sources for ozone under Mr. Sullivan's analysis?

14 A That would be correct.

15 Q Okay. What is your understanding of the ratio of
16 NO2 to NOX coming out of the tailpipe of a car?

17 A Okay. Mr. Sullivan has used .25. There are
18 values in the literature, some of which he has put into the
19 record that show somewhat higher values, for example, going
20 up to .3.

21 Q And what literature is that?

22 A That would be in the Norwegian tunnel studies, I
23 believe.

24 Q Is that the Lerner and Lindquist report you're
25 referring to?

Page 167

1 A Yeah.

2 Q But it's your understanding that that report
3 showed a .3 ratio?

4 A That was the, that was the high end of the scale.

5 Q Uh-huh. Okay. If I could, Dr. Cole, I'd like to
6 show you a copy of the Lerner and Lindquist report, I'm not
7 sure this is in the record, but it has been cited. This is,
8 and the name of the document is NO2 to NOX ratio and
9 emissions from gasoline powered cars, high NO2 percentage
10 and idle engine measurements. It was printed in, it's
11 atmospheric environment, perhaps you can tell me if you
12 recognize this?

13 MR. GROSSMAN: You trailed off. It was printed
14 in?

15 MR. GOECKE: I couldn't read the, on the printed
16 copy, but in the upper left-hand corner, I don't know if you
17 can recognize that?

18 THE WITNESS: Sometimes it printed --

19 MR. GOECKE: I think it's Atmospheric Environment,
20 but --

21 THE WITNESS: That sounds right.

22 MR. GOECKE: -- perhaps you can tell us since it's
23 more familiar?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, Atmospheric Environment, Volume
25 17.

Page 168

1 BY MR. GOECKE:

2 Q Okay. And that's --

3 A So --

4 Q -- direct your attention to --

5 A Yes.

6 Q -- may I?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Thank you. This is page 1397 and Table 2 shows
9 the results of denominator measurements. And if you look at
10 the final column, it shows that the high level of the ratio
11 is around 25 percent, doesn't it?

12 A Well, it also shows other situations where the
13 number goes up to a high of 32.5.

14 Q Correct, if I --

15 A That was, that was Table 1. Table 1, I was clear
16 when I said that there was upper bound information that was
17 higher than .25. And this occurred during idling.

18 Q So most of the results are lower than .3?

19 A That's a fair statement. However, I would like to
20 put forth that these studies were done under very cold
21 conditions, minus 6 centigrade, which I believe is about
22 seven degree Fahrenheit, minus 14.5, well below freezing.
23 17.5 is minus one Fahrenheit.

24 Q That's for tailpipe emissions?

25 A These, I believe, are the outdoor temperatures.

Page 169

1 You wouldn't have a tailpipe emission below freezing.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: Sometimes in my car.

3 THE WITNESS: So I'm saying that I'm not sure that
4 these conditions apply, minus 17 degrees Fahrenheit, I'm not
5 sure that's representative of -- we talked about
6 representativeness from a climatic standpoint. These are
7 all winter situations with very cold temperatures relative
8 to winter temperatures in Wheaton.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank God. Minus 17, that's
10 Scandinavian, no? Then, again, they get to see the Aurora
11 Borealis.

12 THE WITNESS: Time out. I need time out. I don't
13 know --

14 MR. SILVERMAN: I'm taking notes for her.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, you're taking --

16 MR. GOECKE: We can take a break now. Now is
17 actually a good time.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Is Ms. Rosenfeld coming back or did
19 she have to leave?

20 MR. SILVERMAN: I, I would hope she's coming back.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So let's take, let's take a
22 five minute break.

23 (Whereupon, at 4:07 p.m., a brief recess was
24 taken.)

25 MR. GROSSMAN: When you said that there were other

Page 170

1 documents that, and, well, except for Ms. Rosenfeld and Mr.
2 Silverman is sitting in for her, but you said there were
3 other documents that you wanted to introduce and I believe
4 you showed them to --
5 MR. GOECKE: Not yet. We're waiting to get
6 them --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh.
8 MR. GOECKE: -- from our consultant.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, all right. I was hoping that
10 we could resolve, finish up, you know, that aspect of it
11 today, but I guess we can't.
12 MR. GOECKE: I think it's unlikely.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 MR. SILVERMAN: Well, are they documents relevant
15 to any of this stuff?
16 MR. GOECKE: No.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 MR. GOECKE: These are health studies --
19 MR. SILVERMAN: Health studies.
20 MR. GOECKE: -- to the health issues that Dr. Bunn
21 and/or Chase and Dr. Jison may have testified about.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. You may resume
23 your cross-examination.
24 MR. GOECKE: Thank you. Thank you.
25 BY MR. GOECKE:

Page 171

1 Q So, Dr. Cole, just back to the report we were
2 discussing a moment ago, the Lerner and Lindquist report.
3 So the Table 1 that you are referring to with the levels
4 above .3, we agree that those measurements were taken inside
5 of a shed, right?
6 A A shed?
7 Q A shed?
8 A Yes, that's right.
9 Q Right. So they're not, they're, they're not,
10 they're in an enclosed area, not outside?
11 A Well, that's the whole purpose of it is to
12 understand what's happening in the tailpipe itself so that
13 the more confined the space in which you're monitoring, the
14 less chance there is that it will react additionally with
15 ozone in the air. So that's exactly why you would do this
16 in an enclosed area to see, because the study is about
17 primary or in-stack values.
18 Q And so it's your belief that the shed measurements
19 are, what, more accurate than outdoor measurements?
20 A For, let me be very specific, for in-stack
21 ratios --
22 Q In-stack ratios being the ratio coming --
23 A Right, in other words --
24 Q -- out of the tailpipe?
25 A In other words, if there were ozone in the air and

Page 172

1 you measured it let's say at some distance down wind, you
2 might get a higher ratio because of the interaction with
3 ozone. But if you keep out the outside air, in other words,
4 you're doing it in a shed, you're more likely to, to get a
5 better, more precise, accurate look at what's actually in
6 the exhaust.
7 Q Okay. And so then in that report then on page
8 1397 it says, when the measurements in the shed made it
9 clear that the NO2 fraction of emitted NOX was higher than
10 expected for an idling engine, the following additional
11 experiments were made. Number one, the car was placed in a
12 chassis dynamometer, do you know how to pronounce that?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Dynamometer.
14 BY MR. GOECKE:
15 Q Dynamometer, this is a new one for me. Do you
16 know what a chassis dynamometer is?
17 A I don't know what that is.
18 Q Okay.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I think they used to use that here
20 for the testing, the emissions testing. I don't think they
21 use it any more because I think it was hurting cars.
22 MR. GOECKE: I see. Well, they used it here --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I had to bring two cars into that.
24 MR. GOECKE: It says that they used it here and
25 run idling after a cold start for one hour during which time

Page 173

1 NO and NOX were measured continuously at the tailpipe.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 BY MR. GOECKE:
4 Q And so, again, going back to Table 2, which I
5 showed you before, we agree that Table 2 is for the idling
6 car, well, part of it is for the idling car measured at the
7 tailpipe itself?
8 A Are you referring to these numbers?
9 Q I'm sorry?
10 MR. SILVERMAN: Do you have another copy of that?
11 MR. GOECKE: I don't, unfortunately. I was going
12 to make copies at the break, but we, ours is marked up.
13 THE WITNESS: So your point is that after the
14 switch to idle, the numbers were 25 or below, below 25, is
15 that what you're saying?
16 BY MR. GOECKE:
17 Q After the switch to idle --
18 A In this particular experiment?
19 Q Yeah, this experiment.
20 A Different --
21 Q So hang on. Hang on. Let's stay on this table.
22 So --
23 MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, it's hard to, to
24 work with our witness when we don't have the document. Is
25 it in evidence?

Page 174

1 MS. HARRIS: Well, they were provided to the disk
2 that we provided to --
3 MR. GOECKE: We have provided them to you, we just
4 don't have extra copies here today. We could, we could make
5 copies.
6 MS. ADELMAN: Has it been submitted? Is, does it
7 have an exhibit number?
8 MR. GOECKE: It's not exhibit number, no.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's, to be fair to Mr.
10 Silverman and Ms. Adelman, why don't we run some copies?
11 MR. GOECKE: That's fine. Do you have, you don't
12 have a clean copy, do you there?
13 MR. SULLIVAN: I do on the flash drive. I can do
14 it.
15 MR. GOECKE: May we go make a few copies?
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. Just ask, ask my staff and
17 they'll be happy to do it. Make, make an extra one for the
18 record here too.
19 MR. GOECKE: Sure.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I figured you don't have enough
21 reading material already.
22 THE WITNESS: No, I read the abstract, which was
23 very short. I didn't go any further because it seemed
24 satisfactory.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Let's go off the record here.

Page 175

1 (Whereupon, at 4:23 p.m., a brief recess was
2 taken.)
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Somewhere in here is an exhibit
4 list. No, that's not it. It would be if I could find my
5 exhibit list. After all that, I can't find the exhibit
6 list. There it is. All right.
7 Exhibit 604, Exhibit 604 is the NO2/NOX ratio and
8 emissions from gasoline-powered cars, NO2/NOX ratio in
9 emissions from gasoline-powered cars, I've got some things
10 after that, but I think this is sufficient to identify it,
11 by Lerner and Lindquist. And that's 1983, I guess.
12 (Deposition Exhibit No. 604
13 was marked for identification.)
14 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may continue now
15 everybody has got a copy.
16 BY MR. GOECKE:
17 Q So, Dr. Cole, turning back to Table 2 on page
18 1397 --
19 A Okay.
20 Q -- and if you look at Table 2, focusing on the
21 final two columns which are time in minutes and then NO2 to
22 NOX times 100, which gives the NO2 to NOX ratio. So as you
23 see in Table 2, after 33 minutes, they switched to idle.
24 A Uh-huh.
25 Q And the first measurement was taken after 36

Page 176

1 minutes, so sometime between, I guess, less than three
2 minutes or no more than three minutes after they switched to
3 idle. At that point the level, the ratio, NO2 to NOX, was
4 14.3, correct?
5 A Yeah, that's what it says.
6 Q And then three minutes later at, at the 39 minute
7 mark it had gone up to 18?
8 A Right.
9 Q And then it gradually increase. At 42 minutes,
10 it's 20, at 45 minutes it's 22.1 and 48 minutes it's 23.0,
11 at 51 it's 25.3 and then at 54 it's 24.1. So after the
12 engine had been switched to idle, after the car had been
13 switched to idle, it took about 20 minutes before the ratio
14 exceeded 25 percent, is that right?
15 A In this particular set of results, yes.
16 Q In this particular set of results, yes. And this
17 is, and if this is the particular set of results that you
18 were relying on for a .3 or a 30 percent conversion ratio,
19 right?
20 A No, I was looking at a number of these tests which
21 are different results.
22 Q Okay. So when you testified earlier that there
23 was a 30 percent ratio, you were referring to what, the shed
24 results?
25 A Well, let's see. I was referring to Table 1 and

Page 177

1 you notice that exhaust outlet under metal box, temperature
2 minus 8.5; engine off, the car ran for 30 minutes, the
3 engine ran for almost 30 minutes and then it was shut off
4 and the value was 31.5. After another three minutes of
5 idling, it was 32.5 and then it bounced around somewhere
6 above 30 for the rest of the period. So --
7 Q Okay. And these, and these aren't direct
8 measurements, right? These, this is air measurements from
9 inside the shed where the car is running?
10 A Yeah.
11 Q So that's, that's different than the tailpipe
12 measurements that are shown in Table 2, correct?
13 A Yeah, I -- I would refer you to, to give a
14 complete answer, on page 1397 their summary of the results
15 and discussion, they come to the following conclusions. A
16 cold gasoline engine emits it about 6 percent of its NOX as
17 NO2.
18 Q Six percent?
19 A Six percent. The NO2 fraction during 60 minutes
20 of idle running rises steadily up to 30 percent. In some of
21 the experiments, the 30 percent is reached higher. It also
22 says that it really, results didn't vary a whole lot between
23 the different methods.
24 Q And your, your reference for --
25 A So the --

Page 178

1 Q Your reference, excuse me, your reference on page
2 1397 to the results and discussion where you say the NO2
3 fraction during 60 minutes of idle running rises steadily up
4 to 30 percent. So that's for, that takes 60 minutes of
5 idling?
6 A Yeah. I also point out, though, that this was
7 under very cold temperatures and the, there's a recognition
8 here that on a really cold and minus 15 degree day, the
9 starting NO2 to NOX ratio after 30 minute build-up phase is
10 smaller, obviously because the engine takes a longer time to
11 get warm in the former case, so they qualify that and then
12 the issue is, well, with a minus 15 degree centigrade, how
13 often do you have that at the, at the Wheaton Mall?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Although it says on the first
15 column in the first page that due to negative activation
16 energy for this, I can't even read the word it's so dark,
17 maybe it's a system, the rate of reaction is enhanced by low
18 temperatures around or below zero degrees centigrade.
19 THE WITNESS: Where are you reading? I'm sorry.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm reading in the first column of
21 the first page of the article, which is page 1395 is what it
22 says on the bottom.
23 THE WITNESS: Which column?
24 MR. GROSSMAN: The first column on the
25 introduction, the last paragraph and it's the last sentence

Page 179

1 in there, it begins with, due to the negative activation
2 energy for this --
3 MR. SULLIVAN: Reaction.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- reaction? Okay. The rate of
5 reaction is enhanced by low temperatures and it says,
6 parens, around or below zero degree centigrade.
7 THE WITNESS: I'm having a lot of trouble reading
8 this. Does someone have a better copy?
9 MR. GOECKE: We all have the same copy.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think I read you what it
11 says. But strangely enough, this reaction seems to enhance
12 the colder temperatures.
13 THE WITNESS: I'm trying to see which reaction
14 they're talking about. I --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: I assumed they were talking about
16 the conversion.
17 THE WITNESS: No. If you look at the equation --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yeah.
19 THE WITNESS: -- it's not the same, it's not the
20 ozone equation. They're talking about, well, I guess this
21 is in the -- they're talking about in the emissions. So
22 they're looking at this reaction, rate constant. They later
23 say here when they're talking about colder temperatures, I
24 believe they're talking about much higher temperatures and
25 what happens is there's a --

Page 180

1 MR. GROSSMAN: They say below zero degrees
2 centigrade, which this is 32 degrees Fahrenheit.
3 THE WITNESS: Well, here they're talking about, I
4 would, I would pose that you're not going to get these
5 temperatures in the stack. I think what they're talking
6 about is at low temperatures in, in the atmosphere is you're
7 not, you're going to have a very low rate of reaction of O2
8 and O.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I was just reacting to what you
10 said about that, that the temperature, the lower temperature
11 would slow down the reaction. I just saw that language. It
12 said the opposite, that's all.
13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, but you're looking at two
14 different things.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 BY MR. GOECKE:
17 Q And so which is the correct formula to look at,
18 Dr. Cole? Is it, is it the one above it on page 1?
19 A I, I would go by the, on a really cold day, minus
20 15 degrees say, the starting NO2 to NOX value after the 30-
21 minute build-up phase is smaller. And for the less cold,
22 minus five degrees centigrade weather, obviously because the
23 engine takes a longer time to get to warm in the former
24 case. So I think they're talking about this reaction.
25 They're saying can we isolate what's happening inside the

Page 181

1 exhaust which occurs at a high temperature versus this
2 reaction outside of the exhaust, which on these particular
3 days was, was quite cold and it's true that this reaction,
4 this reaction is going to occur at a much slower rate in
5 ambient, in very cold conditions.
6 But here they're talking about the efficiency and
7 temperatures within -- because, because the car takes longer
8 to warm up to its peak temperature once the idling starts.
9 So you get, you optimize, I think you see what I'm saying.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure where, if I see where,
11 how this affects anything I have to ultimately decide.
12 THE WITNESS: I don't think so.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Are we arguing about the difference
14 between .25 and .3?
15 MR. GOECKE: Well, no, it's going to be a bit more
16 different, the gap will be larger than that and I'll get to
17 that right now.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 BY MR. GOECKE:
20 Q So let's go back to Table 2 where the results show
21 the actual levels from the tailpipe. And, again, focusing
22 on the bottom portion of columns three and four --
23 A Which table, 2?
24 Q Table 2 on page 1397. So the car begins idling at
25 33 minutes and idles for 21 minutes, at which point he ratio

Page 182

1 is 24.1 percent. How, do you know how long the cars would
2 idle, would be in the queue at the proposed Costco gas
3 station during the peak hour?
4 A Yeah, I think we've used the 20 minutes here.
5 Q Right. So assuming 20 minutes, and we agree that
6 they're not, you know, they're moving slowly, but they're
7 not idling in the sense that they're stationary during that
8 entire 20 minutes, correct?
9 A In the queue?
10 Q In the queue. They move from the back of the
11 queue to the front of the line during that 20-minute span?
12 A Yeah, but -- true. But during the time when
13 people are filling and you're waiting to, to move, you're
14 stationary or at best you're at the, at 2.5.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hopefully you're not running
16 when you're, when you're filling, the car is not running.
17 THE WITNESS: Right. Right.
18 BY MR. GOECKE:
19 Q Right. So, and here's my point, Dr. Cole. And so
20 if you were to take an average of 10 minutes in the idle, of
21 idle time, according to this table it would show a ratio of
22 around 20 percent?
23 A Well, you can look at that, but you can also look
24 at the, the other Table 1, other results which show much
25 quicker and higher ratios.

Page 183

1 Q Uh-huh.
2 A So it depends which, which of these experiments
3 you want to, to use.
4 Q Well, according to the study, they found the
5 levels in Table 1 too high and so that's why they did use
6 additional tests, isn't that right?
7 A Can you, can you refer me to something --
8 Q Sure.
9 A -- that says that please?
10 Q Under, and the page 1397, in the first column,
11 then you have the heading NO2 to NOX dependence on low. It
12 says, when the measurements in the shed made it clear that
13 the NO2 fraction of emitted NOX was higher than expected for
14 an idling engine, the following additional experiments were
15 made.
16 A All right. So I think they're saying let's try it
17 in a different way because these results were unexpected.
18 They didn't expect to find it so high, so they ran it in a
19 variety of ways and then they later say the four different
20 modes of outlet for the exhaust give no significant
21 variations of the resulting NO2 over NOX fractions in the
22 shed. I guess that's in the shed.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I think we've about exhausted this,
24 this exhibit.
25 MR. GOECKE: We have, Mr. Grossman.

Page 184

1 BY MR. GOECKE:
2 Q And just, just the last question on this. And
3 then contrasting the levels with idling cars with the
4 numbers above it for a car operating at 40 kilometers an
5 hour, those levels are much lower around, for the most part
6 below, below 3 percent?
7 A I'm sorry, what are you reading?
8 Q Table 2.
9 A Table 2. Okay. And what --
10 Q For a car operating at 40 kilometers an hour --
11 A Yeah.
12 Q -- the NO2 to NOX ratio is no higher than 3.7
13 percent.
14 A Well, that's, that's, that's when the, when the
15 thing is going at 40 miles an hour and the engine is
16 efficient. It's not -- the key parameters are switched to
17 idle.
18 Q Right, at 40 kilometers power, which is about 25
19 miles per hour, right?
20 A Yeah.
21 Q Right.
22 A That's a lot different than idling.
23 Q Well, that's my point.
24 A I agree.
25 Q Okay.

Page 185

1 MR. GOECKE: No further questions on this
2 document.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.
4 MR. GOECKE: The next categories are going to take
5 a while, Mr. Grossman. This might be a good breaking point
6 for the day.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we return at 9:30
8 a.m. on May 29, 2014, at the same location, that's the
9 Council Office Building, Second Floor hearing room, 9:30
10 a.m. I announce it with such particularity since we're not
11 sending out a formal notice, but this is, under the code
12 this is allowable for a continuance of an ongoing hearing.
13 THE WITNESS: So, Mr. Grossman, is it fair to say
14 that if we didn't break the record today, that it will
15 certainly be broken the next time?
16 MR. GROSSMAN: I, as I said, I didn't count up the
17 days in the last one. That's what we've all been assuming,
18 that, that the Suburban Hospital was 34 days. I didn't
19 personally count them up.
20 MS. HARRIS: And, Mr. Grossman, I think it's
21 probably, the expectation is that we'll finish up with Dr.
22 Cole and then we'll discuss the exhibits --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
24 MS. HARRIS: -- and that will be the conclusion?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I would think.

1 MS. HARRIS: Okay.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Silverman will bring the liver
3 to celebrate --
4 MR. SILVERMAN: Right.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- right? I'm putting all you guys
6 on notice -- you're on the record, you're on the record.
7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're on.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: I have nothing to do with your
9 alcoholic consumption. I want to state that --
10 THE WITNESS: Just one beer is not like --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
12 THE WITNESS: -- I'm not ashamed to admit.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, okay, the record is
14 still, we're still here. All right. Is there anything
15 further that we need to discuss? Then I expect that the,
16 the parties will consult with each other about these last
17 few exhibits so that we have a clear understanding to put on
18 the record at our last hearing, which will be May 29. All
19 right. Then we are adjourned until May 29th.
20 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
21 MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
22 (Whereupon, at 4:52 p.m., the hearing was
23 adjourned.)
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

Petition of Costco
Special Exception No. S-2863

By:

Tracy Hahn, Transcriber

A				
	acronym (1)	186:19,23	6:18	amounts (1)
	130:9	Administration (6)	ahead (5)	153:22
	across (4)	117:7;118:2;125:17;	8:12;73:11;113:23;	amplify (1)
Abigail (1)	45:11;72:13;143:15;	126:22;127:4;128:2	130:7;155:10	63:9
5:5	147:11	admit (1)	aim (2)	analyses (6)
able (1)	activation (2)	186:12	10:17;39:25	29:3;38:15;117:17;
28:22	178:15;179:1	admitted (2)	aimed (1)	140:24;141:11;142:1
above (15)	actual (7)	69:24;82:8	112:5	analysis (55)
33:4;45:4;66:17;	71:4;73:8;125:5;	adopting (1)	air (28)	8:23;18:1;19:1,18,
100:25;107:4;109:8;	132:7;150:20;160:19;	106:25	5:22;22:2;23:17;	22,23,24;28:12,17,24;
114:9;139:6,18;156:1,	181:21	advantage (1)	25:24;28:11;34:21;	33:18;43:18;54:14;
5;171:4;177:6;180:18;	actually (12)	56:11	35:16;39:18;57:17;	55:8,21;57:8;73:14;
184:4	5:16;17:10;31:1;	advice (1)	59:1;64:10;66:24;69:3;	83:2,6,8;84:1,17;94:7,
absolute (1)	34:23,25;59:5;79:1;	26:7	83:20;85:21;96:20;	21;99:16;100:1;
139:21	99:2;132:18;150:24;	AERMOD (2)	98:4;108:24;111:2;	107:14;108:5,24,25;
absolutely (5)	169:17;172:5	24:16;41:12	139:18,25;142:22;	110:9,11,14;116:6,18;
20:18;38:15;59:8;	add (14)	affect (13)	156:1;158:24;171:15,	126:13,14;127:20;
61:3;87:11	20:8;25:17;30:18;	41:16;49:23;102:7;	25;172:3;177:8	136:23;137:1,4;
abstract (1)	43:11;50:13;110:24;	112:23;146:6;155:13,	aircraft (1)	138:10,15,17,20;
174:22	111:19;127:23;131:16;	17,19,20;156:3,3,6;	101:23	139:23;140:12,13;
accept (4)	152:17;155:2;160:5;	159:15	Airport (1)	141:6,7,14,20;144:21;
6:12;24:23;116:21;	162:7,20	affected (3)	47:2	166:5,13
146:1	added (4)	48:10;50:22;103:4	alcoholic (1)	analyzed (2)
accepted (1)	59:19;60:23;72:3;	affects (5)	186:9	121:1;127:13
24:22	147:14	14:15;99:12,12;	algorithm (1)	and/or (1)
accidents (1)	addition (3)	156:15;181:11	165:18	170:21
79:7	17:6;106:7;161:24	afraid (1)	alignment (1)	angles (1)
according (6)	additional (8)	71:19	50:19	155:24
9:20,20;97:21;	5:14;6:10;111:22;	afternoon (1)	allegory (1)	announce (1)
146:12;182:21;183:4	115:9;142:3;172:10;	97:24	61:14	185:10
account (1)	183:6,14	again (16)	allow (10)	answered (1)
154:23	additionally (1)	34:1;35:5;37:6;39:2;	4:5;15:25;21:19;	86:6
accounted (1)	171:14	65:11;83:5;104:9;	43:1;56:7;57:11;81:8;	apologize (1)
89:24	additions (2)	112:14;126:4;137:7;	92:21;142:22;156:20	130:13
accounts (1)	11:24;60:24	148:23;150:2;155:15;	allowable (1)	apparent (1)
89:22	additive (2)	169:10;173:4;181:21	185:12	84:10
accuracies (1)	161:3,4	against (4)	allowed (2)	Appeals (5)
30:22	address (5)	8:10;31:14;77:20;	70:16;161:24	4:4,17,19;26:2,8
accuracy (10)	15:4,16;37:10;116:5,	137:20	allowing (2)	appears (4)
30:8,21;31:11;32:9,	14	agencies (1)	43:8;113:10	32:8;61:10;76:11;
10;33:2,3;39:3,6;40:1	addressed (5)	125:1	allows (3)	127:4
accurate (11)	12:17;23:13;107:21;	Agency (17)	125:4;142:18;163:17	Appendix (31)
12:25;13:14;31:12,	109:3;111:5	58:12,20;62:25;67:7,	almost (4)	11:20;12:2,15,18;
16;32:15;33:5;34:3;	addresses (1)	10,15,18,22;81:15;	70:13;72:6,6;177:3	19:13;22:4,15;24:19;
47:15;129:5;171:19;	27:22	82:15;101:4,7,12,24;	aloft (5)	26:14,16;30:13;31:7;
172:5	adds (6)	119:10;125:20;136:25	21:5,7,11;66:14,22	32:6,8;39:16;40:22;
accurately (3)	21:23;41:25;51:24,	ago (8)	although (3)	41:6;74:11;76:2;84:9,
30:15;107:10;109:2	25;161:14;162:7	14:7;36:5;56:19;	16:8;19:7;178:14	24:85;12,19;118:25;
accused (1)	Adelman (8)	98:20;155:12,16;	always (9)	119:1;123:7;126:3;
69:4	5:5,5;69:8,13,15;	165:12;171:2	21:1;30:16;40:11;	136:3,4;147:19;149:16
achieve (2)	102:22;174:6,10	agree (23)	52:11;84:1;86:20;92:4,	apple (1)
39:3,6	adequate (1)	8:7;11:5;49:19;	16;94:7	153:20
achieved (1)	28:7	59:14;60:4;75:4;76:11;	Ambient (10)	apples (4)
28:14	adequately (1)	95:11;100:21;104:7;	28:10;45:10,15;	75:17;111:12,12;
achieving (1)	143:14	142:1;148:13;153:7,7;	100:7;139:18,25;	153:8
8:25	adhere (1)	155:1;157:10;165:5,	143:3,14;147:10;181:5	applicability (1)
acknowledge (3)	39:14	19;166:12;171:4;	ambit (3)	107:15
98:4;114:10;127:3	adherence (5)	173:5;182:5;184:24	35:24;36:2;37:7	applicable (3)
acknowledged (5)	22:10;38:24;39:5,10;	agreed (1)	American (1)	31:5;95:21;148:14
18:8;56:8;110:18;	147:18	121:7	5:18	applicant (3)
120:7;128:8	adjacent (2)	agreement (2)	amount (5)	54:19,21;142:12
acknowledges (1)	106:2;109:9	agrees (1)	16:18;31:7;64:25;	applicants (2)
71:16	adjourned (2)		100:2;154:6	26:3;28:21

<p>application (8) 23:13;24:1;29:15; 33:22,23,23;40:5; 94:18</p> <p>applications (3) 15:12;44:9,20</p> <p>applied (9) 11:10;12:24;16:8; 139:5,9;144:19; 164:17;165:5,16</p> <p>applies (6) 58:8;72:11,19;97:20; 120:4;150:2</p> <p>apply (15) 16:9;18:20;32:11; 57:19;72:13,20,20; 92:9,20;128:8,9; 144:24;158:5,10;169:4</p> <p>applying (4) 72:14;127:17;139:8; 146:15</p> <p>approach (14) 19:17;29:6,19;45:1, 2,5,12;89:15;137:16; 142:18;143:1,9,21; 147:12</p> <p>approaches (1) 23:16</p> <p>appropriate (22) 9:2;32:21,21,24; 33:9,10,13;45:4;51:4; 88:10;93:1,94:23;95:6; 98:15;145:25;146:11; 148:3;158:17;161:17, 23;162:14,15</p> <p>appropriately (1) 165:8</p> <p>approval (9) 6:6;23:25;24:17; 33:20,24;34:14; 136:24;147:6;148:12</p> <p>approve (6) 36:19,25;58:20; 67:15;88:13;102:4</p> <p>approved (4) 10:9;35:12,12; 117:23</p> <p>approximately (1) 105:6</p> <p>approximation (1) 130:6</p> <p>apps (1) 56:21</p> <p>April (2) 4:12;108:4</p> <p>arbitrarily (4) 18:11;42:16;56:2; 57:13</p> <p>arbitrary (5) 19:4;43:10;57:14,21; 138:10</p> <p>area (39) 13:2;14:8;30:15;</p>	<p>41:16;46:4,14;47:22; 48:11,14;49:21,22; 51:14;54:4;58:3;61:20; 67:8;92:5;93:2,21; 94:9;95:14;100:19; 106:17;107:16;126:15; 130:17,19;133:4; 146:2,2,4;160:2,25; 162:19;164:1,2; 165:15;171:10,16</p> <p>areas (11) 10:17;19:23;45:15; 51:14;92:19;112:10; 114:14;115:22;137:15; 138:4;143:4</p> <p>argue (5) 83:15;108:18,23,25; 109:1</p> <p>arguing (3) 92:10;98:7;181:13</p> <p>argument (5) 22:3;47:1;65:4; 93:11;94:8</p> <p>arguments (1) 96:9</p> <p>arise (1) 147:16</p> <p>Arlington (6) 43:21;46:6,8;47:8; 51:10;158:13</p> <p>around (13) 49:15;62:19;94:3; 97:14;105:15;114:17; 137:22;168:11;177:5; 178:18;179:6;182:22; 184:5</p> <p>array (2) 31:14;50:22</p> <p>art (1) 41:2</p> <p>article (1) 178:21</p> <p>articles (1) 6:17</p> <p>ashamed (1) 186:12</p> <p>aside (3) 17:25;52:1;129:1</p> <p>aspect (2) 166:4;170:10</p> <p>aspects (1) 166:4</p> <p>assessment (9) 5:19;6:3;14:18;28:7, 21;143:12,24;145:11; 160:22</p> <p>assign (1) 56:5</p> <p>assigning (1) 19:4</p> <p>assigns (3) 18:10;57:12,13</p> <p>associated (4)</p>	<p>41:19;72:2;82:17; 91:2</p> <p>Association (1) 5:19</p> <p>assume (3) 15:25;146:18;165:7</p> <p>assumed (2) 152:13;179:15</p> <p>assumes (3) 15:20;29:23;61:21</p> <p>assuming (6) 9:9;107:10;164:17; 165:22;182:5;185:17</p> <p>assumption (8) 9:23;16:20;45:5,9; 147:9;150:1;161:6; 163:7</p> <p>assumptions (8) 23:14;28:12,16,17; 32:21;36:20;127:18; 139:9</p> <p>assure (1) 40:11</p> <p>atmosphere (11) 13:17;15:3,21;25:17; 43:1;58:5;66:21;78:22; 100:11;156:5;180:6</p> <p>atmospheric (6) 12:25;13:7,7;167:11, 19,24</p> <p>attempting (2) 48:4;50:17</p> <p>attention (5) 44:21;124:17;149:2; 163:22;168:4</p> <p>attentive (1) 135:22</p> <p>attorney (3) 24:23;71:7,9</p> <p>August (5) 11:8;14:21;17:23; 140:24;142:2</p> <p>Aurora (1) 169:10</p> <p>Australia (1) 67:24</p> <p>author (2) 96:6;98:10</p> <p>authorities (1) 28:22</p> <p>authority (3) 28:15;36:19;146:16</p> <p>automobile (2) 4:6;66:11</p> <p>available (9) 16:23;23:16;45:14; 52:21;53:25;143:2; 151:1;154:8,11</p> <p>average (5) 13:11;74:12;82:19; 155:5;182:20</p> <p>averaged (1) 43:15</p>	<p>averages (7) 127:5;128:2;129:3; 150:11,13,15;157:13</p> <p>averaging (2) 54:15;150:9</p> <p>avoid (1) 113:19</p> <p>awake (1) 135:24</p> <p>awakened (1) 135:24</p> <p>aware (8) 8:2,6;97:17,19; 164:8,10,11,13</p> <p>away (13) 20:16,16;33:3;48:10; 71:13,16;72:14;74:4; 146:20;151:14,20; 152:5;158:13</p> <p>axis (1) 76:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>B-11 (6) 76:5,6,7;77:10,11,18</p> <p>B9 (1) 73:24</p> <p>B-9 (12) 74:10,11;75:21;76:3; 77:5,6,6,7,9,17,19; 149:21</p> <p>back (33) 15:24;27:17;34:6; 36:8;37:1;41:22;52:17; 54:9;78:4,9;87:19; 88:2;95:8;107:25; 108:3;114:2,23; 120:17;134:19;135:16, 18;144:20;148:23; 153:19;156:18;159:25; 169:18,20;171:1; 173:4;175:17;181:20; 182:10</p> <p>background (60) 5:10;20:3;28:1; 37:21,22;41:20,21; 43:13,14;44:21,23; 45:6,8;47:8;49:12,16; 52:21;61:25;72:3;73:4; 74:22;89:21,24;90:1,3; 91:4,10,13,19,25;92:3, 4,14,16,18;93:3;94:7,8, 12,12;142:23;143:24; 144:2,8;145:13,18,22; 146:2;151:4,7,13; 152:8,12,18,25;153:10, 12,15;158:9;161:1</p> <p>backgrounds (1) 56:4</p> <p>back-ups (2) 105:16;107:18</p> <p>balance (2)</p>	<p>28:23;30:25</p> <p>balancing (1) 32:4</p> <p>Baltimore (10) 77:2;157:1,8,10,13, 24;158:12,14,25; 159:23</p> <p>band (4) 31:18,20,23,24</p> <p>barriers (1) 95:12</p> <p>base (2) 21:20;126:25</p> <p>based (21) 28:12;32:10;39:20; 41:14;42:19;56:6; 57:14;71:17;72:5; 76:11;78:25;104:19; 113:2;122:1;126:14; 127:12,17,21;128:11; 129:3;132:14</p> <p>basic (5) 16:20;57:12;63:15; 66:3,24</p> <p>Basically (14) 16:13;22:6;24:11; 29:23;41:1;42:8;57:2; 64:5;67:13;79:8;80:2; 96:16;140:15;163:3</p> <p>basics (1) 25:20</p> <p>basis (13) 19:9;24:18;26:7; 40:4;44:22;45:12; 46:10;50:18;94:2; 128:23,24;142:24; 145:24</p> <p>bearing (1) 115:20</p> <p>becomes (3) 15:21;16:1;17:7</p> <p>beer (1) 186:10</p> <p>began (1) 30:4</p> <p>Beginning (1) 44:8</p> <p>begins (3) 78:23;179:1;181:24</p> <p>begun (1) 4:12</p> <p>behalf (1) 4:16</p> <p>belief (1) 171:18</p> <p>below (14) 71:4;72:25;104:22; 124:2;139:6;168:22; 169:1;173:14,14; 178:18;179:6;180:1; 184:6,6</p> <p>Beltsville (1) 47:9</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>benefit (3) 9:14,16,17 best (3) 41:11;42:7;182:14 better (7) 39:25,25;55:1;106:8; 125:5;172:5;179:8 beyond (11) 18:11,13;29:25;31:3; 74:18;75:6;79:11,12; 80:17;100:25;114:15 big (7) 17:12;23:5;64:3,17, 19;93:25;100:17 bigger (1) 32:15 billion (6) 71:3;72:12;76:20; 105:4,7;114:9 birthday (3) 7:19;47:6;87:12 bit (5) 11:19;95:8;115:24; 140:25;181:15 blind (1) 114:21 block (1) 159:17 blowing (1) 93:22 blue (1) 90:15 Board (6) 4:16,19;26:2,7;37:1; 72:13 body (1) 113:18 Boise (1) 157:1 booth (4) 157:14,15,19,25 Borealis (1) 169:11 both (9) 18:20;29:24;31:6; 33:19;75:3;100:13; 111:20;119:14;134:23 bottom (6) 13:21;23:24;109:16; 114:3;178:22;181:22 bounced (1) 177:5 bound (3) 79:4,11;168:16 box (23) 9:7;10:7;18:12,21, 23;29:25,25;43:8,9; 58:2;60:14;61:23; 73:15;74:18;90:15; 93:8;100:15,16,25; 124:2;162:5;165:16; 177:1 box-like (1)</p>	<p>57:16 boy (1) 75:24 BRANN (10) 4:22,22;33:25;34:2, 8,10;112:13;134:13, 16;148:24 break (18) 27:10,11,12,13,19; 78:2;79:2;86:11,15; 87:16,18;134:6,7; 144:13;169:16,22; 173:12;185:14 breakdown (4) 126:19;129:4,7,9 breaking (1) 185:5 breathing (1) 72:9 breezes (1) 159:16 brief (6) 27:15;78:2,6;134:9; 169:23;175:1 briefly (2) 102:6;137:17 bring (4) 48:5;149:2;172:23; 186:2 Britain (2) 67:25;68:1 broad (1) 36:2 broken (1) 185:15 brought (1) 159:25 budget (1) 6:6 build (1) 46:24 Building (5) 4:15;107:22,22; 111:3;185:9 buildings (2) 110:24;111:2 builds (1) 26:25 build-up (2) 178:9;180:21 bunch (4) 31:13;103:12,14,15 Bunn (2) 6:13;170:20 burden (1) 46:10 burned (1) 12:6 buses (2) 122:9,11 buy (1) 62:13 bye (1)</p>	<p>47:6 C C-2 (1) 4:10 calculated (1) 91:14 calculation (2) 66:9;165:22 calculations (1) 139:8 calculus (1) 96:10 call (12) 17:13,13;22:21; 30:23;31:18;48:2; 56:20;60:5;67:8;93:5; 163:22;165:8 called (8) 16:4;17:9,14;23:4; 69:18;70:19;132:12; 133:2 calling (2) 7:6;98:9 calls (3) 57:22;91:22;141:11 came (5) 11:21;17:22;122:18; 134:20;162:7 can (121) 7:1;12:17;13:20; 16:11,18,19;20:6,8; 21:5;22:23;24:24; 27:10;29:14,15;31:9, 12,13;32:10;33:5,25; 35:24;36:9,13,24; 37:10;41:6;43:24; 44:12;45:14;49:15; 51:6;52:11;55:11,20; 56:10,13,16;57:3; 60:22;63:2;64:24; 65:10,13,16;67:12; 68:3;69:13;70:11,16, 25;76:15;77:1,17,19; 78:2,8;79:11;80:21; 82:14;84:6;85:1;86:16; 88:13;90:9,25;92:2,9; 93:23;96:14;99:15,21; 100:2,5;108:17,18,23, 25,25;109:1,2;113:21; 115:5,21;118:20; 119:16;125:8;127:3; 129:13,24;131:1,8,10, 24;132:21;133:1,20, 22;134:4,7,15,19; 135:20;137:18;139:10; 143:2;149:10;155:19, 20;156:19;157:3; 158:6;167:11,17,22; 169:16;174:13;180:25; 182:23,23;183:7,7 Canada (1)</p>	<p>67:24 cap (10) 42:22;43:7;68:6,6, 23;73:14;74:17;83:1; 99:19;160:1 capacity (3) 7:7;35:22;36:17 CAPCOA (3) 58:11,12;136:2 capping (1) 138:10 caps (5) 29:23;42:16;58:2,4; 68:8 caption (2) 123:19,22 car (18) 17:12;62:22;64:20; 67:8,11;166:16;169:2; 172:11;173:6,6; 176:12;177:2,9;181:7, 24;182:16;184:4,10 carbon (1) 15:2 care (1) 163:5 carefully (3) 13:3;26:17,19 carry (1) 142:2 cars (26) 65:1,22;99:8,9,9, 100:4;105:15;118:12, 14;122:8,11;126:16, 19;127:14,16;129:4; 133:23;134:21;153:11; 167:9;172:21,23; 175:8,9;182:1;184:3 CASAC (2) 5:25;71:25 case (40) 4:20;9:7,7;11:6; 12:5;13:8,15;14:15; 17:11,12;19:9;31:16; 33:17;34:13,13;38:25; 39:6;40:12,15;42:22; 46:12;72:1,17;73:3,5; 93:24;94:24;101:3; 110:1,2,10;130:17; 133:4;137:24;145:4, 22;146:13;156:22; 178:11;180:24 case-by-case (1) 24:18 cases (11) 12:23;45:13,23; 46:12;89:15;143:1,13, 19;144:15;147:12; 156:9 categories (1) 185:4 categorize (1) 24:9</p>	<p>cause (2) 28:9;141:18 caution (1) 43:23 cautioned (1) 8:10 cautions (2) 21:23;137:20 cautious (1) 32:1 caveat (5) 6:15;102:3,3;136:22; 137:2 caveats (1) 58:18 celebrate (1) 186:3 cell (2) 56:11,15 centigrade (5) 168:21;178:12,18; 180:2,22 central (4) 82:19;130:18; 131:15;133:5 centrigrade (1) 179:6 century (1) 57:2 certain (6) 11:5;19:8;74:22; 102:2;105:16;136:7 certainly (13) 19:11;23:2;35:24; 38:6,23;39:16;42:18; 43:11;74:14;117:5; 149:19;157:21;185:15 cetera (6) 24:19,19;39:23; 47:25;140:24;161:1 challenge (1) 84:15 chance (1) 171:14 change (6) 50:18;81:11;96:19, 21;166:4,4 changed (1) 61:8 changes (5) 12:13;13:19,20;27:3, 4 characterization (1) 8:7 characterize (2) 12:12;105:23 characterized (1) 96:2 chart (2) 123:12;125:22 charts (1) 122:16 Chase (2)</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>6:13;170:21 chassis (2) 172:12,16 check (2) 34:1;112:13 chemical (11) 9:24;13:1;14:7,8,14, 17;15:10,11;100:14, 24;156:11 chemicals (1) 15:9 chemistry (2) 15:6,8 chemists (1) 39:22 cherry-pick (1) 128:22 cherry-picked (1) 128:25 chief (1) 25:24 chocolate (2) 13:21,23 choice (16) 41:10,10,11,23,23; 42:5;43:10,12,23; 47:17;48:18;49:9;53:2; 54:23;57:22,23 choices (12) 9:6;39:9,11;41:13, 18;54:13,15,16,17; 84:25;128:6,15 choose (7) 16:6;41:24;47:19; 49:16,21;52:25;84:6 chooses (1) 47:7 chose (2) 51:9,10 chosen (2) 53:15;55:3 chunk (1) 100:19 cigarette (2) 62:16;63:21 circulation (1) 107:24 circumstance (1) 33:10 circumstances (1) 32:11 cited (4) 39:15;129:6;132:19; 167:7 cites (1) 67:6 cities (4) 74:13;156:25;157:2; 158:14 city (2) 159:18,19 civil (1) 119:7</p>	<p>clarification (2) 11:24;12:12 clarify (2) 23:15;88:5 clarifying (1) 6:5 class (1) 135:5 classes (1) 34:21 classifications (1) 134:1 clean (1) 174:12 clear (22) 15:1;32:8;36:24; 67:18;84:24;88:11,12; 90:1;95:12;98:24; 100:16;111:20;127:10; 147:7,25;149:14,15,23; 168:15;172:9;183:12; 186:17 clearly (13) 21:22;30:16;45:9; 46:11;52:5;57:22; 128:1;143:10,22; 147:9;148:6;150:5; 151:15 Climate (1) 80:11 climatic (1) 169:6 close (8) 32:14;43:7;57:15; 61:20;64:25;103:5,7; 150:18 close-in (4) 18:12;19:5,10;29:25 closely (1) 157:2 closer (6) 40:1;47:21;48:7,17, 22;158:9 closest (1) 158:14 cloud (1) 159:14 cloudy (1) 159:18 Coalition (2) 5:4,6 coarse (1) 110:20 code (1) 185:11 coefficients (5) 38:18;41:15;65:6; 98:16;160:24 COG (10) 125:21;126:1,2,8,12, 12;127:11;129:2; 130:9;133:5 cold (12)</p>	<p>65:19;83:22;168:20; 169:7;172:25;177:16; 178:7,8;180:19,21; 181:3,5 colder (2) 179:12,23 Cole (51) 5:11;6:7;7:6,9,11,11, 12,14,17;12:8;23:22; 24:7;25:4;29:18;33:17; 39:12;44:19;45:19; 52:4;55:7;68:5;69:12; 73:13;74:1;78:11; 80:19;83:5;88:3,5; 93:14;94:17;96:22; 115:24;122:13;131:5; 133:20;134:14,19; 135:10;136:1;141:5; 142:15;149:2;163:14; 164:6;167:5;171:1; 175:17;180:18;182:19; 185:22 Cole's (2) 8:20;59:18 collate (1) 112:2 collect (1) 152:9 co-locate (1) 112:2 color (1) 114:20 color-coded (1) 124:4 column (6) 168:10;178:15,20, 23,24;183:10 columns (2) 175:21;181:22 combine (3) 16:24;44:21;142:23 combined (1) 142:22 combining (2) 32:5;73:4 comfortable (1) 141:1 coming (11) 47:15;95:13,14; 100:7;128:10;151:3; 152:23;166:16;169:18, 20;171:22 comment (1) 82:11 comments (2) 5:18;8:18 commercial (1) 4:11 commingle (1) 17:3 communicated (1) 6:15 compare (4)</p>	<p>77:19;111:12; 145:13;153:22 compared (6) 86:7;94:10;103:5; 135:1,2;148:11 compares (1) 76:19 comparing (2) 75:17;138:1 comparison (6) 90:17;93:17;127:2; 141:11;146:11;153:9 compelled (1) 44:25 compete (1) 165:11 competing (6) 28:23;163:18; 164:21;165:16,24; 166:13 competition (1) 166:3 compilation (1) 126:12 complete (1) 177:14 complex (1) 29:9 complexities (1) 29:16 complexity (4) 29:11;61:9;147:15; 148:4 compliance (3) 31:22;40:13;147:17 complicated (2) 110:25;124:21 computer (1) 124:21 conceding (1) 146:4 concentration (11) 8:5;45:15;89:25; 91:14;128:17;142:24; 143:3,25;151:14; 163:1;166:6 concentrations (53) 9:13,13;11:15;20:4; 28:2;29:8,23;30:2,15; 41:17;44:22;45:11; 48:12;54:17;57:24; 65:16;66:25;67:3; 71:12,16,18;72:2; 73:24;85:21;89:23; 91:10,11;93:3;97:22, 25;99:13;104:25; 106:8;111:1;112:6,19, 23;117:4;142:16; 143:15;144:8,9,10; 145:14,17;147:11; 151:21,23;152:2; 156:3;157:21,23; 160:23</p>	<p>concept (4) 74:19;78:12;95:11; 158:10 concepts (1) 32:12 concern (7) 16:2;43:23;107:8; 111:25;122:21;132:6; 154:4 concerned (2) 22:13;137:21 concerns (7) 45:1;55:20;57:7; 139:4;141:14,19;142:3 conclude (2) 63:7,8 conclusion (8) 73:20;90:18;92:14; 101:5;104:6;117:2; 129:10;185:24 conclusions (1) 177:15 concurrently (1) 44:23 condition (1) 111:24 conditions (29) 21:7,7;47:11;50:23; 63:5;65:14,14,17; 66:21;84:7;96:13,15, 17;97:21,23;100:10; 125:5;127:21;146:19; 153:14;155:13,14,17, 18;156:1;157:3; 168:21;169:4;181:5 conducted (2) 4:16;125:17 Conference (2) 80:11;124:20 confidence (3) 28:8,13;39:11 confined (1) 171:13 conflates (1) 123:12 conformance (3) 137:6,13;139:25 confused (1) 165:10 confuses (1) 94:6 confusing (1) 77:18 congested (6) 106:19,21,24;107:5; 109:9,25 congestion (3) 105:14;107:18; 157:14 conservatism (11) 15:22;22:11;27:4,23; 29:9,12;30:9,23;31:24; 111:8;128:11</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>conservative (32) 15:20;23:13;28:11, 16:29;3,3,7,13,19,22; 30:2;32:13;34:4,5; 39:11;43:14;57:23; 80:3;136:17,18,19,19, 20,21;137:20;139:16; 140:14,25;152:19; 165:4,6,9</p> <p>conservatively (1) 143:25</p> <p>consider (1) 79:2</p> <p>consideration (2) 120:23,24</p> <p>considered (7) 14:17;15:6;25:20; 28:21;76:10,12;108:10</p> <p>considering (3) 96:13;107:18;162:12</p> <p>considers (2) 79:7;164:18</p> <p>consistency (4) 13:2;26:16;30:18,20</p> <p>consistent (5) 83:10;124:6;160:6; 161:4,16</p> <p>consistently (1) 124:3</p> <p>constant (2) 18:15;179:22</p> <p>construct (1) 4:6</p> <p>consult (1) 186:16</p> <p>consultant (1) 170:8</p> <p>consumption (1) 186:9</p> <p>contact (6) 10:6;61:21,22;75:1; 100:8,20</p> <p>contain (1) 29:11</p> <p>contained (1) 21:24</p> <p>contains (1) 40:17</p> <p>contemplates (1) 144:17</p> <p>contend (1) 65:7</p> <p>contention (2) 67:5;95:19</p> <p>context (2) 72:16;147:16</p> <p>continually (1) 39:24</p> <p>continuance (1) 185:12</p> <p>continue (2) 43:4;175:14</p> <p>continuously (1)</p>	<p>173:1</p> <p>contradicted (2) 126:7;128:13</p> <p>contrary (3) 86:3;100:23;126:18</p> <p>contrasting (1) 184:3</p> <p>contrasts (1) 102:19</p> <p>contribute (7) 28:10,23;45:10;91:9; 143:11,23;147:9</p> <p>contributed (1) 145:11</p> <p>contributing (1) 17:17</p> <p>contribution (1) 144:1</p> <p>controversial (2) 28:14,19</p> <p>convenient (1) 17:2</p> <p>conversion (40) 9:10;10:4;15:10,17, 19,23,25;18:16,20; 19:5,10,15;23:15;24:8; 25:10,13,15;29:4,24; 43:9;59:23;68:6;79:24; 115:21,25;132:14,16; 137:23;140:15;141:2, 22;154:1;156:15,16; 160:5;161:7;162:5; 163:4;176:18;179:16</p> <p>convert (3) 16:18,20;164:22</p> <p>converted (5) 17:7,18;154:8,9,24</p> <p>converter (1) 132:13</p> <p>convinced (1) 82:24</p> <p>cooling (2) 155:22,25</p> <p>copier (1) 135:23</p> <p>copies (8) 103:10;134:4,8; 173:12;174:4,5,10,15</p> <p>copy (26) 52:7;59:17;60:22; 61:9;80:19;81:9;82:8; 102:23;103:23;119:21; 130:20,22,23;131:3,25; 132:1,3;134:7;149:4; 167:6,16;173:10; 174:12;175:15;179:8,9</p> <p>Cordry (1) 6:5</p> <p>corner (1) 167:16</p> <p>Corporation (1) 4:3</p> <p>corrected (1)</p>	<p>44:23</p> <p>correction (3) 120:8;121:17;125:11</p> <p>correctly (7) 96:9;109:5,6;120:17; 144:3;149:6;161:2</p> <p>correlation (1) 20:10</p> <p>Costco (7) 4:3,22,23,25;5:3,5; 182:2</p> <p>Council (10) 4:15;130:11,17,18; 131:15;132:11;133:10, 11,16;185:9</p> <p>counsel (2) 44:15;85:3</p> <p>count (11) 46:22;87:7,10,11,12, 14;91:19;160:2,2; 185:16,19</p> <p>couple (6) 5:11;46:2;54:9; 86:25;133:25;136:1</p> <p>course (6) 7:24;34:13;56:13; 70:15;121:1;141:6</p> <p>Court (1) 4:3</p> <p>cover (1) 159:15</p> <p>cow (2) 110:17,20</p> <p>create (1) 71:11</p> <p>creates (1) 47:13</p> <p>criteria (18) 5:20;6:4;9:3;14:12; 16:2;20:5;26:21;45:25; 46:2;47:20;49:17; 50:10;51:3,12,15;72:4; 90:4;144:22</p> <p>critical (1) 50:16</p> <p>criticisms (1) 148:9</p> <p>criticizes (1) 44:2</p> <p>critiqued (2) 51:8;52:20</p> <p>cross- (2) 37:10;142:7</p> <p>cross-examination (6) 130:1;142:6,13; 160:1;162:7;170:23</p> <p>cross-examine (1) 36:9</p> <p>crossing (1) 95:13</p> <p>crowd (1) 86:15</p> <p>cubic (1)</p>	<p>105:6</p> <p>cumulative (7) 28:6,12,21;143:12, 23;145:11,14</p> <p>cumulus (1) 159:15</p> <p>curious (1) 23:5</p> <p>current (1) 161:1</p> <p>currently (1) 24:15</p> <p>curve (3) 66:18,19;122:8</p> <p>curves (1) 67:16</p>	<p>dealt (1) 95:11</p> <p>decades (4) 36:5;39:19,25;112:1</p> <p>December (4) 14:20;69:18,19; 70:18</p> <p>decide (1) 181:11</p> <p>decider (1) 39:12</p> <p>decision (3) 4:20;40:5,14</p> <p>decoupled (1) 66:22</p> <p>decoupling (1) 156:5</p> <p>decrease (1) 99:12</p> <p>deeper (1) 77:1</p> <p>default (23) 15:23;23:17,19; 24:15;25:4,5,10,12,13, 15,20;34:25;35:3,11; 36:18,21,22;39:14; 79:14,16;140:4; 141:23;147:14</p> <p>defaults (1) 34:17</p> <p>defend (1) 82:22</p> <p>defended (2) 54:18,22</p> <p>defenses (1) 65:5</p> <p>define (3) 31:16;33:2,3</p> <p>defined (1) 75:13</p> <p>definition (1) 76:23</p> <p>degree (6) 28:8;63:9;168:22; 178:8,12;179:6</p> <p>degrees (7) 34:10;169:4;178:18; 180:1,2,20,22</p> <p>demonstrate (3) 28:7;58:24;107:14</p> <p>demonstrating (1) 147:16</p> <p>denominator (1) 168:9</p> <p>depart (2) 129:21;147:14</p> <p>departs (2) 9:8;140:3</p> <p>departure (1) 9:11</p> <p>departures (1) 34:17</p> <p>depend (4)</p>
D				
			<p>Dallas (1) 130:16</p> <p>Dallas/Fort (1) 130:19</p> <p>Dallas-Fort (1) 133:4</p> <p>dark (1) 178:16</p> <p>dash (1) 77:19</p> <p>data (40) 20:14;32:24;33:6; 38:12,21,22;43:21; 44:23,24;47:8,9;53:5,8, 25;57:19,20;74:16; 80:9;82:21;83:7,9,11, 14;85:20;86:5;101:23; 106:20;109:21;110:22; 112:11,18,22;114:3; 126:12;138:2;149:15, 24;150:2,20;152:4</p> <p>database (1) 30:21</p> <p>date (2) 6:6;69:17</p> <p>David (1) 134:14</p> <p>day (6) 4:2;6:8;20:25;178:8; 180:19;185:6</p> <p>days (4) 56:19;181:3;185:17, 18</p> <p>daytime (2) 79:1;82:17</p> <p>DC (1) 53:4</p> <p>deal (8) 24:12;29:11,15; 39:21;43:17,23; 105:13;148:7</p> <p>dealing (6) 50:25;51:1;56:3; 63:11;78:21;92:5</p>	

<p>152:22,22,25;153:14 dependence (1) 183:11 depending (3) 63:5;111:3;117:17 depends (1) 183:2 Deposition (1) 175:12 depriving (1) 162:24 derived (1) 95:4 described (4) 21:16;22:4;25:22; 56:1 describing (1) 98:10 description (1) 24:24 despite (3) 58:17,18;128:3 detail (9) 9:15;21:6;45:20; 54:10;55:23;124:17; 135:13;137:15;147:5 detailed (1) 28:20 determination (3) 53:18,24;92:3 determine (2) 8:4;91:20 determined (3) 67:11;111:15;127:14 determining (3) 28:1;91:25;127:13 developed (1) 101:23 development (3) 9:21;133:3;159:16 deviates (1) 19:24 deviations (4) 13:3;26:16,19;35:11 diagram (3) 104:22;111:9,15 dictate (1) 25:18 dictated (2) 74:23;151:16 dictates (1) 13:11 didn't (1) 15:9 diesel (1) 118:11 difference (9) 23:5;48:16;62:12; 65:11;66:13;121:8; 154:5;163:14;181:13 differences (2) 61:12;93:25 different (59)</p>	<p>13:17;14:23;21:4; 22:8;27:1;34:24;35:2; 36:6;38:12,12;39:22; 40:9;47:24;48:10; 49:23;50:19,22,23; 51:17;58:22,25;62:2,4, 15;77:14;79:13;94:3; 108:6,8;111:7;112:18, 19;117:5,6,16,16; 121:4;123:22;127:8, 20,21;129:7;133:16; 136:7;146:19;150:16, 16,17;163:17;166:1; 173:20;176:21;177:11, 23;180:14;181:16; 183:17,19;184:22 differently (4) 48:10;98:11;102:8; 139:1 difficult (1) 27:2 difficulties (1) 26:24 diffused (3) 162:21;165:11,15 dioxide (4) 5:23,25;6:1;14:12 dire (1) 35:15 direct (4) 88:3;162:4;168:4; 177:7 direction (3) 13:19;83:23;152:23 directions (2) 49:23;100:18 directly (10) 17:22;22:19;37:15; 96:17,24;107:8;109:4, 14;115:15;123:1 disagree (6) 11:5;42:21,25;59:8; 137:16;144:18 disagreement (1) 10:17 discharges (1) 62:2 discuss (7) 6:24;10:16;55:23; 108:20;146:16;185:22; 186:15 discussed (7) 10:20;11:2;51:25; 70:7;71:25;114:24; 122:3 discussing (3) 57:7;133:22;171:2 discussion (11) 28:20;40:23;44:25; 55:9;103:25;111:20; 123:17;148:25;159:9; 177:15;178:2 disk (3)</p>	<p>81:25;82:4;174:1 disperse (1) 63:12 dispersed (1) 64:15 dispersing (2) 63:3;162:21 dispersion (15) 13:1,13,14,14,16,20; 38:18;41:15;96:4; 98:15,25;99:4;103:4; 147:17;160:24 dispersions (1) 24:16 disproportionately (1) 151:17 disrupts (1) 64:12 dissipate (1) 62:20 dissipated (1) 64:13 dissipating (1) 65:2 dissipation (3) 62:23;64:21;65:12 distance (16) 46:5;58:15;59:24,25, 25;60:2,16,19;62:21; 75:18,19;76:9;77:20; 80:12;150:3;172:1 distances (6) 20:15;58:22;63:4; 65:12,12;76:18 distinction (4) 118:8;153:13,23,24 distinguish (1) 21:6 distinguishable (1) 93:18 distribution (4) 77:2;104:14;105:18; 158:24 division (1) 57:14 dock (7) 18:13;58:3;91:2,6; 100:18;118:16,17 document (13) 10:24;28:3;29:14; 58:11;88:19;102:1; 104:6;131:4,7;136:2; 167:8;173:24;185:2 documented (3) 13:3;26:17,19 documents (8) 7:1;11:18;59:19; 71:16;111:21;170:1,3, 14 doe (1) 147:13 domain (3) 18:18;45:11;143:16</p>	<p>dominant (1) 14:14 done (11) 25:19;54:14,15; 59:21;69:2;86:24; 120:8;139:8;148:11; 161:23;168:20 dots (3) 103:12,14,15 double (1) 87:12 doubled (2) 120:13,23 down (26) 20:15;33:4;34:10; 58:15;63:10;64:13,21; 67:2,9;75:4;78:24; 79:2;101:6;103:23; 111:3;128:18;136:20; 138:2,8;142:3;144:13; 155:4,8;156:6;172:1; 180:11 downward (1) 66:17 Dr (55) 5:11;6:7,12,13,13; 7:6,9,11,12,17;8:20; 12:8;23:22;24:7;25:4; 29:18;33:17;39:12; 44:19;45:19;52:4;55:7; 59:18;68:5;69:11; 73:13;74:1;78:11; 80:19;83:5;88:3,5; 93:14;94:17;95:3; 96:22;115:24;122:13; 131:5;134:19;135:10; 136:1;141:5;142:15; 149:2;163:14;164:6; 167:5;170:20,21; 171:1;175:17;180:18; 182:19;185:21 drag (1) 155:4 dragging (1) 155:8 draw (1) 104:6 drawer (1) 56:12 drawing (1) 37:1 draws (2) 58:16;117:2 drive (1) 174:13 drives (1) 64:8 driving (2) 60:10,12 drop (1) 66:14 DUCKETT (3) 5:8,8;142:11</p>	<p>due (4) 21:10;100:4;178:15; 179:1 dueling (1) 130:1 during (17) 7:24;34:13;35:15; 78:25;83:22;141:6; 155:6,23;156:4; 168:17;172:25;177:19; 178:3;182:3,7,11,12 Dutton (1) 96:25 dynamometer (4) 172:12,13,15,16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>EA (3) 81:16;101:9,10 earlier (17) 12:10;25:22;26:13; 61:6;93:14;110:10; 114:24;120:8;141:13, 20;143:18;144:6,14; 158:8,16;162:4;176:22 early (1) 97:23 earth (2) 21:4;47:23 easier (2) 125:1,8 east (2) 107:23;110:24 effect (15) 49:23,24;66:1;79:6; 84:3;86:4;99:13,18,24; 107:19;108:12;110:15, 21;156:10,11 effects (2) 65:9;103:6 efficiency (1) 181:6 efficient (1) 184:16 effort (2) 32:4;147:20 either (10) 6:22;11:11;14:20; 76:18,19;81:11;82:25; 85:25;98:20;147:21 elaborate (1) 19:22 elaborates (1) 86:1 Eleanor (1) 5:8 electrons (1) 17:2 element (1) 10:7 elements (2) 21:11;67:2</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>elevated (2) 20:11;138:3</p> <p>eliminate (2) 53:13;154:7</p> <p>else (3) 36:1;93:19;165:25</p> <p>email (1) 6:5</p> <p>embedded (4) 33:13;39:15;46:3; 63:16</p> <p>embraced (1) 95:22</p> <p>emission (12) 8:25;42:2;101:2; 121:20;133:3;143:10, 21;145:2,3,6,12;169:1</p> <p>emissions (42) 13:10;14:15;17:8; 20:12;28:9;41:21,22, 23,24;47:10;92:6; 93:19;102:7;117:13, 22,25;118:6;121:18, 19;128:13;133:3; 136:7;143:11,22; 145:5,10;146:6,10; 151:4,18;152:15,16,19; 153:11;162:19;163:2; 167:9;168:24;172:20; 175:8,9;179:21</p> <p>emits (1) 177:16</p> <p>emitted (4) 15:21;16:1;172:9; 183:13</p> <p>employee (1) 10:16</p> <p>enclosed (2) 171:10,16</p> <p>encompasses (1) 100:19</p> <p>encourage (1) 147:18</p> <p>end (9) 5:17;6:19;8:4;30:19; 43:8;49:22;57:15; 104:24;167:4</p> <p>ended (1) 78:11</p> <p>endorse (1) 90:6</p> <p>endorses (1) 102:1</p> <p>ends (1) 6:21</p> <p>energy (9) 64:9,9,10,11,12,14, 15;178:16;179:2</p> <p>engine (10) 167:10;172:10; 176:12;177:2,3,16; 178:10;180:23;183:14; 184:15</p>	<p>engineer (1) 119:7</p> <p>England (1) 101:18</p> <p>English (1) 67:22</p> <p>enhance (2) 14:3;179:11</p> <p>enhanced (8) 96:1;98:5;99:10,11, 14;100:6;178:17;179:5</p> <p>enhancement (1) 11:24</p> <p>enough (6) 21:19;56:22;104:21; 122:4;174:20;179:11</p> <p>ensure (3) 13:2;26:15;46:25</p> <p>entered (4) 70:8;82:9,10;104:3</p> <p>entire (2) 124:18;182:8</p> <p>entirely (1) 35:25</p> <p>entrances (1) 146:3</p> <p>Environment (10) 58:12,20;62:25;67:7; 81:15;101:7,24; 167:11,19,24</p> <p>Environmental (7) 67:10,15,17;82:15; 85:8;101:4,12</p> <p>EPA (68) 11:14,14,17,21;14:6; 15:16,18;18:5,19; 19:14,25;22:18,21; 25:5,10;26:3,19;29:13; 31:15;33:14,20;35:8,9, 11,12,18,23;36:1,17, 18;37:8;38:24;39:17; 43:22;67:18;70:21; 71:1,6,9;72:11,20; 79:13,15;83:10,11,25; 85:25;88:8,25;91:22; 101:9,16;104:4;106:6; 117:23;119:9;124:19; 128:12;129:21;137:20; 139:16;142:17,21; 146:13,23;148:12,17, 20</p> <p>EPA's (15) 5:19;9:12,20;12:14; 18:10;20:4;25:24; 40:20;91:17;97:10; 111:20;112:8;140:3, 20;141:23</p> <p>equally (1) 18:23</p> <p>equation (9) 65:7;67:11;74:19; 79:3;96:6,8;137:25; 179:17,20</p>	<p>equilibrium (3) 78:14;79:6;82:17</p> <p>equivalent (1) 126:1</p> <p>Erich (1) 4:22</p> <p>error (7) 31:18,19,23,24; 79:23;122:10;124:1</p> <p>errors (1) 31:8</p> <p>essence (1) 140:20</p> <p>essentially (1) 141:7</p> <p>estimate (5) 11:15;152:19; 161:16;162:13,15</p> <p>estimates (1) 30:15</p> <p>estimating (2) 23:14;85:21</p> <p>estimation (1) 112:9</p> <p>et (6) 24:18,19;39:22; 47:25;140:24;161:1</p> <p>evaluate (2) 31:14;127:1</p> <p>evaluation (2) 39:21;60:17</p> <p>even (19) 15:3;35:18;40:3,15, 24;50:16;74:12;79:22; 83:15;86:21;89:23; 94:2;95:22;106:23; 135:22;143:14;158:13; 162:20;178:16</p> <p>event (4) 7:2;56:16;68:2; 106:16</p> <p>eventually (1) 64:13</p> <p>Everybody (3) 51:21;56:10;175:15</p> <p>evidence (33) 4:18;10:13;19:6; 43:3;58:6;68:25;80:7; 88:14,15;100:23; 102:14;111:10;113:3, 4,7,9,12,18;114:11; 117:5;118:1;121:15; 125:16;126:7,25; 128:6,14,19;138:2; 151:24;152:1;163:10; 173:25</p> <p>evidentiary (1) 21:20</p> <p>exact (1) 125:21</p> <p>exactly (9) 16:25;27:2;61:8; 120:24;129:21,25;</p>	<p>138:19;143:18;171:15</p> <p>examination (4) 37:11;127:21; 139:12;142:8</p> <p>examiner (3) 4:18;27:8;135:24</p> <p>example (14) 14:23;15:6;26:25; 29:5;31:4;41:14;61:22; 83:19;95:13;127:9; 154:3;155:22,24; 166:19</p> <p>examples (2) 42:11;43:6</p> <p>exceed (2) 104:4;138:14</p> <p>exceeded (3) 73:6,7;176:14</p> <p>exceedence (3) 72:23,23,24</p> <p>exceeding (1) 110:3</p> <p>except (7) 45:13;89:15;115:20; 143:1,12;147:12;170:1</p> <p>exception (3) 4:5;91:17;92:21</p> <p>exceptions (1) 90:5</p> <p>excerpt (1) 12:18</p> <p>excerpts (3) 31:5;97:7;130:21</p> <p>exchange (2) 6:14;66:16</p> <p>exchanged (1) 81:4</p> <p>excluding (1) 19:10</p> <p>exclusion (1) 20:1</p> <p>exclusionary (1) 9:22</p> <p>Excuse (5) 33:25;56:10;96:22; 165:13;178:1</p> <p>exercise (1) 30:17</p> <p>exhaust (10) 17:12;64:20;67:8,12; 152:3;172:6;177:1; 181:1,2;183:20</p> <p>exhausted (1) 183:23</p> <p>exhausts (5) 17:10;62:22;65:21; 66:11;164:5</p> <p>Exhibit (62) 5:18;12:2,3,3;24:7, 25;27:7;28:4;30:13; 32:6;44:3;51:17,19; 52:2,4,18;59:17;60:23; 69:25;70:11,14,22;</p>	<p>74:2;81:21;89:7;91:23; 103:11,14,15,21;104:3, 8;105:18;106:11; 111:16;112:24;114:1; 115:1;119:2,20;133:2, 5,6,20,21;135:10; 136:2;143:8;149:3; 153:9;157:6,6;160:11; 174:7,8;175:3,5,5,7,7, 12;183:24</p> <p>exhibitized (1) 82:1</p> <p>exhibits (5) 5:14;6:14;70:17; 185:22;186:17</p> <p>exits (1) 146:3</p> <p>expect (8) 28:19;31:9;47:15; 86:23,24;100:3; 183:18;186:15</p> <p>expectation (1) 185:21</p> <p>expected (3) 160:23;172:10; 183:13</p> <p>expecting (1) 94:1</p> <p>expense (1) 30:20</p> <p>experience (4) 36:4;37:13,15;40:6</p> <p>experiment (2) 173:18,19</p> <p>experiments (4) 172:11;177:21; 183:2,14</p> <p>expert (1) 113:2</p> <p>experts (2) 129:19;130:1</p> <p>explain (5) 29:14;61:1,19;78:13; 92:2</p> <p>exposure (2) 5:22;154:22</p> <p>extends (1) 100:17</p> <p>extensive (1) 130:1</p> <p>extent (2) 30:23;41:25</p> <p>externally (1) 6:4</p> <p>extra (4) 17:1;52:12;174:4,17</p> <p>extremely (1) 40:5</p>
				F
				fact (24) 8:2,10;29:7;36:24;

<p>43:8;51:9;58:18,19; 63:3;88:16;97:20; 100:6;107:16;109:19; 112:3;124:1;127:13; 129:2;138:7;140:4; 144:7;154:1;155:5; 161:5 factor (28) 18:20;19:15;60:16; 84:2,2;92:3,14;107:20; 120:4,10;121:8,17,20; 122:6;125:12;126:20, 21;127:14;128:11,16, 18,18,20,21,22;132:14, 16;142:3 factors (14) 28:20,23;29:24;45:9; 46:22;48:18;116:2; 118:18;120:8;132:15; 139:14;147:9;152:23; 154:24 facts (1) 113:3 Fahrenheit (4) 168:22,23;169:4; 180:2 fair (10) 24:22;30:7;31:1; 32:16;93:20;104:21; 122:4;168:19;174:9; 185:13 fairly (3) 65:14;155:7;156:19 fall (5) 18:4;45:21;99:3,4; 155:23 familiar (8) 10:23;11:7,14;12:4; 34:22;66:3;163:14; 167:23 far (3) 29:22;87:6;146:20 Farmingham (1) 5:23 fashion (1) 139:16 fast (3) 74:24;154:7,24 faster (3) 13:22;63:13;100:8 features (1) 107:24 February (1) 7:21 Federal (7) 117:7;118:2;125:16; 126:22;127:4;128:2; 129:9 feed (1) 64:4 feel (7) 44:25;55:2;56:15,19; 59:22,25;140:12</p>	<p>feet (1) 100:17 felt (1) 111:23 few (9) 6:16;20:8;34:10; 39:9;56:19;88:5; 143:14;174:15;186:17 figure (26) 61:8,12;73:24;74:10; 75:21,22;76:2;77:5,6,9, 19;90:9,10,11,22,23; 91:13;121:21;123:13, 14;124:11,12;144:10; 149:21;154:5;162:5 figured (2) 56:20;174:20 Figures (10) 88:16,23;119:12; 122:24,25;129:3; 132:16;133:23;134:21; 144:10 file (1) 52:12 filed (2) 5:14;52:11 files (1) 6:25 filled (1) 58:18 filling (3) 4:6;182:13,16 final (4) 6:8;70:18;168:10; 175:21 finally (1) 56:20 find (8) 19:13;28:22;41:6; 70:11;115:8;175:4,5; 183:18 finds (1) 29:2 fine (3) 96:12;134:17;174:11 finish (6) 6:23;53:23;108:12; 120:20;170:10;185:21 finished (1) 130:7 firm (1) 65:17 first (30) 6:4;7:10;11:21; 14:19;15:19;17:17; 23:20;24:3;34:23;51:2; 62:16,16;70:14;72:18; 73:21;97:2,3;106:3; 120:4;133:24;136:16; 146:9;161:8;175:25; 178:14,15,20,21,24; 183:10 fit (1)</p>	<p>130:19 five (14) 6:16;27:13;40:7; 62:24;78:4;83:13; 84:18;85:2,14,19; 114:8;134:7;169:22; 180:22 fixing (1) 9:9 flash (1) 174:13 fleet (4) 118:9,16;127:4; 129:3 floor (2) 4:14;185:9 Florida (1) 159:16 flow (5) 13:11;64:10,11; 83:20;111:2 flowing (1) 94:6 flows (2) 13:18;57:17 focused (2) 110:23;153:20 focusing (2) 175:20;181:21 follow (2) 26:3;27:2 followed (1) 39:18 following (5) 5:14;101:8;172:10; 177:15;183:14 footnote (1) 131:17 forget (1) 120:23 forgive (1) 82:13 forgot (1) 56:14 form (4) 17:1;64:9,14,15 formal (1) 185:11 formed (1) 17:10 former (2) 178:11;180:23 forming (2) 74:21,21 formula (7) 67:6;94:18;95:2,4,6, 6,180:17 Fort (1) 130:16 forth (1) 168:20 found (4) 126:17;132:5;</p>	<p>152:18;183:4 foundation (2) 34:21;35:17 four (8) 68:24;74:12;134:8; 156:25;157:1;158:14; 181:22;183:19 Fox (13) 11:22,25;12:9;22:16; 23:10,11;39:16,16; 89:3;143:6,20;144:17; 146:22 fraction (4) 172:9;177:19;178:3; 183:13 fractions (1) 183:21 frame (1) 117:14 frankly (1) 54:18 freeze (1) 68:24 freezing (2) 168:22;169:1 frequency (1) 159:14 frequently (2) 82:16;157:14 front (2) 149:4;182:11 Fry (1) 63:16 fuel (2) 118:11;147:17 full (3) 7:10;23:15;130:22 fully (4) 13:4;26:17,20;45:7 fun (1) 131:19 function (2) 5:22;80:12 fundamental (2) 94:8,13 further (21) 9:15;10:13;11:23; 14:3;24:9;33:3;45:24; 46:9;57:15;63:9;71:5; 72:14;78:13;86:1; 121:2;142:5;156:23; 158:13;174:23;185:1; 186:15 furthest (1) 140:3</p>	<p>118:10,10,18;146:2; 149:8;182:2 gasoline (4) 118:9,12;167:9; 177:16 gasoline-powered (2) 175:8,9 gave (8) 30:13;73:23;88:15; 118:6;129:3;134:14; 160:15;162:4 gee (1) 124:20 general (7) 4:10;26:22;28:11; 61:14;72:19;147:13; 159:12 generalized (1) 111:24 generally (8) 11:1,13;16:11;66:5; 72:22;112:5;159:7,19 geography (1) 51:15 geometry (1) 96:18 gets (7) 12:22;27:6;57:18,23; 95:20;121:21,23 giant (1) 63:13 gist (1) 32:1 given (10) 12:24;30:4;66:8; 77:14;100:2;124:2; 135:13;147:14;148:12; 165:8 gives (8) 33:14;79:3;89:20; 96:6,8,18;134:2; 175:22 giving (5) 12:17;22:20;79:22; 80:3;109:5 glass (2) 13:21;125:19 goal (5) 28:6,13;30:8,17; 40:11 God (1) 169:9 GOECKE (91) 4:24,24;6:11,22; 19:19;21:17;24:10; 26:5;34:20;35:14;36:4, 8,12;37:5;69:11,15; 70:1,4;76:1,4,6;78:2; 80:19;81:8,21;87:1,4; 96:22;97:6;103:11; 104:11;130:23;131:4, 8,10,12,24;132:1,5,24; 133:15;134:4;138:16;</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>139:7;140:9;142:14; 148:21;149:1;150:4,7, 8;155:10,11;157:9; 159:10;163:13;167:15, 19,22;168:1;169:16; 170:5,8,12,16,18,20,24, 25;172:14,22,24;173:3, 11,16;174:3,8,11,15, 19;175:16;179:9; 180:16;181:15,19; 182:18;183:25;184:1; 185:1,4;186:20 goes (5) 80:16;97:11;136:20; 140:21;168:13 Good (19) 4:22,23,24;5:4,6,7; 7:17,18;31:14;33:5,6; 40:23;86:11;100:19; 115:24;131:21;163:12; 169:17;185:5 goodness (1) 128:21 Google (2) 47:23,23 governing (1) 11:17 Government (9) 129:9;130:11,17,18; 131:15;132:11;133:11, 12,16 Government-sponsored (1) 130:14 graded (1) 72:25 gradiance (1) 112:8 gradient (1) 151:14 gradually (1) 176:9 graph (8) 74:10;76:11,16,18; 117:2,3;149:16,18 graphed (2) 6:4;67:6 graphs (3) 63:1;119:13;153:9 grapple (1) 58:13 great (9) 17:11;20:15;29:11; 39:20;43:17,22;64:19; 105:13;148:7 greater (18) 21:6;22:11,11;31:19; 34:16;39:10,11;54:10; 55:23;66:7,10;74:13, 13,14;106:18;139:17; 141:5;145:17 greatest (1) 162:25 grid (4)</p>	<p>46:16;110:19,20; 146:5 GROSSMAN (531) 4:2,17;5:7,9;6:20,23; 7:5,9,12,15;8:11,16,19; 9:16;10:2,12;12:1,6,19, 21;13:25;14:4;16:22; 17:4;19:20;20:20,23; 21:1,18,25;22:12,23; 23:1,3,8,19,21,24;24:5, 20,25;25:13;26:6,9,10; 27:7,9,12,17,20,25; 28:4;30:3,6,12;31:10; 32:3,22,25;33:8,15,25; 34:5,9,11,20,23;35:4, 21;36:4,7,9,15,21;37:6, 10,14,21,23,25;38:9, 13;39:1;41:3,8;42:2, 21,24;43:4,24;44:2,4,8, 11,14;45:17;46:6;47:4, 16;48:2,6,13,21,24; 49:2,5,8,11,14,25;50:3, 5,7,9,12,15,25;51:8,18, 20,23;52:6,9,16,24; 53:7,10,12,14,21,23; 54:6,11,20,24;55:5; 56:10,22;57:1;59:4,9, 12,15,21;60:5,7,9,12, 19,21;61:1,4,13,17; 62:6,9,12;63:7,14,17, 24;64:1,7,23;67:17,20, 23;68:1,15,19,21;69:2, 7,14,21;70:1,5,9,11,15, 24;71:8,14,20;72:10, 18,24;73:2,7,10;74:4,7; 75:1,8,11,16,19,22,25; 76:3,7,9,17;77:7,9,12, 15,17,23,25;78:3,4,8, 18;79:19,21;80:4,6,23; 81:3,10,16,18;82:11; 83:3;84:10,14,19,23; 85:3,6,10,12,16,18,22; 86:6,8,9,12,14,17,20; 87:6,9,11,14,18;88:2, 17,22,24;89:2,5,7,10, 13,18;90:7,10,13,21; 91:5,19,22;92:7,10,13, 22,25;93:7,10;94:5; 95:2,9,16;96:11;97:1, 11,13,18;101:9,11,14, 17,19;102:9,13,20,25; 103:2,9,14,18,22; 104:1,8,12,20;105:1,4, 8,10,19;106:1,9,15,22; 107:25;108:4,7,9,11, 17,21,23;109:13,16,22; 110:6;111:15,18; 112:13,25;113:8,12,16, 18,23;114:1,4,7,16,19; 115:1,3,5,10,12,14; 116:9,12,14,17,20; 117:8,12,15,21;118:8, 14,17,23,25;119:18,20,</p>	<p>22,25;120:2,6,9,13,16, 20,22;121:5,9,12,15, 23;122:1,3,15,20,23; 123:3,6,9,11,14,16,18, 21,24;124:3,6,9,14,24; 125:2,6,10,13,19,23; 126:1,6,11,17,24; 127:6,10,23,25;128:24; 129:16,18,25;130:5,20; 131:8,11,14,19,23; 132:3,9,21,23,25; 133:8,13,17,19;134:4, 6,11,15,17,24;135:1,3, 6,17,21;138:18,22,25; 139:10;140:5,7,11,16, 18,22;141:3;142:4,6, 11;148:18,22;149:19; 153:18;154:4,11,14,18, 21;155:9;157:6; 159:24;160:10,13,16, 19,22;161:9,11,14,19, 21,25;162:3,12,17,23; 163:1,6,8;167:13; 169:2,9,15,18,21,25; 170:7,9,13,17,22; 172:13,19,23;173:2,23; 174:9,16,20,25;175:3, 14;178:14,20,24;179:4, 10,15,18;180:1,9,15; 181:10,13,18;182:15; 183:23,25;185:3,5,7, 13,16,20,23,25;186:2, 5,8,11,13 ground (2) 67:16;102:7 Group (12) 25:24;163:15,16,21; 164:4,7,14,18,23; 165:4,4,7 grumpy (1) 21:2 guarantee (1) 84:6 guess (13) 24:20;70:19,20; 76:17;107:8;120:17; 142:7;161:6;170:11; 175:11;176:1;179:20; 183:22 guidance (69) 9:12,20;11:14,14,19; 12:15,16,23;14:6;15:1, 4,16;18:10,14,15,19; 19:12,14,25;20:5; 21:21,21,24;22:19; 25:5;26:3,19;27:5; 31:5,6,21;35:12;38:3; 39:14;40:3,14,20; 43:11,22;45:25;56:1; 57:13;71:23;79:15,17; 83:10,12;84:9;85:14, 25;88:8;95:1,22;97:12; 124:19;128:23;129:22;</p>	<p>136:2;137:20,24; 138:10;139:16;140:4; 142:17;143:20;146:12, 23,25;148:2 guidances (1) 47:1 guide (2) 13:3;26:16 guideline (2) 11:20;149:12 guidelines (2) 38:25;39:5 guy (1) 84:1 guys (1) 186:5 guy's (1) 126:4 <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> half (2) 145:19,19 halfway (2) 98:21,23 halt (1) 156:4 hand (3) 51:19;59:16;135:15 handed (2) 5:17;103:11 handle (3) 32:4;40:20;43:13 handled (1) 139:15 handwriting (1) 119:4 Hang (2) 173:21,21 happened (1) 78:16 happening (3) 138:4;171:12;180:25 happens (8) 20:15;21:3,4;58:24; 59:1;137:25;154:22; 179:25 happy (2) 7:19;174:17 hard (9) 31:16;46:10;61:7; 63:23;71:22;98:17; 110:6;111:6;173:23 harder (2) 110:6;125:5 HARRIS (13) 4:23,23;7:4;70:1,3; 86:16,18,22;174:1; 185:20,24;186:1,21 head (1) 11:22 heading (2) 24:12;183:11</p>	<p>health (7) 5:20;31:23;40:13; 103:6;170:18,19,20 health- (1) 72:6 health-related (2) 27:11,12 heard (2) 98:14;133:10 hearing (17) 4:3,12,14,16,17;5:15, 16,21;6:5;27:8;56:23; 103:11;135:24;185:9, 12;186:18,22 heart (3) 10:2;12:23;27:6 heating (1) 155:25 height (1) 66:11 Heights (1) 5:2 help (3) 52:5;55:8;90:22 helpful (1) 133:9 Henry (1) 7:11 Here's (7) 82:13;96:12;101:20; 105:11;111:13,13; 182:19 hierarchy (2) 15:17;136:6 high (15) 71:11;74:16;89:22; 128:7;144:8;155:3,5,7; 167:4,9;168:10,13; 181:1;183:5,18 higher (33) 19:7;43:2,3;57:21; 59:6;71:18;73:24;75:6; 82:24;89:23;105:24; 106:15;114:12;117:4; 149:9;150:6;151:20, 21;152:20;157:24; 158:3;159:6,11,13; 166:19;168:17;172:2, 9;177:21;179:24; 182:25;183:13;184:12 highest (7) 9:13;48:12;65:15,15; 104:4;106:10;107:9 highlight (2) 42:14;137:17 highlighted (3) 23:12;89:11,14 highly (2) 112:9;114:14 highway (12) 106:2,19,24;107:5; 109:9,25;117:7;118:2; 125:16;126:22;127:4;</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>128:2 highways (2) 105:21;106:21 Hlinka (1) 10:16 Hold (5) 44:14;75:8;103:22; 108:20;131:23 holding (1) 65:17 homes (1) 71:13 hope (4) 98:11;101:20; 149:23;169:20 hopefully (2) 6:8;182:15 hoping (1) 170:9 Hospital (1) 185:18 hot (1) 17:10 hour (32) 8:5;11:15,18;43:16, 16;45:6,8;50:20;92:24; 104:15,19;105:10; 106:11,18;107:3; 109:8;110:3;114:13; 137:19,19;139:19; 140:1;153:22;154:15, 22;160:23;172:25; 182:3;184:5,10,15,19 hour-by- (2) 50:19;92:23 hour-by-hour (27) 20:3;38:14;43:21; 44:22;45:25;46:10; 47:14;50:17,18;88:8, 10;90:6;92:9;93:20,23; 94:2;142:16,22,24; 145:24;146:11,14; 147:8;148:5,11; 150:14,15 hourly (5) 43:19,20;44:22; 45:11;143:15 hours (5) 86:25;87:13;105:16; 114:5;155:3 Houston (2) 126:15;130:16 huge (4) 31:6,18;58:22;66:13 huh (1) 52:16 human (2) 31:23;40:13 hundred (1) 21:5 hundreds (2) 63:4;106:7 hurting (1)</p>	<p>172:21 hydrocarbons (1) 124:11 hypothetical (2) 113:2;139:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>I'm (2) 12:19;150:12 ice (1) 14:2 idea (3) 56:25;99:2;113:4 ideal (1) 48:18 identical (2) 124:12;140:20 identification (3) 70:23;133:7;175:13 identity (3) 4:20;74:1;175:10 identifying (1) 10:17 idle (13) 167:10;173:14,17; 175:23;176:3,12,13; 177:20;178:3;182:2, 20,21;184:17 idles (1) 181:25 idling (14) 105:15;168:17; 172:10,25;173:5,6; 177:5;178:5;181:8,24; 182:7;183:14;184:3,22 idyllic (1) 33:4 iffy (1) 146:17 ignores (2) 45:9;147:9 impact (13) 28:7;45:16;46:17; 60:3;66:3;107:24; 110:23;143:4,12,23; 145:11;146:10;166:9 impacted (1) 153:4 impacts (3) 23:14;91:8;99:11 imparts (1) 13:19 implemented (2) 24:15;28:16 implications (1) 99:17 implicit (1) 45:5 imply (1) 40:24 important (9) 14:10,13;20:3,13;</p>	<p>41:10;48:6;52:10; 101:4;112:4 impression (1) 162:3 improved (1) 22:6 improvements (1) 12:13 inappropriate (2) 20:18;158:22 inbox (1) 18:11 Inc (4) 68:10,18;69:10; 70:21 include (13) 4:7;15:7;37:3,18; 38:17,20;44:25; 121:10;151:3,7; 152:12;153:10;165:18 included (11) 18:10;46:16;94:12, 25;97:10,16;107:10; 110:15;114:11;141:7, 10 includes (4) 16:3;105:15;146:2; 153:11 including (4) 48:17;87:1,3;91:25 inclusion (1) 143:24 inconsistent (8) 129:1,5,8,14,18; 162:14,18;165:17 incorporates (1) 146:5 incorrect (1) 10:10 incorrectly (2) 59:10;123:12 increase (9) 59:22;66:15;99:8; 139:15;157:19,20,21, 23;176:9 increased (3) 98:6;99:7;107:19 increasing (1) 67:3 indicate (1) 154:21 indicated (1) 155:23 indicates (1) 152:1 indication (3) 84:12;144:11;150:17 indications (2) 82:21,23 indicator (3) 137:6,12;139:25 indifferent (1) 87:4</p>	<p>individual (3) 107:11;164:5;166:1 individually (2) 29:10;164:19 induces (1) 65:25 influence (2) 79:8;96:20 information (8) 20:19;52:22;58:6; 73:19;98:1;115:9; 117:6;168:16 informed (2) 113:10,13 initial (2) 96:15;142:1 initially (1) 74:22 inputs (3) 25:5;34:15;36:19 insecure (1) 56:14 inside (3) 171:4;177:9;180:25 inspired (1) 71:20 in-stack (6) 17:9,17;19:7;171:17, 20,22 installed (1) 112:10 instruct (1) 15:16 insufficient (3) 53:8;67:7;101:5 insulation (1) 159:11 integrate (2) 96:15;154:19 integrated (2) 5:19;6:2 intended (2) 134:13;143:25 intensity (2) 96:20;98:2 interact (1) 16:14 interaction (2) 163:17;172:2 interactively (1) 29:11 interest (5) 13:2;14:8;30:16; 74:6,7 interested (1) 83:25 Interesting (3) 66:12;128:16;157:13 interface (1) 96:18 intermediate (1) 99:3 intermingle (1)</p>	<p>156:20 International (1) 80:10 interpret (1) 71:1 interpretation (2) 22:20;71:6 interpreted (1) 71:9 interpreting (2) 22:16;76:13 interrupt (1) 51:19 into (38) 6:14,14;9:14;12:6; 15:21;20:6;21:5;32:23; 36:20;42:6;45:19; 56:23;57:1;69:24;72:5; 76:25;77:1;78:22;79:6; 82:9;86:10;94:6;95:14; 96:15;98:9;100:7; 103:6;104:3;117:5; 118:1;120:23,24; 146:14;154:23;163:10; 166:7,18;172:23 introduce (1) 170:3 introduced (1) 148:5 introduces (2) 43:17;138:7 introduction (1) 178:25 inventories (1) 133:3 inventory (9) 103:19;133:3; 143:10,22;144:3; 145:2,3,6,12 inversely (2) 66:25;99:12 inversion (2) 156:2,2 invoke (2) 99:7;102:1 involved (5) 10:7;39:9;40:10; 41:11;147:21 isolate (1) 180:25 isolated (27) 45:13,23;46:11,12; 88:14,15;89:2,16;90:2, 2,18;91:12,16,24;92:1, 3,4,15,19;93:6,21; 94:10;143:2,13,19; 144:12,16 isolation (2) 15:11;91:20 issue (30) 14:9;31:22;38:2,5; 40:20;42:4,5;67:4; 71:25;72:6,7;74:25;</p>
--	--	---	---	--

75:3;95:20;96:3;106:5; 108:6,8;115:16; 116:15;118:20;120:3; 124:15,16;129:20; 141:22;148:22;154:7; 159:14;178:12 issued (2) 12:10;29:2 issues (13) 10:16;11:2;19:23; 23:12;27:22;39:18,18; 46:3;55:14;119:13; 139:3;147:15;170:20 It's (2) 21:16;24:21	Kensington (2) 5:1,8 kept (2) 161:5,7 key (3) 99:6;162:2;184:16 kilometer (1) 20:16 kilometers (3) 184:4,10,18 kind (16) 19:2;20:25;21:1; 30:7;32:11;61:14; 88:13;93:24;95:14; 107:14;119:14;124:17; 132:10,19;138:9;152:5 kinds (6) 15:7;22:8;39:22; 40:9;42:8;156:6 kinetic (3) 64:11,11,12 knowledge (1) 37:7 known (3) 4:9;66:5;74:20	layer (2) 96:14;155:23 layers (1) 66:8 Leading (3) 19:19;21:17;74:4 leads (1) 65:15 least (11) 25:18;51:9;57:23; 105:22;109:23,24; 117:24;136:21;140:2; 151:16;160:3 leave (4) 5:16;44:14;140:11; 169:19 leaves (1) 142:12 leaving (1) 56:12 left (3) 91:3,6;134:18 left-hand (1) 167:16 legal (3) 26:7;39:2;148:1 legality (1) 146:14 legitimately (1) 129:13 length (3) 12:5;141:6,14 lengthier (1) 28:18 Lerner (4) 166:24;167:6;171:2; 175:11 less (29) 23:13;28:14,16;29:3, 3,22;30:2,24;32:14; 48:17,18;50:1;56:19; 64:21;66:16,23;84:5,6, 11;112:1;127:14; 136:17,18,19;145:18; 155:25;171:14;176:1; 180:21 lesser (1) 64:4 level (40) 10:6;20:15;43:3,12; 47:13;58:16;61:20; 63:10;64:6,14,22;67:9, 16;72:7,8,25;75:5; 78:24;82:22;100:11; 101:6;102:7;104:23; 105:14,14;110:4; 112:23;115:16;120:25; 135:13;136:23;137:1; 139:18;148:2,2,3,4,4; 168:10;176:3 levels (28) 8:25;45:6,8,15;59:6; 77:20;104:4;112:18;	113:14;138:14;139:5; 143:4;144:2;145:13, 18;150:19,20;151:13; 152:12,17,25;155:7; 158:9;171:3;181:21; 183:5;184:3,5 Lewis (1) 63:16 light (1) 36:6 likelihood (3) 139:13,17,20 likely (4) 100:6;107:3;138:5; 172:4 limit (2) 70:17;78:25 limited (1) 49:9 limiting (24) 8:3,24;9:8;10:20; 11:10;15:7;16:3,7,12, 21;18:5,9;19:1;21:14; 22:9;25:11,21;41:13; 42:17;56:8,9;57:11; 58:9;164:13 limits (1) 16:17 Lindquist (4) 166:24;167:6;171:2; 175:11 line (7) 104:24;109:16; 114:15,20;128:3; 139:16;182:11 lines (2) 57:16;146:7 list (6) 20:7;69:25;70:12; 175:4,5,6 listed (1) 156:25 lists (1) 136:6 literature (7) 57:20;82:24;83:1; 128:22,25;166:18,21 little (12) 61:25;64:3,4,18; 77:1,1;78:15,18,20; 95:8;106:15;126:21 liver (2) 86:21;186:2 loading (7) 18:13;58:2;91:2,6; 100:18;118:16,17 loan (2) 52:14,15 located (1) 4:8 locating (2) 114:13,13 location (8)	48:19;49:16;56:6; 69:3;151:1;158:10,17, 185:8 locations (5) 49:9,14;160:4;161:1; 162:8 logarithmic (1) 96:14 logic (1) 158:16 London (1) 82:19 long (3) 40:3;98:20;182:1 longer (7) 83:16;86:22;102:24; 117:23;178:10;180:23; 181:7 long-term (1) 5:24 look (54) 31:2,4,13,23;32:17; 35:6;40:22;42:15; 47:22,24;49:22;51:16; 54:10;62:2,6;63:2; 64:24;65:10,18;66:1, 12,18;67:5;76:25;77:1, 2;84:2;88:16,20;89:19; 90:25;91:10,13;99:10, 11,13;106:10;119:12; 120:17;122:7,9; 124:10;129:4;133:24; 139:13;147:5;164:5; 168:9;172:5;175:20; 179:17;180:17;182:23, 23 looked (11) 36:2;65:7;114:5; 126:24;129:7,7,9; 149:20;153:3;164:1,4 Looking (45) 5:10;15:10;26:24; 30:3;34:6;41:4;46:11; 47:10;48:9;49:21;62:9; 63:3,6;64:16;65:23; 72:1;75:11,21;77:5; 83:17,19;85:3,9;90:9,9, 15,17;92:9;99:16; 100:5;103:10;104:16; 112:5;127:12;129:11, 11,12;133:20;134:20; 152:14;166:1,9; 176:20;179:22;180:13 looks (4) 25:16;62:4;65:11; 128:2 loose (2) 6:19,20 lost (1) 119:23 Lot (41) 4:9;8:14;16:15,18; 21:9;33:12;47:15;		
J	Jansen (5) 58:20;62:25;65:12; 67:6,15 Janssen (1) 101:22 January (1) 14:21 Japan (1) 80:10 Jison (2) 6:13;170:21 judgment (23) 9:5,11;22:9;26:21; 29:12;36:23;41:14; 42:22;46:1;90:4;91:12, 17;92:8,11;93:3;98:15; 105:17;113:11,13; 132:22;134:22;140:2; 144:7 judgments (2) 61:19;141:25 July (1) 80:11 June (5) 4:14;6:9;11:22; 23:11;56:1 justification (9) 9:6;24:17;56:3; 57:25;79:18;83:1; 88:12;129:22;148:8 justifications (1) 9:4 justified (5) 55:2;73:16;143:9,21; 145:2 justify (5) 8:24;29:14;45:25; 79:11;156:19	L	label (2) 123:23;149:21 labeled (8) 5:15;18:1;119:6,14; 122:9,11;124:12,13 labeling (5) 23:4;77:18;124:1,14, 16 labels (1) 21:22 language (8) 32:5,5,6;71:15; 91:23;147:7,13;180:11 large (5) 49:21;101:24; 106:21,22;151:17 larger (2) 99:8;181:16 largest (1) 162:19 Larry (1) 5:3 last (12) 5:13;24:3,5;57:10; 89:14;147:15;178:25, 25;184:2;185:17; 186:16,18 later (7) 20:7;55:15;97:24; 163:10;176:6;179:22; 183:19 laundry (1) 20:7 lay (1) 6:25	layer (2) 96:14;155:23 layers (1) 66:8 Leading (3) 19:19;21:17;74:4 leads (1) 65:15 least (11) 25:18;51:9;57:23; 105:22;109:23,24; 117:24;136:21;140:2; 151:16;160:3 leave (4) 5:16;44:14;140:11; 169:19 leaves (1) 142:12 leaving (1) 56:12 left (3) 91:3,6;134:18 left-hand (1) 167:16 legal (3) 26:7;39:2;148:1 legality (1) 146:14 legitimately (1) 129:13 length (3) 12:5;141:6,14 lengthier (1) 28:18 Lerner (4) 166:24;167:6;171:2; 175:11 less (29) 23:13;28:14,16;29:3, 3,22;30:2,24;32:14; 48:17,18;50:1;56:19; 64:21;66:16,23;84:5,6, 11;112:1;127:14; 136:17,18,19;145:18; 155:25;171:14;176:1; 180:21 lesser (1) 64:4 level (40) 10:6;20:15;43:3,12; 47:13;58:16;61:20; 63:10;64:6,14,22;67:9, 16;72:7,8,25;75:5; 78:24;82:22;100:11; 101:6;102:7;104:23; 105:14,14;110:4; 112:23;115:16;120:25; 135:13;136:23;137:1; 139:18;148:2,2,3,4,4; 168:10;176:3 levels (28) 8:25;45:6,8,15;59:6; 77:20;104:4;112:18;	113:14;138:14;139:5; 143:4;144:2;145:13, 18;150:19,20;151:13; 152:12,17,25;155:7; 158:9;171:3;181:21; 183:5;184:3,5 Lewis (1) 63:16 light (1) 36:6 likelihood (3) 139:13,17,20 likely (4) 100:6;107:3;138:5; 172:4 limit (2) 70:17;78:25 limited (1) 49:9 limiting (24) 8:3,24;9:8;10:20; 11:10;15:7;16:3,7,12, 21;18:5,9;19:1;21:14; 22:9;25:11,21;41:13; 42:17;56:8,9;57:11; 58:9;164:13 limits (1) 16:17 Lindquist (4) 166:24;167:6;171:2; 175:11 line (7) 104:24;109:16; 114:15,20;128:3; 139:16;182:11 lines (2) 57:16;146:7 list (6) 20:7;69:25;70:12; 175:4,5,6 listed (1) 156:25 lists (1) 136:6 literature (7) 57:20;82:24;83:1; 128:22,25;166:18,21 little (12) 61:25;64:3,4,18; 77:1,1;78:15,18,20; 95:8;106:15;126:21 liver (2) 86:21;186:2 loading (7) 18:13;58:2;91:2,6; 100:18;118:16,17 loan (2) 52:14,15 located (1) 4:8 locating (2) 114:13,13 location (8)	48:19;49:16;56:6; 69:3;151:1;158:10,17, 185:8 locations (5) 49:9,14;160:4;161:1; 162:8 logarithmic (1) 96:14 logic (1) 158:16 London (1) 82:19 long (3) 40:3;98:20;182:1 longer (7) 83:16;86:22;102:24; 117:23;178:10;180:23; 181:7 long-term (1) 5:24 look (54) 31:2,4,13,23;32:17; 35:6;40:22;42:15; 47:22,24;49:22;51:16; 54:10;62:2,6;63:2; 64:24;65:10,18;66:1, 12,18;67:5;76:25;77:1, 2;84:2;88:16,20;89:19; 90:25;91:10,13;99:10, 11,13;106:10;119:12; 120:17;122:7,9; 124:10;129:4;133:24; 139:13;147:5;164:5; 168:9;172:5;175:20; 179:17;180:17;182:23, 23 looked (11) 36:2;65:7;114:5; 126:24;129:7,7,9; 149:20;153:3;164:1,4 Looking (45) 5:10;15:10;26:24; 30:3;34:6;41:4;46:11; 47:10;48:9;49:21;62:9; 63:3,6;64:16;65:23; 72:1;75:11,21;77:5; 83:17,19;85:3,9;90:9,9, 15,17;92:9;99:16; 100:5;103:10;104:16; 112:5;127:12;129:11, 11,12;133:20;134:20; 152:14;166:1,9; 176:20;179:22;180:13 looks (4) 25:16;62:4;65:11; 128:2 loose (2) 6:19,20 lost (1) 119:23 Lot (41) 4:9;8:14;16:15,18; 21:9;33:12;47:15;
K	keep (3) 6:24;52:10;172:3 keeper (1) 52:16					

<p>57:24;58:8,10,25; 60:10;63:13;65:5,18, 18,19,21;66:6;71:24; 80:2;82:4;83:21;92:6, 6;95:18;98:19;102:14; 107:6,7,7;114:8; 119:13;131:21;138:5; 155:3,6;159:15; 177:22;179:7;184:22</p> <p>lots (1) 94:3</p> <p>louder (1) 78:18</p> <p>love (1) 132:23</p> <p>low (14) 97:23;98:8;117:3; 118:5;122:6;126:20; 155:24;156:4,9; 178:17;179:5;180:6,7; 183:11</p> <p>lower (22) 8:25;29:7;30:2;33:2; 54:16;59:6;63:23;66:7, 8,20,21;71:17;90:3; 91:3,6;106:12,24; 112:14;156:15;168:18; 180:10;184:5</p> <p>lowered (1) 166:2</p> <p>lowering (1) 107:19</p> <p>lowers (1) 72:14</p> <p>lowest (2) 57:23;66:12</p> <p>lunch (8) 86:11,19,21;87:5,9, 13,16,19</p> <p>luncheon (1) 87:22</p> <p>Lung (2) 5:18,22</p>	<p>makers (1) 40:15</p> <p>makes (7) 23:5;27:2;41:14; 118:9;124:17;125:8; 135:15</p> <p>making (5) 53:17;93:17;101:3; 106:25;131:19</p> <p>Mall (5) 4:10;8:5,25;95:18; 178:13</p> <p>manifestation (1) 95:5</p> <p>manual (1) 128:12</p> <p>many (31) 9:3,6;21:23;22:5,5,7; 27:1;29:10;31:8,25; 39:8,18,21;40:9,17,25; 41:24;45:9;46:15; 56:20;61:6;83:6;93:2, 2,4,4,23;141:25,25; 147:9;156:14</p> <p>March (13) 6:4;11:24;12:2,9; 20:5;21:21;23:10,10; 27:5;28:5;32:7;56:1; 143:7</p> <p>margin (2) 32:16;79:22</p> <p>mark (4) 50:23;132:23,25; 176:7</p> <p>marked (5) 59:17;70:22;133:7; 173:12;175:13</p> <p>Martin (1) 4:17</p> <p>martini (2) 13:25;14:3</p> <p>Maryland (1) 4:8</p> <p>masses (1) 158:24</p> <p>match (3) 50:17;93:23;147:8</p> <p>matches (1) 43:21</p> <p>matching (11) 20:3;90:6;92:21; 93:21;136:15;137:18; 146:14;147:3,6;148:6, 11</p> <p>match-up (2) 43:16;47:14</p> <p>material (1) 174:21</p> <p>matter (10) 4:3;8:10;16:6;62:9, 23;63:11;93:22; 129:16;141:10;148:18</p> <p>matters (4)</p>	<p>5:12;7:3;11:5;158:5</p> <p>maximum (12) 45:15;71:18;72:2; 79:16;91:8;97:22,25; 111:1;139:17;143:4; 144:10;159:21</p> <p>May (63) 4:13;5:13,17;6:8;7:5, 15;14:3;23:12;28:17, 18;32:15;34:11;36:25; 41:11,11,11,16,43;2,4; 46:17;51:18;57:19,19; 59:9;60:2,23;65:1,2; 67:24;68:9;71:11,11, 17;79:7;105:17;108:4; 109:25;111:3,3;112:2; 121:12;129:8,8;131:8, 16,16;136:24;143:9, 21;145:2;156:15,16; 163:18;164:8;166:2; 168:6;170:21,22; 174:15;175:14;185:8; 186:18,19</p> <p>maybe (15) 62:23;63:4,5;65:24, 24;71:13;109:23; 120:16;133:8;144:19; 154:12;156:1;161:3; 163:22;178:17</p> <p>mean (26) 9:17,18;22:1;30:6; 32:8;33:5;36:25;37:21; 39:3;42:2;53:16;55:14; 60:14;79:19;84:10; 88:24;102:13;107:6; 118:18;132:6,11,13; 142:20;145:3;153:22; 161:2</p> <p>meaning (4) 26:16;38:9;151:19, 19</p> <p>means (8) 4:18;9:19,19;39:1; 61:2;67:2;76:21; 138:20</p> <p>meant (2) 20:21;29:21</p> <p>measure (3) 98:21,23;151:13</p> <p>measured (5) 41:20;150:21;172:1; 173:1,6</p> <p>measurement (3) 154:15,23;175:25</p> <p>measurements (17) 42:6,7,19;153:21; 154:14,17,19;167:10; 168:9;171:4,18,19; 172:8;177:8,8,12; 183:12</p> <p>measuring (2) 75:12;84:11</p> <p>meet (3)</p>	<p>9:3;40:12;90:4</p> <p>meeting (2) 10:21;46:2</p> <p>meets (1) 144:21</p> <p>mega (1) 107:17</p> <p>memo (6) 12:11;23:10,11;24:9; 28:5;146:23</p> <p>memorandum (7) 11:21;12:2,3,9,9,10; 32:7</p> <p>memos (6) 12:16;19:14;22:16; 39:16,20;86:1</p> <p>mention (3) 93:2;138:9;163:21</p> <p>mentioned (15) 18:14;19:11;20:4; 22:15;27:23;28:25; 39:9;43:11;57:18;58:1; 95:3,22;122:7;139:14; 155:12</p> <p>mentions (2) 15:19;70:25</p> <p>merely (1) 132:7</p> <p>merits (1) 45:1</p> <p>mesh (1) 110:19</p> <p>met (3) 10:15;20:6;26:21</p> <p>meta-analysis (1) 5:24</p> <p>metal (1) 177:1</p> <p>meteorological (15) 38:21,21;44:24; 46:22,24;83:7,11,13, 14;85:20;86:5;153:14; 155:12,14,17</p> <p>meteorologists (1) 39:22</p> <p>meteorology (4) 46:25;66:25;84:3; 158:23</p> <p>meter (20) 9:8;19:5,15;58:2; 65:24;66:9,18,19;67:8; 73:21;74:18;80:16,17; 93:8;99:19;105:6; 110:20;137:22;150:3; 165:15</p> <p>meters (27) 18:12;20:16;21:5; 59:1,1;62:24,24,24; 63:4,4;71:13;73:24; 74:15,17;75:6,15; 76:11,21,22;77:23; 79:12;80:14,14,16; 149:8,25;161:12</p>	<p>method (57) 8:3,24;9:8;10:9,20; 11:10;15:7,20;16:4,7,9, 12,21;18:5,9,9;19:1; 21:14,15,25;22:9,15; 23:3;24:9;25:8,11,12, 21;35:3,11;41:13; 43:15;45:3;50:20; 55:25;56:8,9;57:11; 58:2,9,21;68:7;79:14; 88:8,13;95:21,21;97:9, 9;101:22;102:1,2; 163:19;164:16,18; 165:9,19</p> <p>methodologies (2) 18:6;36:18</p> <p>methodology (4) 22:13;94:24,25; 164:18</p> <p>methods (5) 18:4;24:15;29:14; 34:17;177:23</p> <p>metric (1) 72:14</p> <p>Metro (1) 47:22</p> <p>metropolitan (3) 46:4;49:21;51:14</p> <p>Miami (5) 157:1;159:4,5,6,18</p> <p>Michele (4) 5:1;69:8;86:22; 102:21</p> <p>micro-environment (1) 72:8</p> <p>micrograms (1) 105:6</p> <p>middle (3) 44:6;46:12,13</p> <p>might (15) 19:6;46:12;65:23; 71:12;86:11;105:23; 110:23;112:18,23; 127:23;128:15;157:24, 24;172:2;185:5</p> <p>Mike (1) 4:24</p> <p>mild (4) 145:2,3,6;150:19</p> <p>miles (4) 46:4;48:10;184:15, 19</p> <p>milk (2) 13:21,23</p> <p>Mill (1) 4:8</p> <p>mind (6) 12:6;53:18;54:3; 61:15;162:14;163:10</p> <p>mine (2) 56:12,14</p> <p>minor (1) 144:1</p>
M				
<p>machinations (1) 40:8</p> <p>machine (1) 135:23</p> <p>Madhussudhan (1) 131:13</p> <p>magazine (1) 61:10</p> <p>magnifying (1) 125:19</p> <p>major (1) 46:14</p> <p>majority (7) 106:4;143:10,22; 145:10,21,23;146:10</p> <p>maker (1) 40:6</p>	<p>masses (1) 158:24</p> <p>match (3) 50:17;93:23;147:8</p> <p>matches (1) 43:21</p> <p>matching (11) 20:3;90:6;92:21; 93:21;136:15;137:18; 146:14;147:3,6;148:6, 11</p> <p>match-up (2) 43:16;47:14</p> <p>material (1) 174:21</p> <p>matter (10) 4:3;8:10;16:6;62:9, 23;63:11;93:22; 129:16;141:10;148:18</p> <p>matters (4)</p>	<p>5:12;7:3;11:5;158:5</p> <p>maximum (12) 45:15;71:18;72:2; 79:16;91:8;97:22,25; 111:1;139:17;143:4; 144:10;159:21</p> <p>May (63) 4:13;5:13,17;6:8;7:5, 15;14:3;23:12;28:17, 18;32:15;34:11;36:25; 41:11,11,11,16,43;2,4; 46:17;51:18;57:19,19; 59:9;60:2,23;65:1,2; 67:24;68:9;71:11,11, 17;79:7;105:17;108:4; 109:25;111:3,3;112:2; 121:12;129:8,8;131:8, 16,16;136:24;143:9, 21;145:2;156:15,16; 163:18;164:8;166:2; 168:6;170:21,22; 174:15;175:14;185:8; 186:18,19</p> <p>maybe (15) 62:23;63:4,5;65:24, 24;71:13;109:23; 120:16;133:8;144:19; 154:12;156:1;161:3; 163:22;178:17</p> <p>mean (26) 9:17,18;22:1;30:6; 32:8;33:5;36:25;37:21; 39:3;42:2;53:16;55:14; 60:14;79:19;84:10; 88:24;102:13;107:6; 118:18;132:6,11,13; 142:20;145:3;153:22; 161:2</p> <p>meaning (4) 26:16;38:9;151:19, 19</p> <p>means (8) 4:18;9:19,19;39:1; 61:2;67:2;76:21; 138:20</p> <p>meant (2) 20:21;29:21</p> <p>measure (3) 98:21,23;151:13</p> <p>measured (5) 41:20;150:21;172:1; 173:1,6</p> <p>measurement (3) 154:15,23;175:25</p> <p>measurements (17) 42:6,7,19;153:21; 154:14,17,19;167:10; 168:9;171:4,18,19; 172:8;177:8,8,12; 183:12</p> <p>measuring (2) 75:12;84:11</p> <p>meet (3)</p>	<p>9:3;40:12;90:4</p> <p>meeting (2) 10:21;46:2</p> <p>meets (1) 144:21</p> <p>mega (1) 107:17</p> <p>memo (6) 12:11;23:10,11;24:9; 28:5;146:23</p> <p>memorandum (7) 11:21;12:2,3,9,9,10; 32:7</p> <p>memos (6) 12:16;19:14;22:16; 39:16,20;86:1</p> <p>mention (3) 93:2;138:9;163:21</p> <p>mentioned (15) 18:14;19:11;20:4; 22:15;27:23;28:25; 39:9;43:11;57:18;58:1; 95:3,22;122:7;139:14; 155:12</p> <p>mentions (2) 15:19;70:25</p> <p>merely (1) 132:7</p> <p>merits (1) 45:1</p> <p>mesh (1) 110:19</p> <p>met (3) 10:15;20:6;26:21</p> <p>meta-analysis (1) 5:24</p> <p>metal (1) 177:1</p> <p>meteorological (15) 38:21,21;44:24; 46:22,24;83:7,11,13, 14;85:20;86:5;153:14; 155:12,14,17</p> <p>meteorologists (1) 39:22</p> <p>meteorology (4) 46:25;66:25;84:3; 158:23</p> <p>meter (20) 9:8;19:5,15;58:2; 65:24;66:9,18,19;67:8; 73:21;74:18;80:16,17; 93:8;99:19;105:6; 110:20;137:22;150:3; 165:15</p> <p>meters (27) 18:12;20:16;21:5; 59:1,1;62:24,24,24; 63:4,4;71:13;73:24; 74:15,17;75:6,15; 76:11,21,22;77:23; 79:12;80:14,14,16; 149:8,25;161:12</p>	<p>method (57) 8:3,24;9:8;10:9,20; 11:10;15:7,20;16:4,7,9, 12,21;18:5,9,9;19:1; 21:14,15,25;22:9,15; 23:3;24:9;25:8,11,12, 21;35:3,11;41:13; 43:15;45:3;50:20; 55:25;56:8,9;57:11; 58:2,9,21;68:7;79:14; 88:8,13;95:21,21;97:9, 9;101:22;102:1,2; 163:19;164:16,18; 165:9,19</p> <p>methodologies (2) 18:6;36:18</p> <p>methodology (4) 22:13;94:24,25; 164:18</p> <p>methods (5) 18:4;24:15;29:14; 34:17;177:23</p> <p>metric (1) 72:14</p> <p>Metro (1) 47:22</p> <p>metropolitan (3) 46:4;49:21;51:14</p> <p>Miami (5) 157:1;159:4,5,6,18</p> <p>Michele (4) 5:1;69:8;86:22; 102:21</p> <p>micro-environment (1) 72:8</p> <p>micrograms (1) 105:6</p> <p>middle (3) 44:6;46:12,13</p> <p>might (15) 19:6;46:12;65:23; 71:12;86:11;105:23; 110:23;112:18,23; 127:23;128:15;157:24, 24;172:2;185:5</p> <p>Mike (1) 4:24</p> <p>mild (4) 145:2,3,6;150:19</p> <p>miles (4) 46:4;48:10;184:15, 19</p> <p>milk (2) 13:21,23</p> <p>Mill (1) 4:8</p> <p>mind (6) 12:6;53:18;54:3; 61:15;162:14;163:10</p> <p>mine (2) 56:12,14</p> <p>minor (1) 144:1</p>

<p>Minoura (1) 80:9</p> <p>minus (10) 168:21,22,23;169:4,9;177:2;178:8,12;180:19,22</p> <p>minute (6) 27:13;134:7;169:22;176:6;178:9;180:21</p> <p>minutes (23) 78:5;175:21,23;176:1,2,2,6,9,10,10,13;177:2,3,4,19;178:3,4;181:25,25;182:4,5,8,20</p> <p>misplaced (1) 103:12</p> <p>missing (1) 5:9</p> <p>mistakes (1) 141:25</p> <p>misunderstanding (1) 154:12</p> <p>mix (8) 47:24;58:14,15,23;60:15;63:12;67:9;118:9</p> <p>mixing (26) 13:22,23;20:14;21:10;59:6;61:19;62:1;63:10;65:5,13,18,21;74:24;75:4,78:22,24;99:14;100:6,11,15,25;101:6;138:1,3,5;156:3</p> <p>mobile (25) 42:3;115:25;116:5,14;117:3,17,22,25;118:7;120:5,11,25;122:5;124:23;126:17;127:2,15,19;128:7;132:16;133:23;134:1,21;138:8;145:5</p> <p>mod (1) 22:2</p> <p>mode (2) 60:10,12</p> <p>model (56) 9:21,21;12:24;14:18;16:4;21:23;22:7,10,22;23:17;24:16,21,22;30:14,21;31:12;32:21;23;39:21;40:25,25;41:10,12,17,21,23,23,24;42:2,5,6;43:22;44:22,24;46:7;54:2;85:21;117:23,24;120:24;124:23;127:17;130:15,16;133:4;134:3,22,24;136:7;142:23;143:9,15;144:2,9;145:16;147:18</p> <p>modeled (11) 14:25;46:17;143:21;145:7,10,12;146:2,9;</p>	<p>153:22;162:20;165:25</p> <p>modeler (2) 49:15;158:8</p> <p>modelers (3) 11:15;15:16;142:22</p> <p>modeling (57) 10:16,18,23;11:2,18,20,23;14:22,24;15:2,4,9,12;18:18;21:22;22:3,21;25:24;27:4;29:15;36:20;39:6,9,18;40:17;41:2;45:11;46:16;47:1,10;51:5;53:8,14,16,21,25;54:1;61:7;73:4;89:21;92:23;93:5,7,9;94:21;97:22;104:23;111:7;121:11;136:16;137:19;139:4;142:23;146:5;156:19;161:15;166:4</p> <p>models (5) 15:7;31:13;35:22;41:9;116:4</p> <p>modes (1) 183:20</p> <p>modified (1) 28:9</p> <p>molecular (17) 10:6;16:4;20:15;58:16;61:20;63:10;64:6,13,22;65:13;67:9;75:1,5;78:24;100:7;101:6;138:3</p> <p>molecularly (1) 156:21</p> <p>molecule (1) 16:23</p> <p>molecules (1) 58:23</p> <p>moment (10) 14:7;17:25;86:16;138:12;146:5;155:12,16;156:24;165:12;171:2</p> <p>momentum (1) 66:17</p> <p>monitor (20) 45:6,14;48:18;51:25;52:1;53:4;69:3;83:12;85:1;94:1,4;104:16;107:9;115:2;143:2,14;151:6;152:9;153:3,5</p> <p>monitored (9) 44:21,23;45:7;109:8;119:15,16;143:24;153:21;154:6</p> <p>monitoring (26) 47:17,18;49:9;50:20;51:5,17;52:21,25;54:6;69:19;70:20,25;86:13;92:23;103:18;106:7,10;107:11;111:13;113:15;137:19;146:19;</p>	<p>151:1;154:25;158:9;171:13</p> <p>monitors (28) 31:14,15;37:4,19,21;38:10,11;43:13;48:5;49:16;80:13;83:13;84:5;104:15;105:18,21;107:7;109:23,24;112:3,5,18,22;114:13,13,25;143:14;150:21</p> <p>monoxide (1) 15:2</p> <p>more (79) 6:16;13:22;16:15,17,19;17:1;20:8;21:10;28:11,13,17,19,20;29:2,2,6,7,13,18;30:23;31:19;32:1,12;34:16,18;36:5;39:13,13;43:14;45:2,3,4,20;48:6;50:14,16;52:5,8,10;57:22;59:5;61:8,9;65:21,24;82:16;83:21;91:14;95:17;102:11;109:24,25;111:24;112:9;114:14,14;125:4,4;126:21;135:10;136:17,18,19,20;141:1,11,21;147:7;158:25;165:4,5;167:23;171:13,19;172:4,5,21;176:2;181:15</p> <p>morning (10) 4:22,23,24;5:4,6,7;7:17,18;65:19;97:24</p> <p>morning's (1) 88:6</p> <p>mortality (1) 5:23</p> <p>most (31) 12:25;13:13;14:10,13;15:19;20:2;27:3;30:15;32:20,21,24;42:17;47:18;48:2;49:2,17;50:12;51:4;52:25;53:15;54:2;66:24;90:1;106:3;107:8;157:2,10;158:2,17;168:18;184:5</p> <p>motor (1) 127:8</p> <p>move (5) 49:15;81:8;124:21;182:10,13</p> <p>moved (1) 57:1</p> <p>moves (26) 42:3;115:25;116:5,14;117:4,17,23;118:6;120:5,13,24;122:5;124:23;125:3;127:2;128:7;130:15,16;132:12,17;133:4,10,23;</p>	<p>134:1,21;138:9</p> <p>moving (3) 64:11;99:9;182:6</p> <p>much (17) 41:2;57:21;66:20;73:24;75:5;86:22;87:15;90:3;100:8;112:6,7;150:6;152:20;179:24;181:4;182:24;184:5</p> <p>multiplies (1) 121:20</p> <p>must (2) 9:3;155:6</p> <p>Myocki's (1) 96:18</p> <p>myself (1) 57:2</p>	<p>needed (1) 110:7</p> <p>negative (3) 128:18;178:15;179:1</p> <p>neglected (1) 144:16</p> <p>neighborhood (3) 72:3;73:5;146:6</p> <p>neither (2) 9:5;147:23</p> <p>nervous (1) 124:18</p> <p>neutral (3) 96:13,17;97:21</p> <p>new (12) 8:25;28:8;40:12;45:16;46:14;56:18;59:18;70:14;112:18,22,22;172:15</p> <p>next (15) 4:13;48:24;63:18;64:17;68:3;86:9,12;105:21;106:23;107:4;109:24;124:10;138:15;185:4,15</p> <p>nice (1) 52:12</p> <p>nicely (1) 114:16</p> <p>night (1) 56:14</p> <p>nitric (1) 9:22</p> <p>nitrogen (8) 5:20,23,25;6:1,3;14:12;16:1,15</p> <p>NO1 (1) 6:1</p> <p>NO2 (115) 6:2;8:5,25;10:5;11:15,18;12:16;14:13;15:17,21;16:1,18,20;17:6,8,10,13,14,16,17;19:4,10;20:3;21:22;23:14;24:8;25:11;29:24;31:6;41:21;42:16;43:13,21;47:8;56:2,5;57:13;59:23,23;60:3;65:15;69:19;70:19,25;71:2;74:21,22;79:2,5;80:11;82:15,16,19;86:13;99:19;104:4,15;105:10,12;106:1,11,18;107:4;109:7;110:3;112:1,7,7,19,24;114:13;115:16,16;117:9;127:14;137:23;138:14;139:5,19;140:1,21;147:17;149:8,24;150:24;151:24;152:7,17;153:15;154:22;155:4,13,17;156:3;157:19;</p>
N				
			<p>N-631 (1) 4:9</p> <p>NAA (1) 5:25</p> <p>NAAQS (8) 28:10;72:11;73:8;137:6,13,13;139:6;147:17</p> <p>name (7) 4:17;7:10;126:4;131:9,17,19;167:8</p> <p>National (5) 28:10;47:2,3;139:18,25</p> <p>nationwide (3) 103:18;106:11;107:10</p> <p>natural (1) 144:1</p> <p>nature (1) 57:16</p> <p>naysaying (1) 162:4</p> <p>near (23) 29:24,25;46:1;47:15;69:19;70:19,25;71:4,12;75:12,12,13;76:12,21,23;106:5;112:9,22;114:25;115:2,21;151:1,22</p> <p>necessarily (2) 115:20;157:12</p> <p>necessary (10) 8:24;29:2;38:25;39:2,2,3,6;45:25;112:8;113:20</p> <p>need (16) 23:12;27:11;29:12;30:9,18,18;32:24;52:18;55:12;59:2;66:1;88:17;111:8,9;169:12;186:15</p>	

<p>160:23;162:21;164:22; 166:2,16;167:8,9; 172:9;175:21,22; 176:3;177:17,19; 178:2,9;180:20; 183:11,13,21;184:12 NO2/NOX (4) 77:20;160:24;175:7, 8 Nobody (1) 84:14 Nolastrangenobgood (1) 131:17 non (1) 35:9 non- (4) 22:13,21;35:10; 113:21 non-default (4) 34:15,25;35:1;36:19 none (3) 7:5;100:14;106:23 non-linear (1) 107:18 non-regulatory (19) 21:15,22,25;22:10, 17;23:4,16,18,19; 24:15,21,21;25:4,29:6; 34:25;35:3;36:18,21, 22 non-speculative (1) 113:23 noon (1) 70:13 nor (1) 146:1 north (5) 107:22;110:24; 130:17,18;133:5 northeast (1) 111:1 northerly (1) 83:21 northern (1) 54:4 Norwegian (1) 166:22 note (1) 101:3 notes (1) 169:14 noteworthy (1) 133:1 Notice (4) 47:2;177:1;185:11; 186:6 novel (1) 19:17 November (7) 10:24;11:7;14:20; 29:5;99:1,5;140:24 NOX (62) 9:13;15:17,20;16:17;</p>	<p>19:5;25:11;29:24; 42:16;56:2,5;57:14; 59:23;60:15;65:15; 74:22;79:5;80:12; 82:16,16,19;92:6; 115:17;117:11,12,19, 20;118:5,6;120:25; 124:12,13;126:18; 128:7;140:21;149:8; 150:24;151:3,24; 152:7;155:4,13,17; 157:19,21,23;162:24; 166:2,6,16;167:8; 172:9;173:1;175:22, 22;176:3;177:16; 178:9;180:20;183:11, 13,21;184:12 nuanced (1) 141:21 number (35) 20:2,2;33:2;38:15; 40:24;41:9;47:21,22; 53:20;54:13;55:25; 56:1;65:9;67:13,14; 81:21;82:14;103:16; 104:8;106:21,23; 109:20;116:22;117:1; 119:9;136:20,21,22; 152:20;155:19;168:13; 172:11;174:7,8;176:20 numbers (10) 63:25;90:16,25;91:1; 135:1,2;152:7;173:8, 14;184:4 numeric (1) 98:15</p>	<p>124:23 obstacles (3) 13:18,18;99:8 obtaining (1) 35:16 obviously (4) 6:18;121:12;178:10; 180:22 Occasionally (1) 21:2 occur (3) 10:8;156:9;181:4 occurred (1) 168:17 occurring (3) 64:25;67:12;97:22 occurs (2) 63:10;181:1 odds (4) 125:15,17;137:24; 140:4 off (17) 34:1,6;50:23;56:11, 13,16,23;71:5;103:25; 123:17;134:18;148:25; 159:9;167:13;174:25; 177:2,3 offer (2) 6:12;8:18 Office (6) 4:15;5:18;22:21; 24:17;147:20;185:9 official (2) 22:5;117:24 offshoot (1) 163:16 often (2) 156:9;178:13 old (1) 124:23 olive (1) 14:3 OLM (20) 19:18;23:3,16;24:9, 14;25:8;141:25; 163:15,15,16,16;164:7, 7,18,18,23;165:3,7,16, 18 once (6) 9:7;37:6;39:2;41:24; 75:1;181:8 one (148) 4:14;5:13;6:15,19; 8:5;9:3;11:15,18; 12:24;14:10;15:24; 16:14;17:20;19:6;20:2; 26:24;29:4,10;30:12; 35:6;40:24;41:9,13; 43:10;46:3;47:21; 49:20;50:13;51:24,24; 52:8;53:5,7;55:2,25; 57:17;58:9;60:23;61:2, 11;62:5,14;63:21;64:9;</p>	<p>65:5,7;66:3,24;68:9; 74:9;75:8;76:18,20; 79:11;80:13;81:16; 83:15;84:25;86:16; 87:7;92:2;93:25;95:14; 96:5,15;97:2,20,25; 102:11;103:4,17; 104:15,19;105:10,12, 22;106:11,18,23; 107:3;108:18,25; 109:8,23,24;110:1,3, 17,18;113:5,21; 114:13;117:1;118:20; 119:6,9;120:25; 122:10,21,21;128:3,15; 129:11,20;132:5,15,19; 134:2,8,11,15,25; 135:7,10;136:20; 139:18;140:1;141:23; 142:18,20;143:5; 144:13,15;145:22; 146:7,20;147:22; 148:9;149:19;153:22; 154:15,22;155:14,18; 156:10;157:12;160:23; 164:3;166:4,8;168:23; 172:11,15,25;174:17; 180:18;185:17;186:10 one-hour (4) 31:6;71:2;106:1; 147:17 ones (2) 82:2;107:7 ongoing (1) 185:12 only (20) 33:5;42:4;53:5,7; 65:7;87:6;88:12;93:2; 96:18;104:16;118:11, 11;131:25;132:1; 142:18;144:15;151:3; 153:11,13;160:1 onsite (2) 83:12;84:25 onto (1) 152:18 operate (1) 4:6 operating (2) 184:4,10 operators (1) 101:22 opining (1) 98:18 opinion (43) 8:23;11:17;12:14; 18:4,25;20:5,10;21:14; 26:2,13,18,23;31:21; 33:11;38:24;39:5; 42:11;45:21;46:23; 47:17;49:6;53:5;58:3, 7;68:13;79:11;86:4; 92:20;94:23;99:18;</p>	<p>100:24;107:1;109:19; 112:17,21;116:6,18; 135:11;137:4;138:14; 139:3,23;146:24 opponents (1) 105:13 opposed (4) 37:23;76:22;117:10; 141:22 opposite (4) 49:22;118:3;126:10; 180:12 optimize (1) 181:9 option (5) 23:15;24:21;140:15; 148:16,19 options (11) 23:17,19;24:8,13,16; 25:5,20;30:24;125:4; 140:4;141:23 orange (1) 153:20 oranges (2) 75:17;153:8 order (4) 60:15;61:19;107:14; 164:22 organized (1) 64:14 original (1) 121:19 originally (1) 67:23 others (2) 11:5;95:5 ours (1) 173:12 out (42) 6:25;11:21;17:14; 23:9;30:14,14;32:14; 45:21;51:19;52:12; 56:12,20;57:15;59:16; 61:8,12;74:16,18; 76:11;79:1;84:3; 103:11;118:21;126:16; 134:3;140:11;146:17; 147:1;154:5;158:18; 159:17,25;160:6; 162:7;166:8,16; 169:12,12;171:24; 172:3;178:6;185:11 outcome (1) 139:17 outdoor (2) 168:25;171:19 outlet (2) 177:1;183:20 outlined (1) 139:4 outlines (1) 42:8 output (1)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>43:22 outside (12) 18:23;58:3;68:23; 73:15,15;93:5,7,8,9; 171:10;172:3;181:2 over (19) 13:18;22:5;39:25; 43:15;62:20;64:10; 80:12;84:8,14;95:17, 18;111:2,3;129:19; 142:2;154:9,20; 163:10;183:21 overall (1) 161:15 overemphasize (1) 87:15 overriding (1) 11:13 overrule (5) 35:21;36:3,10;37:6; 139:11 overstates (1) 127:16 overview (1) 26:22 overwhelming (1) 106:4 own (4) 53:18;54:3;119:3; 132:5 oxide (2) 9:22;16:1 oxides (3) 5:20;6:3;16:15 oxygen (3) 16:23;17:1,1 OZAH (1) 4:4 Ozguven (8) 119:6,6;122:18; 123:1;126:4,5,6,18 ozone (85) 8:3,24;9:8,10,14,18, 22,25;10:1,6,20;11:10; 14:11;15:5,6;16:3,7,11, 14,15,16,17,17,19,20, 25;17:7,15,18;18:5,9; 19:1,10;21:14;22:9; 25:11,16,21;29:23; 41:13,20;42:17;43:9; 47:9;56:7,9;57:11; 58:9,23;59:6;61:21,22; 74:20,22;76:19;78:23; 79:6;99:15;100:7,7,20; 112:1,3,4,6,6;137:21, 22;152:13;154:3; 156:21;163:3,18; 164:13,22;165:12,16, 24;166:3,7,13;171:15, 25;172:3;179:20</p>	<p>page (82) 12:18,19;23:9,23; 24:7,12;26:14;27:6,24; 30:13;41:3,6,7;43:25; 44:3;63:6,17,18,20,25; 64:1;65:10;67:13,14; 69:5;74:1,2,3,9,11; 75:22,24;77:10,11,18; 82:7,14;85:4,14,16; 88:18,18,23;89:7,9; 90:12,16,22,23;97:5; 101:21;102:20;114:24; 115:10,11,14;119:1; 121:22;136:3,4;143:8; 147:15;148:13;149:13, 16;156:25;157:4,5; 160:10,16,20;168:8; 172:7;175:17;177:14; 178:1,15,21,21;180:18; 181:24;183:10 pages (3) 97:3;103:23;149:18 paginated (1) 63:22 paired (4) 38:14;90:6;92:21; 148:6 pairing (2) 46:1;92:9 panels (1) 39:21 Panofsky (4) 94:18;95:2;96:25; 97:7 paper (1) 81:1 paragraph (9) 24:3;30:19;44:4,6,7, 16;143:17;147:16; 178:25 parameters (4) 42:5;45:22,22; 184:16 Parcel (4) 4:9;8:5;9:1;45:21 Pardon (2) 113:8;123:12 pared (3) 43:19,20;142:16 parens (1) 179:6 parent (2) 136:15;137:18 Park (1) 5:23 parking (4) 58:25;65:18;95:18; 146:4 parkland (1) 47:25 parse (1) 166:8 part (22)</p>	<p>14:18,20,21;40:7; 51:9;54:4;60:14;65:7; 76:10,12;101:7;106:6; 111:25;118:16,18; 129:22;130:2;131:24; 148:11;156:19;173:6; 184:5 particular (49) 12:16;13:15;14:15; 19:9;22:15;31:4,16; 40:15;42:22;43:23,24; 44:4;54:6,8;56:3,4,4; 58:9,17;65:21;66:8; 72:1,2,12,17;73:3,14; 79:12;83:19,20;95:4,7, 20;106:17;107:15,22; 109:20;111:11;118:21; 119:15;136:22;149:10; 150:6;152:24;173:18; 176:15,16,17;181:2 particularity (1) 185:10 particularly (13) 15:5;29:9;47:14; 48:9;57:16;61:20; 62:19;78:25;97:9; 100:10;138:4;146:20; 149:15 particulate (1) 84:4 parties (4) 4:20;40:9;147:21; 186:16 parts (7) 71:3;72:12;76:19; 105:4,7;114:9;129:12 pass (1) 103:7 passed (1) 70:16 passenger (3) 122:8;126:16,19 passes (1) 111:2 Pat (1) 4:23 peak (4) 105:16;160:23; 181:8;182:3 peculiarities (1) 109:7 peer (1) 119:11 pending (2) 26:10;135:18 peninsula (1) 159:17 people (6) 39:23;62:19;103:7; 130:2;131:21;182:13 per (9) 71:3;72:12;76:20; 105:4,6,7;114:9;</p>	<p>118:19;184:19 perceived (1) 45:2 percent (37) 15:23,25;18:11,13, 16,19;19:4,8;79:4,4,14, 22;82:16,22;89:22,24; 91:11,15;141:1,2,3; 144:9;145:20,22; 168:11;176:14,18,23; 177:16,18,19,20,21; 178:4;182:1,22;184:6, 13 percentage (3) 9:9;145:14;167:9 percentages (2) 18:15;58:17 percentile (7) 43:15;89:22;104:16, 19;106:12;114:6; 160:23 perfect (2) 40:25;41:10 performed (1) 8:23 perhaps (9) 19:6;20:2,16;32:15; 33:2;52:4;139:14; 167:11,22 perimeter (3) 93:5,7;137:22 period (8) 44:24;83:15,16,16; 84:11,14;155:6;177:6 periods (3) 154:1;156:5,9 permit (12) 28:21;33:19,21,22, 23;35:8,10,17;36:1; 40:5;147:21,24 permitting (2) 28:22;34:21 person (3) 72:8;113:10,13 personally (1) 185:19 perspective (1) 28:15 pertained (1) 108:13 pertains (1) 160:1 petition (1) 4:4 petitioner (1) 4:6 phase (2) 178:9;180:21 phone (2) 56:15,19 phones (1) 56:11 phonetic (2)</p>	<p>118:3;131:17 photo (9) 61:10,11,11;74:20; 78:12;79:3,12,25; 82:18 photograph (1) 100:12 pick (1) 47:20 picked (3) 79:14;129:15;151:6 picking (1) 47:2 picks (1) 56:2 picture (1) 102:11 pictures (3) 62:1,15;102:10 piece (1) 144:19 Pilot (2) 69:19;70:20 pipe (2) 9:7;98:8 place (8) 9:23;10:5;17:2; 57:17;62:23;113:15; 115:21,21 placed (1) 172:11 places (3) 57:18;112:3;131:22 planned (1) 6:8 plant (20) 17:11;20:11,23,24; 46:12,13;62:24;63:2, 13;64:19;65:11,13; 67:11;93:15;94:10; 102:6,19;103:5;138:1, 3 plants (5) 20:19,21,22;62:17; 63:2 play (2) 13:7,14 played (1) 133:12 Plaza (1) 4:9 please (17) 4:21;36:14;38:7; 44:19;55:24;60:23; 61:24;69:11;70:10; 82:13;112:14,14; 137:7;145:15;155:15; 160:8;183:9 pleasure (1) 86:14 plenty (1) 130:1 plethora (1)</p>
P				

<p>102:16 plume (15) 16:4;20:11;58:14,15; 59:2;62:24;63:12,13; 64:19;65:12,16;78:22; 102:18;138:1,3 plumes (17) 20:17,23;62:2,17; 63:3;64:21;67:11; 100:9;101:23,25; 102:7,16;103:8; 163:17;164:21;165:22; 166:1 pluming (1) 102:14 plus (3) 151:7;152:8,8 PM (10) 16:5;78:6;87:22; 117:10,18;120:11; 134:9;169:23;175:1; 186:22 PM2.5 (2) 14:24;15:2 pocket (1) 56:12 point (53) 13:24;20:8;36:10; 40:1;44:12;46:18; 48:23;64:18,20;66:23; 68:2,3;75:2;78:14; 79:8,24,25;81:7;84:9; 86:1;91:9;94:5,13,13; 99:6;102:15;106:16, 25;107:13;108:3; 128:5,19;135:16,18; 143:18;146:9,17; 147:1,1;152:13; 153:18;156:13,18; 158:2,18;163:2; 173:13;176:3;178:6; 181:25;182:19;184:23; 185:5 points (6) 49:20;77:3;88:5; 104:14,22;114:15 pollutant (4) 14:12;16:2;72:12; 119:15 pollutants (4) 13:10,12;14:24; 16:13 pollution (2) 5:22;66:24 pop (1) 163:9 populations (1) 72:9 portion (8) 44:15;89:11,14; 143:17;150:23;153:15, 15;181:22 pose (1)</p>	<p>180:4 posed (1) 14:4 position (3) 99:1;141:21;149:7 possible (1) 114:12 possibly (2) 4:13;6:9 post-doctoral (1) 119:8 Post's (1) 61:10 potential (4) 23:12;32:14;44:25; 144:1 potentially (4) 143:11,23;145:11,24 power (27) 17:11;20:11,19,21, 22,23,24;46:12,13; 62:17,24;63:1,2,13; 64:19;65:11,13;67:11; 93:15;94:10;101:24; 102:6,19;103:5;138:1, 3;184:18 powered (1) 167:9 Powerpoint (6) 20:17,20;59:2,18; 100:9;132:7 prairie (4) 46:13,14;93:15; 94:11 precedence (1) 138:9 precise (1) 172:5 precludes (1) 19:14 pre-date (1) 14:16 preliminary (3) 5:12;7:2;139:12 premise (7) 32:19,19,20;63:15; 109:18,19;146:1 premises (2) 66:3,24 prepare (1) 132:12 prepared (6) 6:12;70:20;139:20; 145:13,17;158:1 presence (1) 17:7 present (5) 7:24;10:13;17:8,16; 94:17 presentation (2) 110:22;132:7 presented (6) 43:2;80:10;105:13;</p>	<p>125:16;126:7;144:21 presumably (1) 57:18 presume (1) 52:19 presumes (1) 56:2 presumption (1) 32:19 pretty (7) 40:10;46:10;62:20; 65:17;66:19;100:17,19 prevail (1) 84:8 previous (4) 121:20;127:18; 132:14;140:24 previously (10) 21:8;25:23;53:18,24; 54:3;118:1;120:7; 126:7;127:1;142:25 primary (6) 5:25;17:14;19:7; 60:3,5;171:17 principle (1) 14:2 principles (1) 11:13 print (1) 130:13 printed (4) 167:10,13,15,18 prior (3) 14:16;15:13;131:2 pro (1) 30:19 probability (1) 139:20 probably (7) 6:16;65:14;98:7; 122:10;159:4,5;185:21 problem (17) 30:17;34:24;53:4; 57:12;73:6;95:23;96:4, 4;97:8,25;98:1;105:11; 106:6;113:2;124:10; 131:20;163:5 problematic (1) 113:6 problems (5) 19:4;58:10;110:17; 122:7;125:14 procedural (1) 7:2 proceed (3) 7:2,6,15 process (8) 28:14,18;35:9,10,16; 36:1;129:23;130:3 processed (1) 44:24 produce (6) 106:18;107:2,3,3;</p>	<p>127:14;145:5 produced (4) 119:7,9,10;130:23 produces (2) 29:7;30:2 producing (1) 130:6 product (1) 14:11 professor (1) 119:8 proffer (1) 97:5 proffered (1) 5:16 profile (2) 66:4;96:14 profiles (1) 66:5 progressive (2) 27:23;29:8 projection (1) 106:13 prolonging (1) 69:4 promoted (1) 30:20 pronounce (1) 172:12 pronouncing (1) 131:20 proof (1) 46:10 proper (3) 28:22;115:25;124:1 properly (1) 139:5 property (1) 62:3 proportional (1) 67:1 proportionate (1) 151:17 proposed (7) 28:8;45:16;107:23; 110:2;118:10;143:4; 182:2 proposing (1) 44:21 protect (1) 40:13 protection (1) 31:23 protocol (2) 10:24;11:1 proven (1) 95:21 provide (4) 9:3;81:1;108:15; 115:9 provided (13) 9:5;33:18;51:21; 81:9;82:6;97:4;108:24;</p>	<p>110:10;117:6;132:6; 174:1,2,3 provides (1) 12:25 providing (1) 28:20 proximity (2) 103:7;158:4 PSD (2) 147:21,23 public (1) 4:2 published (1) 119:11 puff (2) 110:17,20 pull (1) 52:11 pumps (1) 4:7 purports (1) 118:21 purpose (7) 12:14,23;53:16;54:1; 124:18;141:10;171:11 purposes (2) 53:8;76:13 pursuant (2) 4:5;24:18 put (21) 19:2;38:11;39:8; 42:6;53:16,22;58:13; 71:23;74:15;98:12; 113:3;117:5;118:1; 119:12;135:14;145:16; 157:22;164:9;166:18; 168:20;186:17 puts (1) 29:23 putting (4) 13:21;129:1;131:12; 186:5 puzzle (1) 61:10 PVMRM (2) 23:16;24:14</p>
Q				
				<p>QS (1) 5:25 Quagit (3) 118:2,3,4 qualification (2) 49:20;96:13 qualifications (4) 25:18;96:6;97:20; 98:10 qualified (1) 161:10 qualify (6) 19:1;91:12,17,18; 99:19;178:11</p>

<p>Quality (6) 25:24;28:11;39:18; 85:21;139:18,25</p> <p>queue (21) 18:13;43:10;58:25; 61:22;67:8;91:2,6; 98:5;99:20;100:18; 127:8;137:22;146:3; 160:2,25;162:19; 164:1;182:2,9,10,11</p> <p>queued (1) 165:15</p> <p>queues (4) 105:15;107:17; 118:10;149:8</p> <p>queuing (1) 118:12</p> <p>quicker (1) 182:25</p> <p>quickly (1) 62:20</p> <p>quite (5) 11:19;65:25;76:10; 92:2;181:3</p> <p>quote (11) 8:4,4;12:22;27:5,21, 24;34:19;63:16;82:13, 15;101:20</p> <p>quoted (3) 13:6;26:14;30:23</p> <p>quotes (3) 30:3,12,22</p> <p>quoting (1) 22:19</p>	<p>rather (6) 96:2;121:18,19; 124:2;127:16;151:15</p> <p>ratio (44) 18:12;19:5,7;25:11, 13;42:16;68:21;77:20; 79:5,16,24;80:12; 82:17;115:17;149:7; 150:23;152:7,11; 155:3,4,7,13,17; 156:24;157:20;160:24; 166:2,15;167:3,8; 168:10;171:22;172:2; 175:7,8,22;176:3,13, 18,23;178:9;181:25; 182:21;184:12</p> <p>ration (1) 153:2</p> <p>rations (1) 150:10</p> <p>ratios (21) 18:11;56:2,5;57:14, 21;74:12,12,17;75:5; 76:19;77:20;82:19; 149:24;150:6;151:16; 156:15,16;158:3; 171:21,22;182:25</p> <p>reach (3) 11:4;90:17;109:16</p> <p>reached (1) 177:21</p> <p>reaches (2) 95:25;98:7</p> <p>react (3) 15:3;78:23;171:14</p> <p>reacting (1) 180:9</p> <p>reaction (27) 9:14,18,22,24;10:1; 14:11,12,15;17:15; 74:21,24;99:15;100:7; 166:2;178:17;179:3,4, 5,11,13,22;180:7,11, 24;181:2,3,4</p> <p>reactions (2) 14:14;156:11</p> <p>reactive (2) 15:5;17:1</p> <p>read (26) 8:12;26:15;27:5,22; 31:5;44:12,15;45:22; 63:23;81:13;84:5; 89:10;90:16;96:7; 104:5;119:3;131:9; 141:18;142:25;144:3, 19;148:13;167:15; 174:22;178:16;179:10</p> <p>reading (17) 80:24,25;81:1;96:17, 23;106:1,24;109:8; 143:6;160:10,17,19; 174:21;178:19,20; 179:7;184:7</p>	<p>readings (7) 104:17;106:18; 107:4,7,9;115:2,7</p> <p>ready (1) 55:18</p> <p>Reagan (1) 47:3</p> <p>real (2) 50:9;128:23</p> <p>reality (1) 143:19</p> <p>realize (1) 56:11</p> <p>realized (1) 56:14</p> <p>really (21) 17:12;25:16;31:12; 48:21;72:9;82:22; 83:17,18;84:7;93:10, 21;98:1;107:21;112:1; 113:19;129:16;153:8; 161:5;177:22;178:8; 180:19</p> <p>reason (6) 16:22;83:14;93:2; 111:23;133:9;151:12</p> <p>reasonably (3) 137:5,12;139:24</p> <p>reasoning (1) 59:13</p> <p>reasons (2) 95:18;116:22</p> <p>rebuttal (41) 6:8;7:7,7,22,25;8:22; 14:17,19;15:13;16:10; 17:19;18:2;20:6;26:20, 25;33:19;42:12;67:6; 88:3,20,22;89:19; 90:11;105:20;116:5, 15;119:1;121:1,17; 128:10;136:11;137:5, 10;138:8;139:24; 140:13;141:9,18; 144:11;160:11,14</p> <p>recall (10) 59:5;70:2,4;97:1; 105:20,22;110:21; 130:25;133:13;163:22</p> <p>recalling (1) 120:17</p> <p>received (3) 5:15,20,21</p> <p>recently (1) 165:14</p> <p>receptor (4) 45:8;94:1;146:18,21</p> <p>receptors (3) 37:25;43:22;102:7</p> <p>recess (6) 27:15;78:6;87:22; 134:9;169:23;175:1</p> <p>recognition (1) 178:7</p>	<p>recognize (4) 80:1;111:6;167:12, 17</p> <p>recognized (2) 18:5;106:6</p> <p>recognizes (1) 31:6</p> <p>recognizing (5) 32:9;35:8;80:2; 125:3;163:18</p> <p>recollect (1) 120:16</p> <p>recollection (3) 10:22;35:15;121:3</p> <p>recommend (6) 25:19;45:12;89:15; 143:1;147:12;148:7</p> <p>recommendation (2) 4:19;88:9</p> <p>recommendations (2) 140:3;147:19</p> <p>recommended (5) 34:17;39:10;45:3; 53:15;98:20</p> <p>recommends (1) 25:6</p> <p>record (43) 6:15;7:10;8:18;12:1; 27:18;58:13;59:20; 69:24;78:9;80:8;81:14; 82:9;88:2;98:24; 101:14,22;103:25; 104:3;111:20;113:7,9, 12;117:6;118:1;123:4, 17;130:9;131:9,24; 133:15;134:19;144:20; 148:25;159:9;166:19; 167:7;174:18,25; 185:14;186:6,6,13,18</p> <p>red (2) 114:15,20</p> <p>reduce (2) 30:9;128:17</p> <p>reduced (1) 27:4</p> <p>reduction (1) 128:10</p> <p>refer (6) 17:20;80:7;136:3; 149:10;177:13;183:7</p> <p>reference (23) 13:6;20:17;22:23; 24:9;43:24;52:18; 58:13;73:22,23;81:12; 82:6;85:4,4;88:18,25; 89:8;93:14;123:6; 127:11,12;177:24; 178:1,1</p> <p>referenced (11) 14:6;32:6;60:25; 68:11;69:22,23;70:6; 102:25;114:3;123:8; 128:12</p>	<p>references (1) 82:5</p> <p>referencing (3) 88:17,18;130:12</p> <p>referred (1) 105:1</p> <p>referring (14) 44:5;91:24;111:16; 117:19,20;119:5,25; 131:5;133:2;166:25; 171:3;173:8;176:23,25</p> <p>refined (7) 22:6;29:6;39:25; 45:3,3;57:22;141:11</p> <p>reflect (11) 11:1;93:4;106:8; 112:18;114:24;127:4; 139:5;146:20;149:24; 153:4;166:6</p> <p>reflected (12) 12:15;34:19;105:17; 111:24;112:11;136:10, 11,13;137:5;139:24; 144:2;153:25</p> <p>reflective (1) 92:19</p> <p>reflects (2) 149:24;154:2</p> <p>regard (1) 82:12</p> <p>regarding (3) 45:1;116:18;142:16</p> <p>regardless (1) 10:8</p> <p>regime (1) 156:20</p> <p>regimes (1) 158:24</p> <p>region (1) 112:7</p> <p>regional (4) 24:17;112:5;144:2; 147:20</p> <p>registered (1) 107:4</p> <p>regulation (2) 32:2;43:25</p> <p>regulations (8) 23:1;30:1,8;33:13; 39:15,20;71:6;97:10</p> <p>regulator (1) 39:12</p> <p>regulators (1) 35:13</p> <p>regulatory (10) 22:14,22;34:14; 35:11;36:17;37:18; 40:4,16;117:24;146:16</p> <p>rehashing (1) 96:3</p> <p>reiterate (1) 135:21</p> <p>reject (1)</p>
R				
<p>radius (1) 19:15</p> <p>rainy (1) 84:4</p> <p>raise (1) 156:16</p> <p>raised (4) 79:16,17;139:4; 153:19</p> <p>raises (1) 48:11</p> <p>ran (3) 177:2,3;183:18</p> <p>rapidly (1) 65:3</p> <p>rare (9) 45:13,23;89:15;90:5; 143:1,13,19;144:15; 147:12</p> <p>rate (13) 61:19;63:9;75:4; 99:14;138:2;141:23; 156:11;160:5;178:17; 179:4,22;180:7;181:4</p> <p>rated (1) 153:25</p>				

<p>36:19 rejected (1) 101:25 rejecting (1) 107:1 relate (2) 104:17;115:15 related (3) 48:8;72:7;111:21 relates (1) 115:16 relationship (1) 127:18 relationships (4) 50:18;94:2;146:18, 21 relative (6) 23:14;24:24;50:20; 90:16;155:25;169:7 relatively (7) 45:13,23;89:16; 143:2,13,19;144:16 relevant (3) 35:25;60:1;170:14 reliable (5) 135:12;137:5,12; 139:24;140:2 relied (1) 145:4 relies (3) 20:14;58:21;81:20 rely (2) 15:10;153:9 relying (5) 149:6;150:10;152:5; 156:24;176:18 remaining (1) 17:18 remember (8) 69:24;103:16; 110:14,19;119:3; 133:9;162:21;166:3 remembering (1) 59:9 remind (1) 7:12 render (1) 158:18 repeat (3) 36:15;57:3;145:15 repeated (1) 6:2 repeats (1) 143:12 repetivity (1) 59:22 rephrase (1) 158:6 report (86) 4:19;7:22,25;8:22; 14:17,20;15:13;16:10; 17:19,23;18:1,2;20:6; 26:20,25;29:1;33:19;</p>	<p>42:12;67:6,7,10;68:9, 10,14;69:18;73:22; 80:9,9,20;81:15;82:7,7, 15;88:14,21,22;89:20; 90:11;96:25;99:2,5; 101:5,7,21;102:2; 116:5,15;118:2,3,21; 119:1,7;121:1,1,17; 122:19;123:1;124:18, 19,25;126:6,12,23; 128:10;130:22,24; 132:8;136:11;137:5, 10;138:8;139:24; 141:8,9,18;144:11; 149:3;160:11,14; 163:20;166:24;167:2, 6;171:1,2;172:7 reported (1) 106:10 reporting (1) 104:15 reports (16) 11:8,11;14:16,16; 27:1;61:7,15;68:9; 71:24,25;82:25; 110:18,22;120:8; 121:20;148:10 represent (4) 104:14;143:25; 145:10;152:7 representation (2) 12:25;13:14 representative (36) 33:6;42:7;45:7,14; 46:9,9,25;47:18;48:3,5, 7,15,17,22;49:3,17; 50:1,12,21;51:4;53:1, 15;54:2,18;83:18;84:7; 85:20;90:1;109:20; 143:3,15;157:11; 158:2,25;159:23;169:5 representativeness (2) 51:12;169:6 represents (5) 106:21;125:5; 143:10,22;157:2 repress (1) 156:3 require (7) 17:15;26:3;28:18; 33:20,24;35:20;146:13 required (4) 31:1;40:4,16;106:7 requirement (2) 26:18;148:1 requirements (2) 21:24;147:6 requires (4) 22:10;24:17;34:22; 89:2 requiring (1) 111:22 rescind (1)</p>	<p>12:10 resolve (2) 6:9;170:10 resolving (1) 6:19 respect (5) 12:16;84:16,17; 117:17;141:20 response (1) 116:10 responsibility (1) 102:2 rest (2) 160:7;177:6 restate (2) 36:13,15 restrict (1) 74:16 result (5) 28:8,19;109:7;110:3; 126:22 resulting (1) 183:21 results (23) 30:10;32:14;39:7,13; 43:12;68:20;69:19; 70:19;89:20;127:13; 168:9,18;176:15,16,17, 21,24;177:14,22; 178:2;181:20;182:24; 183:17 resume (4) 34:11;78:8;88:3; 170:22 retract (3) 12:10;138:24;141:19 retreat (4) 15:22;27:23;29:8; 128:11 retreating (1) 29:4 return (3) 30:21;69:3;185:7 review (23) 5:24,24,25;6:2,2; 8:22;16:11;28:14,18; 34:14;35:9,10;36:24, 25;37:3,18;68:10;72:4; 110:9;121:13,15; 134:5;141:17 reviewed (10) 7:21;17:25;35:12; 52:19,20,25;68:13; 116:6;119:11;141:18 reviewing (4) 28:15;35:22;52:4; 136:25 reviews (1) 36:17 revision (2) 147:21,23 revisions (2) 27:1;61:6</p>	<p>rhythmic (1) 66:6 Richardson (1) 63:16 Richmond (1) 52:1 ride (1) 111:3 right (171) 5:9,11;6:7,23;7:5; 10:12;16:5,16,25; 17:14;20:22;21:2,3; 27:12,13,17;31:10; 32:22,25;33:8,11,15; 34:9;35:4;40:19;42:18; 47:10;49:7,10,13,25; 51:11;52:9,15;56:24; 57:9;59:16;60:9;61:2, 17;62:11;63:23;70:9, 17;73:10;76:8;77:24; 78:4,8;80:1,4,6,13,15; 81:13,19;84:15;85:16; 87:6,16,18;88:7;89:5, 10,12,18;91:1,5,7;92:4, 7,10,22;94:22;95:16; 97:17;101:9,11,15,15, 15,17,19;102:17;104:1, 20;105:8,21;107:4; 113:24;116:1,3,17,20; 117:9,15;120:6;121:5, 16,23;122:4;123:15, 24;124:3,9;125:24; 126:9;127:25;129:17; 130:6;131:14,20; 133:15,17,17,19; 134:12;135:3;140:8; 143:6;146:25;147:5, 25;152:5;153:5;154:4, 9,18;155:9;156:23; 157:7;158:23;159:7,8, 20;161:11,14;162:23; 163:8;165:5,19; 167:21;170:9,22; 171:5,8,9,23;175:6,14; 176:8,14,19;177:8; 181:17;182:5,17,17,19; 183:6,16;184:18,19,21; 185:7,23;186:4,5,11, 14,19 right-hand (1) 90:15 ring (3) 105:16;107:17;146:3 rises (2) 177:20;178:3 risk (1) 61:20 Road (25) 4:8;69:19;70:19,25; 71:4,5,17;72:15;73:25; 75:12,12,13,18,20; 76:13,21,23;77:21; 105:16;112:22;114:25;</p>	<p>115:2;146:3;151:8,20 roads (1) 107:17 roadside (2) 80:13,15 roadway (11) 71:12;80:15;106:8; 149:25;150:3,18; 151:4,17,22;152:8; 153:10 roadways (3) 106:5;146:4;151:15 ROBESON (1) 43:19 Rockville (1) 47:9 role (3) 13:8,15;133:12 room (4) 4:15;56:23;62:20; 185:9 ROSENFELD (161) 5:1,1;6:11,16,18;7:6, 8,16;8:14,17,20,21; 10:14;12:1,7;13:5; 14:5;17:5;19:21;21:8, 13;23:22;24:2,6,12; 25:3,14;26:12;28:3; 29:17;33:16;34:12; 35:3,7;36:16,22;37:2, 17,22;38:1,4,8,16;39:4; 42:10;43:5;44:17,18; 45:18;46:20;51:18,21, 24;52:3,8,14;55:6; 57:5,6;59:16;63:18,20, 22,25;67:25;68:4,17, 20,23;69:2,6,10,16,23; 70:7,10,13;73:12;74:6; 76:5;77:4,10;78:10,20; 81:5,23;82:1,3,6;83:4; 84:16,21;85:7,24;86:7, 9,13,24;87:3,8,20;88:4; 90:8,11,14,23,24;91:7; 93:13;94:16;97:5,7; 98:13;102:5,23;103:1, 10,15,21;104:2,10; 110:8;112:16;114:22; 115:2,4,6,11,18,23; 116:13,23,25;122:12, 18;123:5,8,10;126:5; 130:8,21,25;131:2; 132:4;133:18;135:7,8, 9,25;138:21,24;139:1, 2,22;141:4;142:4,10; 149:18,22;169:18; 170:1 rough (2) 64:10;65:25 roughly (2) 91:11;118:6 roughness (14) 21:11;41:15;65:4,22, 23,24;66:4,7,10,19;</p>
--	--	---	---	---

67:1;98:6;99:7;100:3 run (2) 172:25;174:10 running (5) 177:9,20;178:3; 182:15,16 rural (6) 38:18;41:15;82:15; 96:2,4;98:25 Rutgers (1) 119:8	169:10 science (4) 5:19;6:3;41:2;82:25 scientific (4) 33:10;56:6;125:23; 126:2 scientifically (2) 10:9;56:7 scientist (2) 25:23;139:19 scientists (1) 39:22 scrutiny (3) 22:11;28:17;34:18 sea (1) 159:16 second (24) 4:14;10:3;11:23; 12:8;15:22;16:4;23:7; 26:15;44:7,14;51:14; 62:5,14,16,64;18;75:8; 80:14;97:3;129:2; 131:23;134:2;144:19; 146:8;185:9 secondly (10) 11:20;17:18;27:3; 40:13;46:11;51:3; 99:13;103:6;104:23; 137:21 seconds (1) 74:25 secret (1) 49:5 Section (11) 4:5;11:23;25:23; 40:22;41:5;45:20; 61:11;85:4,18;147:19; 163:23 Sections (1) 24:18 secure (1) 56:19 Seeing (2) 7:5;82:21 seeking (2) 32:9;146:23 seem (2) 32:7;161:6 seemed (5) 99:1;103:12;119:23; 128:6;174:23 seems (5) 32:4,8;161:9;165:17; 179:11 sees (1) 97:22 segregated (2) 127:24;135:4 select (5) 38:11;49:2,15;51:2; 158:8 selected (4) 34:15;35:10;51:4;	54:1 selection (9) 37:4,19;38:9,17,20, 21;53:17;54:3;55:1 sell (1) 118:11 sending (1) 185:11 sense (6) 30:25;32:13;39:2; 157:18;165:3;182:7 sensitive (1) 72:9 sensitivity (1) 54:14 sent (2) 82:2,4 sentence (5) 24:4,5;26:15;89:14; 178:25 separate (1) 118:21 separately (1) 134:24 September (2) 10:15;121:7 sequence (1) 27:1 serious (3) 16:8;19:3,4 seriously (1) 161:21 served (2) 25:23;35:22 session (2) 4:13;5:13 Set (7) 17:25;40:14;42:7; 71:18;176:15,16,17 sets (1) 32:24 setting (1) 33:19 seven (1) 168:22 several (5) 21:5;43:15;44:8,20; 105:12 shaken (1) 13:25 shape (1) 66:6 sharp (1) 112:7 shed (11) 171:5,6,7,18;172:4, 8;176:23;177:9; 183:12,22,22 shock (1) 119:4 short (3) 21:9;62:21;174:23 shortcut (1)	124:22 shorter (1) 84:5 short-term (1) 5:21 show (30) 6:17;20:14;21:6; 43:3;57:20;62:22;67:7; 68:25;69:11,13;74:15; 76:18;90:21;95:24; 102:12;103:3;107:16; 111:9;114:14;115:20; 118:15;119:16;128:7; 133:19;139:17;166:19; 167:6;181:20;182:21, 24 showed (9) 62:15;100:12; 102:10;118:3,5; 120:24;167:3;170:4; 173:5 showing (1) 144:21 shown (13) 45:14;88:13;104:14; 105:18;121:21;136:10, 17;137:10,24;143:3; 144:10;156:8;177:12 shows (18) 66:9;73:24;74:11; 76:19;80:11;100:8; 104:21,25;111:14; 117:3;120:3;122:5; 126:9;139:12;150:23; 168:8,10,12 shut (1) 177:3 side (6) 46:4;47:21;51:13; 90:15;102:20;119:25 sides (1) 67:4 significant (4) 139:20;153:23; 156:19;183:20 significantly (1) 28:9 Silver (1) 4:8 SILVERMAN (27) 5:3,3;52:15;81:24; 82:2,4;86:19,20;87:21; 102:16;113:7,9,14; 133:8,14;142:7,9; 169:14,20;170:2,14,19; 173:10,23;174:10; 186:2,4 similar (6) 51:16;62:3,6;111:13; 125:20;126:22 similarity (1) 62:14 simply (2)	15:10;18:10 single (1) 143:13 SIP (2) 147:21,23 site (38) 4:7;42:19;45:21,21; 46:3,8;47:1,18;48:1; 49:21,24;50:20,21; 51:5;52:25;53:1,14; 54:2,7,23;55:1;56:4; 57:19;80:16;88:13,15; 105:17;107:2,15,22; 108:25;109:7;110:3; 111:11,13;146:19,21; 158:9 sites (20) 47:17,21;51:17; 52:21;53:25;75:14; 82:15,18;94:4;104:15; 106:4,5,8,10;107:16; 111:22;112:2,9,10; 157:17 sitting (1) 170:2 situation (23) 12:24;28:25;29:9; 49:18;53:1;105:23; 110:25;142:18,20; 143:5,8,20;144:5,15, 17,24;145:1;146:18; 148:14,20;158:5,11; 165:8 situations (4) 109:21;156:6; 168:12;169:7 six (4) 40:8;114:9;177:18, 19 size (1) 110:19 skin (1) 19:3 skipped (1) 143:17 sleep (1) 135:23 slide (9) 61:9,24;63:20;64:17, 24;65:10;66:2;120:1; 122:13 slides (18) 21:6;55:8,12;58:24; 59:2,18,19;60:22; 62:22;69:3;102:17,23; 119:13,17,18;121:22; 122:25;130:21 slope (2) 110:11,14 slow (2) 127:16;180:11 slower (3) 66:10;156:8;181:4
S				
S-2863 (1) 4:4 safety (1) 32:16 sakes (1) 128:21 same (17) 11:25;14:2;24:7; 35:14;37:5;47:21,24; 51:13;52:1;62:4;94:2; 113:4;129:10;132:18; 179:9,19;185:8 samples (1) 150:20 sanctioned (1) 125:15 satisfactory (1) 174:24 satisfied (1) 26:18 saving (2) 74:6,7 saw (4) 52:11;113:24;164:8; 180:11 saying (35) 28:4;32:1;41:1; 47:12,13;79:23;89:25; 95:2,5,6;97:15;101:12; 106:9,12;107:6,6; 108:2;109:2;110:2; 122:24,24;124:14; 126:3;129:10;161:6, 22,23;162:1;163:3; 164:24;169:3;173:15; 180:25;181:9;183:16 scale (6) 63:11;65:20;121:18; 128:18;142:3;167:4 scaled (1) 138:8 scale-down (1) 128:22 scales (2) 13:17;62:4 scaling (6) 116:2;120:4;128:16, 18,20,21 Scandinavian (1)				

<p>slowing (1) 67:2</p> <p>slowly (2) 160:9;182:6</p> <p>small (2) 63:11;130:13</p> <p>smaller (6) 63:12;64:20,21; 101:25;178:10;180:21</p> <p>small-scale (1) 21:10</p> <p>smart (2) 56:19,22</p> <p>smoke (1) 62:19</p> <p>smoking (1) 62:18</p> <p>smoother (1) 66:16</p> <p>so-called (1) 9:7</p> <p>solar (1) 159:11</p> <p>sole (2) 50:9,10</p> <p>solely (1) 118:9</p> <p>solid (1) 40:11</p> <p>somebody (1) 132:11</p> <p>somehow (1) 99:19</p> <p>someone (3) 62:18;165:25;179:8</p> <p>sometime (1) 176:1</p> <p>sometimes (5) 47:9;61:7;79:7; 167:18;169:2</p> <p>somewhat (3) 32:4;162:22;166:19</p> <p>somewhere (4) 103:24;119:17; 175:3;177:5</p> <p>Sonoma (9) 68:9,10,17;69:10; 70:21;73:22;114:23; 115:13;149:3</p> <p>sophisticated (1) 125:4</p> <p>sorry (26) 12:19;24:10;28:3; 36:25;41:3;58:12;68:1; 69:14;74:21;76:1; 80:25;85:11;105:3,5; 108:22;114:2;117:14; 119:24;136:20;145:24; 150:12;151:10,25; 173:9;178:19;184:7</p> <p>sort (3) 72:13;84:10;104:24</p> <p>sorted (1)</p>	<p>126:15</p> <p>sought (1) 30:16</p> <p>sounds (2) 166:12;167:21</p> <p>source (32) 42:18,20;45:16; 46:14;49:24;50:17; 60:19;63:11;64:9;66:8; 72:3;90:2,2;91:12,16, 20,24;92:1,15;93:6,18; 94:1,10;134:1;143:5; 144:12;146:18,20; 153:12,16;161:8; 164:19</p> <p>sources (54) 9:10;22:8;31:8; 40:23;43:9;45:13,23; 46:15,16;49:23;50:19, 22;56:4;57:20;60:24; 61:23;62:2,15;67:16; 88:9;89:16;90:3;91:9; 93:2,4,5,23;94:3,9,11; 143:2,13,19;144:1,16; 145:7,9;150:25;151:5; 152:8;153:4,10; 156:20;160:4,25; 161:12,15,24;162:8,21; 164:1;165:11,15; 166:13</p> <p>south (3) 95:13,25;107:23</p> <p>sp (2) 118:3;131:18</p> <p>space (1) 171:13</p> <p>span (1) 182:11</p> <p>spatial (2) 45:10;147:10</p> <p>spatially (1) 45:6</p> <p>speak (4) 78:15,17;95:10; 116:23</p> <p>SPEAKER (1) 186:7</p> <p>speaks (4) 8:12;111:8,8;124:17</p> <p>special (1) 4:5</p> <p>specific (9) 49:11,14;56:5;57:13; 72:24;125:22;126:15; 147:6;171:20</p> <p>specifically (8) 22:4;23:11;97:16; 108:9,12;110:23; 120:19;126:16</p> <p>speculate (1) 113:1</p> <p>speculation (3) 35:14;113:19;138:16</p>	<p>speculative (4) 35:19;37:5;113:22; 166:10</p> <p>speed (17) 13:11,20;66:6,10,15, 22,23;67:1,2;83:23; 96:19;97:23;99:12; 107:24;156:7,7,9</p> <p>speeds (10) 66:20;107:20;117:3; 118:5;122:6;126:21; 127:17;156:4,8;159:13</p> <p>spending (1) 8:14</p> <p>spent (1) 115:24</p> <p>spoken (1) 6:11</p> <p>spot (2) 53:17;131:12</p> <p>squad (1) 32:14</p> <p>Spring (1) 4:8</p> <p>squeaks (1) 19:2</p> <p>stability (1) 111:4</p> <p>stable (4) 65:14;97:23;100:10; 156:1</p> <p>stack (8) 17:11,12,15;60:6,7; 98:8;103:13;180:5</p> <p>stacks (1) 62:18</p> <p>staff (3) 6:25;134:7;174:16</p> <p>stage (71) 17:20;18:1,2,7,7,8, 10,25;19:22,24;29:4,5, 18,25;33:17,18;42:15; 55:7,21;57:8;58:1,9; 68:6,7;73:13;83:2,5,7, 9;89:20,20,21,23; 100:13,13;104:23; 106:13,16;136:10,12, 13,14;137:4,8,13; 138:10,12,13,15,15,17, 19;139:5,23;140:5,8, 11,12,16,17,19;141:6, 7,11,12,14,20;160:3, 20,21;162:13</p> <p>stages (1) 106:13</p> <p>stakeholders (1) 40:10</p> <p>stand (2) 5:11;130:10</p> <p>standard (21) 31:22;71:2,4,17; 72:11,25;84:19,21; 104:18,18,23;105:2,9;</p>	<p>106:6;111:21,22; 114:10,11;139:18; 146:15;150:16</p> <p>Standards (9) 28:11;40:12;71:1,2; 72:11,21;73:8;104:5; 140:1</p> <p>standpoint (3) 40:16;158:23;169:6</p> <p>start (8) 15:21;18:7;42:15; 61:5;73:21;137:18; 142:15;172:25</p> <p>started (2) 20:1;30:14</p> <p>starting (3) 78:11;178:9;180:20</p> <p>starts (2) 30:14;181:8</p> <p>state (10) 7:10;35:4;74:20; 78:12;79:13;82:18; 119:10;148:1;160:8; 186:9</p> <p>stated (4) 29:13;125:1;139:19; 148:6</p> <p>statement (5) 31:4;57:10;58:19; 126:3;168:19</p> <p>statements (1) 6:6</p> <p>state-of-the-art (1) 22:7</p> <p>states (9) 67:10,13,14;79:15; 83:12;85:14;101:7; 104:18;107:12</p> <p>station (13) 4:7;58:25;79:3; 83:13;95:25;105:15; 107:17;110:2;118:10, 10,18;146:2;182:3</p> <p>stationary (8) 74:20;78:12;79:13, 24,25;82:18;182:7,14</p> <p>stations (2) 101:24;107:11</p> <p>status (2) 22:8;23:15</p> <p>stay (2) 135:24;173:21</p> <p>steadily (2) 177:20;178:3</p> <p>steam (1) 65:2</p> <p>steep (1) 151:15</p> <p>step (2) 15:24;144:13</p> <p>STI (3) 70:20;115:13;149:3</p> <p>stick (3)</p>	<p>113:17;121:19; 138:12</p> <p>sticking (1) 156:24</p> <p>still (13) 7:13;40:25;50:3; 68:6;76:9;79:21;83:5; 106:24;110:2;149:4; 162:13;186:14,14</p> <p>stirred (1) 14:1</p> <p>Stop (3) 5:3,5;112:25</p> <p>strangely (1) 179:11</p> <p>stratification (1) 111:4</p> <p>stress (1) 96:19</p> <p>strict (3) 38:24;39:5;57:16</p> <p>strictly (2) 40:4,15</p> <p>strike (1) 81:12</p> <p>strong (2) 29:12;102:3</p> <p>strongly (1) 147:18</p> <p>struggle (2) 86:15,18</p> <p>student (1) 119:8</p> <p>studied (1) 74:13</p> <p>studies (12) 5:24;19:8;20:17; 39:21;73:19;129:6; 130:2;152:1;166:22; 168:20;170:18,19</p> <p>study (37) 5:23;58:17,18,19; 62:25;69:19;70:20; 73:4;80:13;114:23; 117:1;122:1,2;125:17, 23;126:2,25;127:11, 12;128:12;129:2,20, 21;130:12,14,17; 132:10,12,19;133:4,21; 134:20;135:11,12,12; 171:16;183:4</p> <p>stuff (1) 170:15</p> <p>subject (7) 4:7;53:1;100:9; 106:18;107:2;109:6; 110:3</p> <p>subjected (1) 100:11</p> <p>submissions (1) 131:2</p> <p>submit (1) 6:17</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>submitted (4) 6:14;35:23;101:21; 174:6</p> <p>subscribe (1) 71:5</p> <p>subsection (1) 30:14</p> <p>subsequent (2) 22:16;141:17</p> <p>substantial (2) 9:9,11</p> <p>substitute (1) 96:14</p> <p>subsumed (1) 48:15</p> <p>suburban (3) 46:15;47:25;185:18</p> <p>successive (1) 29:1</p> <p>suddenly (3) 121:16;128:10,17</p> <p>sufficient (1) 175:10</p> <p>sufficiently (1) 55:2</p> <p>suggest (3) 27:10;104:4;114:12</p> <p>suggested (3) 106:19;110:16;160:7</p> <p>suggesting (5) 65:1;105:22;106:17; 126:2;160:4</p> <p>suggestion (3) 59:4;71:3;124:20</p> <p>suggestive (1) 113:10</p> <p>suggests (1) 155:6</p> <p>suitcase (1) 160:15</p> <p>Sullivan (87) 5:10;8:2,23;10:3,15; 11:2,4;14:17;16:6,8; 18:8;20:14;22:2;26:13, 18;29:1;33:22;35:10; 43:17;46:1;51:9,25; 52:20;54:13;56:8; 58:21;59:14;61:21; 63:1;65:3,15,23;66:2; 68:7,11;70:6;75:4; 81:20;82:23;83:7; 94:17;95:3,10;96:8,16; 97:3;99:2,7;100:4; 101:4;104:13,18; 105:19;109:22;110:10; 116:4,12;117:25; 119:1;120:4;123:10; 125:9;127:7;128:6; 129:6;132:19;133:9; 138:6,19;140:12; 144:21;145:4,12,17; 149:25;152:11,19; 155:23;156:8,22;</p>	<p>160:3;163:19;164:17; 165:25;166:17;174:13; 179:3</p> <p>Sullivan's (26) 7:21;8:17;10:23; 11:7;33:18;42:12;47:2; 55:7,20;57:8;58:1; 60:13;61:7,15;82:7; 88:14;97:21;122:16; 136:11;137:16;140:23; 148:10;153:11;160:11, 13;166:13</p> <p>summary (5) 68:20;69:18;70:19; 149:7;177:14</p> <p>summer (1) 82:20</p> <p>sun (4) 79:1,1;155:24; 159:17</p> <p>Sunday (1) 61:10</p> <p>sunlight (1) 79:7</p> <p>sunny (1) 159:19</p> <p>super (7) 105:21;106:2,19,24; 107:5;109:9,25</p> <p>supervision (1) 148:3</p> <p>supplied (1) 127:1</p> <p>support (4) 26:23;58:7;73:20; 149:7</p> <p>supported (3) 13:4;26:17,20</p> <p>suppose (1) 62:10</p> <p>supposed (4) 69:3;122:8;124:11, 13</p> <p>sur (3) 6:8;7:7;88:3</p> <p>sure (36) 9:15;16:13;23:4,8; 35:5;54:16;55:10,12; 66:2;70:16;75:16; 76:10,14;90:19;92:2; 103:23;106:20;116:10; 117:15,19;126:24; 131:23;138:18;144:20; 145:16;149:11;155:16; 157:23;166:11;167:7; 169:3,5;174:16,19; 181:10;183:8</p> <p>surface (29) 13:17;21:4,7,10,11, 12;41:15;45:2;64:10; 65:22,24,25;66:4,7,10, 13,16,19;67:1,12; 95:18;96:14,98:6;</p>	<p>100:3;103:5;138:4; 155:23,25,25</p> <p>sur-rebuttal (1) 30:6</p> <p>suspect (2) 109:25;159:23</p> <p>suspicious (1) 135:15</p> <p>sustain (2) 19:20;26:6</p> <p>swirls (4) 13:19;64:17,18,20</p> <p>switch (3) 148:22;173:14,17</p> <p>switched (5) 175:23;176:2,12,13; 184:16</p> <p>synergistic (1) 107:19</p> <p>system (4) 77:18;113:15; 136:17;178:17</p>	<p>13:9;15:12;40:1; 46:6,21;47:5;67:20; 68:6,15,17,22;69:8; 73:8,13;74:24;75:7; 76:1,16,17;89:8,13; 110:11;115:25;117:9, 9,11,13,18,18;123:19; 138:13;140:17;147:3; 148:1,2;153:2;158:12; 159:21;179:14,15,20, 21,23,24;180:3,5,24; 181:6</p> <p>talks (8) 13:6,13;14:7;18:16; 31:7,7;46:11;75:12</p> <p>Tampa (3) 157:1;159:1,6</p> <p>tasks (1) 40:9</p> <p>tech (1) 131:21</p> <p>technical (3) 57:24;111:21;147:15</p> <p>technology (7) 39:23;68:10,18; 69:10;70:21;73:22; 149:3</p> <p>teeth (1) 19:3</p> <p>telling (1) 76:21</p> <p>temperature (14) 155:14,18,20;156:2, 2,10,14,14;158:24; 177:1;180:10,10; 181:1,8</p> <p>temperatures (15) 83:22,23;159:6; 168:25;169:7,8;178:7, 18;179:5,12,23,24; 180:5,6;181:7</p> <p>temporal (2) 45:10;147:10</p> <p>tend (4) 28:18;114:14;155:4; 156:4</p> <p>tends (2) 66:21;82:17</p> <p>tension (2) 30:7;32:12</p> <p>term (6) 22:13,19;23:18;33:8; 67:17;94:7</p> <p>termed (1) 24:20</p> <p>terms (20) 6:19;16:1;22:7; 25:20;31:11,12;51:7, 12;66:5;74:18;75:9; 87:15;119:14;138:1; 145:14;153:20;154:1, 24;160:4;162:20</p> <p>terrain (4)</p>	<p>96:21;108:4,25; 110:9</p> <p>terribly (2) 47:24;77:13</p> <p>testified (36) 8:3;10:3;22:14; 33:22;40:17;61:5; 65:23;68:5,8;73:16; 82:9;95:4,14;102:9,10; 105:19;109:23;120:10, 19,22;121:6;132:15; 138:6;141:5,13,19; 143:18;144:7,15; 155:16;158:8;161:5; 165:12,14;170:21; 176:22</p> <p>testify (7) 6:13;30:4;35:18,24; 81:9;109:1;144:5</p> <p>testimony (26) 7:25;8:11;10:4; 35:15;59:5;60:13;71:1; 88:3,6;99:8;105:13,20; 120:17;128:9;139:7; 141:7;142:15,17; 144:18,24;148:10; 158:4;159:18;160:7; 162:4;165:10</p> <p>testing (2) 172:20,20</p> <p>tests (2) 176:20;183:6</p> <p>Texas (15) 125:18,18;126:2,8, 12;127:11,22;129:2; 130:12,16,18;131:15; 133:4,5;135:11</p> <p>Thanks (1) 116:25</p> <p>theoretical (1) 78:25</p> <p>theory (1) 63:16</p> <p>there'd (1) 40:25</p> <p>therefore (6) 35:17;45:4,12;89:14; 142:25;147:11</p> <p>thermostat (2) 34:1;112:14</p> <p>thinking (2) 58:10;159:24</p> <p>third (4) 12:8;16:3;62:17; 80:14</p> <p>though (6) 15:3;79:22;94:3; 99:6;135:22;178:6</p> <p>thought (4) 67:23;120:22; 165:12,14</p> <p>thousand (1) 20:16</p>
T				
<p>Table (42) 73:23;74:1,2,9,11; 75:11;76:13,16,20,24; 77:16,17;80:25;81:1; 114:24;115:11,13,14; 136:6,8;149:13; 156:25;168:8,15,15; 171:3;173:4,5,21; 175:17,20,23;176:25; 177:12;181:20,23,24; 182:21,24;183:5; 184:8,9</p> <p>tables (1) 133:25</p> <p>tail (1) 9:7</p> <p>tailpipe (22) 17:13;18:20,23; 20:11;60:8;62:17; 73:15;98:8;100:15,16, 25;101:2;102:7; 166:16;168:24;169:1; 171:12,24;173:1,7; 177:11;181:21</p> <p>tailpipe-by-tailpipe (1) 166:5</p> <p>tailpipes (1) 152:20</p> <p>talk (12) 37:12,15;55:14; 78:12;91:23;100:5; 144:16,23;146:8; 152:4;156:13,23</p> <p>talked (9) 12:4;60:13,14;65:3; 100:4;110:16;138:7; 156:7;169:5</p> <p>talking (48)</p>				

<p>three (31) 15:18;16:7;18:2,7,7, 8,10;33:14,14;36:5; 42:8,15;62:1,1,15; 74:12;80:12;83:9,15, 16;85:1;86:5;134:8; 140:6,7,8;176:1,2,6; 177:4;181:22</p> <p>throughout (1) 124:7</p> <p>tier (15) 15:24,24;16:3,7,7; 23:14;24:8;79:14,19, 20,21;80:1;140:16,20; 141:1</p> <p>tiers (2) 15:18;33:14</p> <p>timeframe (1) 84:6</p> <p>times (6) 58:22;120:10;150:9; 159:17,21;175:22</p> <p>timing (2) 87:15;154:24</p> <p>title (2) 125:21;160:19</p> <p>titrating (1) 166:7</p> <p>today (12) 6:7,24;36:5;61:6; 131:3;143:18;144:6, 14;158:16;170:11; 174:4;185:14</p> <p>together (3) 112:4;160:5;162:13</p> <p>told (1) 135:23</p> <p>toll (4) 157:14,15,19,25</p> <p>took (8) 51:16;68:8;98:25; 120:23,24;122:24; 153:3;176:13</p> <p>tool (5) 9:2,4;125:4,8,15</p> <p>tools (4) 32:11;33:5,9;125:9</p> <p>top (1) 61:2</p> <p>topic (6) 86:9,12,23;87:1,2,3</p> <p>topography (2) 41:16,16</p> <p>total (12) 15:19;29:4;89:23; 91:11,15;140:15; 141:22;145:14,16; 146:10;166:6,9</p> <p>totally (2) 108:6,8</p> <p>touched (1) 47:16</p> <p>touchstone (2)</p>	<p>30:8,16</p> <p>towards (1) 82:17</p> <p>traffic (5) 65:19;71:11;105:14; 107:19;152:2</p> <p>trafficked (2) 112:10;114:14</p> <p>trafficking (1) 115:22</p> <p>trailed (1) 167:13</p> <p>transferred (1) 66:17</p> <p>transferring (1) 64:15</p> <p>transformations (4) 13:1;14:7,8,18</p> <p>transformed (1) 96:9</p> <p>transition (1) 95:15</p> <p>transitional (1) 95:12</p> <p>transport (5) 13:1,7,7,9,10</p> <p>travel (2) 60:15,16</p> <p>traveled (2) 59:24,24</p> <p>traveling (1) 59:25</p> <p>treat (1) 38:12</p> <p>treated (1) 116:7</p> <p>treatment (3) 96:18;165:4,6</p> <p>treats (1) 9:25</p> <p>tremendous (2) 66:14,15</p> <p>trend (5) 83:17;84:1,2,12,17</p> <p>tried (1) 135:24</p> <p>trouble (1) 179:7</p> <p>troubled (1) 119:11</p> <p>trucks (1) 118:16</p> <p>true (4) 49:17;156:12;181:3; 182:12</p> <p>trust (1) 118:20</p> <p>truth (2) 33:5;130:6</p> <p>try (7) 21:1;56:5;71:10; 84:2;113:19;125:22; 183:16</p>	<p>trying (15) 30:25;32:3;47:11; 49:6;51:2,10;72:10; 92:13;103:3;109:11, 14,16;115:8;154:5; 179:13</p> <p>tunnel (1) 166:22</p> <p>turbulence (24) 13:16,17,22;14:3; 62:3;63:15;64:6,9,12, 25;65:3,6,9,20,25;67:5; 95:17;96:1;98:6;99:10, 11;100:2;108:24;138:5</p> <p>turbulent (6) 21:10;62:1;66:16; 74:23;96:19;98:2</p> <p>turn (6) 34:6;55:7;56:11,13, 16,23</p> <p>turned (3) 34:1,6,10</p> <p>Turning (2) 11:13;175:17</p> <p>twice (4) 118:6,7;120:25; 128:7</p> <p>two (51) 11:21;15:24;16:13; 17:16;18:1,11,25; 19:23,24;20:2,22;15; 32:12;33:21;35:2; 39:16;47:22;48:8; 49:20;56:2;60:24; 61:11;66:9,18,19; 84:25;87:9,9,13;97:3,3, 20;99:4;103:3;104:21; 112:4;116:4,9;121:8; 126:21;127:14;128:3, 3;129:19;132:15; 134:8;146:6;160:5; 163:4;172:23;175:21; 180:13</p> <p>twofold (1) 96:5</p> <p>Tyler (5) 23:11;143:6,20; 144:17;146:22</p> <p>type (2) 118:22;127:24</p> <p>types (2) 88:9;134:1</p> <p>typical (3) 30:24;45:11;147:11</p> <p>typically (1) 159:13</p> <p>typographical (2) 122:10;124:1</p>	<p>ultimately (4) 50:5,7;161:4;181:11</p> <p>uncertain (1) 41:25</p> <p>uncertainties (7) 31:17,19,25;40:18; 41:1,19;46:21</p> <p>uncertainty (21) 30:9;31:7,8;39:13; 40:21,24;41:12;42:1,9, 11,19,20;43:6,7,12,17; 46:22;47:13;51:1;80:3; 148:4</p> <p>under (23) 7:13;18:4,19;24:8, 12;25:4,11;28:1;50:22; 65:17;66:21;96:20; 100:10;138:15,16; 146:19;158:20;166:13; 168:20;177:1;178:7; 183:10;185:11</p> <p>underlying (1) 45:5</p> <p>underneath (4) 122:9,11;123:19,21</p> <p>understated (2) 126:18,18</p> <p>understatement (1) 162:6</p> <p>understates (1) 127:16</p> <p>unexpected (1) 183:17</p> <p>unfortunately (1) 173:11</p> <p>UNIDENTIFIED (1) 186:7</p> <p>uniform (3) 13:23;45:7;66:20</p> <p>unique (4) 105:17,23;107:20; 136:23</p> <p>United (1) 107:11</p> <p>units (1) 134:2</p> <p>University (1) 119:9</p> <p>unless (5) 20:8;29:14;81:9; 83:12;158:17</p> <p>unlikely (1) 170:12</p> <p>unpublished (1) 128:12</p> <p>up (38) 13:22;14:19;19:8; 38:5;39:24,24;40:10; 41:22;55:15;59:1; 78:15,17;79:16;80:16; 95:8;98:7;116:23; 121:18;124:22;125:8, 11;128:10;129:20,20;</p>	<p>130:2;148:23;151:6; 166:20;168:13;170:10; 173:12;176:7;177:20; 178:3;181:8;185:16, 19,21</p> <p>upgrade (1) 120:11</p> <p>upon (2) 63:5;111:4</p> <p>upper (8) 31:24;79:4,10;91:1, 5;104:24;167:16; 168:16</p> <p>upward (1) 66:11</p> <p>urban (17) 38:17;41:14;46:15; 47:24;48:11,14;49:24; 65:6;80:11;82:18;92:5, 19;93:1;96:2,4;98:25; 160:24</p> <p>urbanized (1) 51:14</p> <p>use (45) 8:10,24;9:20;16:6; 20:18;21:24;22:13; 24:16;29:13;33:8; 38:14;43:14;51:3; 83:13;85:1,2;94:24; 98:9,21;101:25;110:3, 16;111:10;125:5,8,9; 128:16,20,21,22; 133:25;134:15;136:24; 137:20;140:24;142:22; 158:9,17;164:4; 165:19,21;172:19,21; 183:3,5</p> <p>used (37) 8:4;9:4;16:9;22:3,7; 32:20;33:6,7;37:19; 38:21;41:22;43:17; 63:1;65:4;76:23;85:20; 101:22;117:25;120:10; 136:14;150:1,5; 152:11,19;163:19,25; 164:3,7,12,13;165:7, 25;166:17;172:19,22, 24;182:4</p> <p>useful (1) 53:25</p> <p>uses (12) 29:6,18;58:2;61:8; 82:23;83:7,9,9,95;23, 24;98:10;101:4</p> <p>using (19) 25:6;44:22;50:19; 58:20;65:6;67:15,17; 80:9;86:4;88:8;94:6; 101:23;133:3,10; 134:22;158:16;160:24; 163:15;165:4</p> <p>usual (1) 83:21</p>
		U		
		ultimate (1) 79:24		

<p style="text-align: center;">V</p>	<p>138:8 versus (12) 38:17;41:15;42:3; 115:25;117:23;118:9; 132:17,17;133:23; 134:21;138:3;181:1 vetted (3) 97:10,14,15 View (3) 5:8;8:17;19:17 viewpoint (2) 47:23;57:25 violations (1) 28:10 viscosity (2) 64:5,5 viso (1) 30:19 voila (1) 13:23 voir (1) 35:15 volume (2) 16:4;167:24 vote (2) 87:7,8 votes (3) 86:20;87:9,9 voting (1) 87:12</p>	<p>119:13;135:14;139:9; 140:16;145:16;157:22; 164:9;166:1;183:17 ways (5) 111:7;130:5;136:7; 155:19;183:19 wealth (1) 40:6 weather (1) 180:22 week (3) 154:9,20;155:5 week-long (2) 150:11,13 weekly (7) 153:21;154:6,14,15, 16,25,25 weighted (2) 153:25;154:2 weighting (1) 151:15 welcome (1) 69:7 Westfield (2) 4:10;48:1 whatnot (3) 62:20;64:18;71:25 what's (22) 16:1;27:2;31:12; 33:9;40:3;41:20;48:15; 60:9;61:8;66:14,22; 82:11;86:14;89:7; 104:8;126:4;138:4; 150:18;162:20;171:12; 172:5;180:25 Wheaton (8) 4:9,10;47:11,25; 48:1;157:25;169:8; 178:13 whereas (4) 65:18;66:18;153:10; 154:24 Whereupon (7) 27:15;78:6;87:22; 134:9;169:23;175:1; 186:22 whirls (5) 13:19;64:3,3,4,5 whispered (1) 142:10 whole (7) 18:18;57:24;67:4; 106:5;129:11;171:11; 177:22 Wholesale (1) 4:3 whose (1) 138:16 wider (1) 32:13 willing (1) 90:5 wind (33)</p>	<p>13:11,18;49:23; 50:23;64:11;66:4,5,10, 15,20,22,23;67:1,2; 83:23,23;93:22;95:13, 24;96:19;97:23; 107:24;111:1;146:19; 152:23;156:4,7,7,8,9; 158:24;159:13;172:1 winds (1) 83:21 windy (2) 83:19;84:4 winter (6) 82:19;83:20,22; 155:24;169:7,8 wish (1) 36:10 within (36) 10:7;18:12,12,20; 19:15;23:17;24:16; 35:24;36:2;37:7;41:12; 45:22;58:2;61:23; 71:16;73:24;74:15,17; 75:14,15;76:21,22; 83:15;85:21;86:25; 100:15,25;149:8,24; 160:2,25;161:12; 162:5;165:15,15;181:7 without (18) 56:3,15;57:24;72:5; 89:25;96:3,3;98:9,10; 99:16;100:5;103:6; 146:14;148:7;164:23; 165:3,7;166:8 witness (391) 5:10;6:7;9:19;10:11, 13;12:20,22;14:2; 16:25;20:22,24;21:3,9, 21;22:2,18,25;23:2,6,9, 20,25;24:3,11,14,23; 25:2;26:9,11;27:8,10, 14,19,21;28:1,6;30:5, 11;31:3,11;32:18,23; 33:1,12;34:3;36:13,23; 37:9,12,16,24;38:2,5, 11,14;41:5,9;42:4,23, 25;43:20;44:1,3,6,10, 12;46:8;47:6,20;48:4, 8,20,23;49:1,4,7,10,13, 19;50:2,4,6,8,11,13,16; 51:6,11;52:23;53:3,9, 11,13,20,22;54:4,8,12, 22;55:4;56:18,25;57:3; 59:8,11,13;60:2,6,8,10, 18,20,22;61:3,5,16,18; 62:8,11,13;63:8,15,19, 21;64:3,8,24;67:19,21; 68:25;71:7,10,15,22; 72:16,22;73:1,3,9; 74:9;75:3,10,14,18,21, 24;76:8,15,25;77:8,11, 13,16,22,24;78:19,21; 79:20;80:1,5,7,21,25;</p>	<p>81:7,13,17,19;82:13; 84:13,20,22,24;85:5,8, 11,13,17,19,23;87:10, 13,17;88:20,23;89:1,3, 6,9,12,17,19;91:8,21; 92:5,8,12,18,23;93:1,9, 12;94:15;95:8,10,17; 96:12,24;97:2,8,12,17, 19;101:10,13,15,18,20; 102:11,17,21;103:3,20; 104:13,21;105:3,5,9, 11,25;106:3,14,20; 107:13;108:2,6,8,10, 15,19,22;109:12,15,18; 110:5;111:17,19; 113:17,21,24;114:2,5, 8,16,18,20;115:13,15, 19;116:11,16,19,21,24; 117:1,11,13,20,22; 118:13,15,20,24;119:5, 19,21,23;120:1,3,7,12, 15,19,21;121:3,6,10, 14,16,25;122:2,4,17, 21;123:2,13,15,20,22, 25;124:5,8,10,16,25; 125:3,7,11,14,20,25; 126:9,14,20;127:3,7, 20;128:1;129:15,17, 19;130:4;131:1,6,16, 21;132:20,22;133:24; 134:22,25;135:2,4,20; 139:12;140:6,8,10,14, 17,19,23;149:21,23; 150:5;153:24;154:10, 13,16,19;155:1;157:8; 160:8,12,15,17,21; 161:8,10,12,18,20,22; 162:2,10,16,18,24; 163:2,7,12;167:18,21, 24;169:3,12;173:13, 24;174:22;178:19,23; 179:7,13,17,19;180:3, 13;181:12;182:17; 185:13;186:10,12 witnesses (1) 6:10 wonder (1) 129:12 wondered (1) 132:13 wondering (1) 122:15 word (1) 178:16 wording (1) 36:23 words (13) 9:23;43:2;48:3; 66:20;79:5;80:17; 127:15;153:2;156:10; 164:21;171:23,25; 172:3 work (3)</p>
<p>valid (3) 56:7;111:11;116:21 validated (1) 22:5 validity (1) 107:14 valuable (2) 40:5,14 value (8) 65:24;79:16;80:17; 82:17;99:3;122:5; 177:4;180:20 values (20) 34:18;39:11;45:7; 73:5,7;77:13;80:15; 82:24;95:20;104:16; 106:12;111:23;114:9, 12;118:6;133:11; 147:14;166:18,19; 171:17 VanBuren (1) 53:4 vapor (1) 65:2 variability (2) 45:10;147:10 variable (2) 84:3;166:8 variables (5) 29:10;41:25;156:14; 158:18;166:9 variations (2) 32:10;183:21 varies (1) 46:15 variety (1) 183:19 various (9) 52:19,20;61:15;68:8; 71:15;82:25;95:18; 133:23;152:1 vary (3) 83:23;112:6;177:22 vehicle (5) 107:20;119:14; 127:24;135:4;145:5 vehicles (6) 92:6;93:4;118:9,22; 127:8;129:5 vehicular (1) 17:8 Veirs (1) 4:8 velocity (2) 64:4;66:7 ventilation (1) 112:20 Venugopal (1) 131:13 version (1)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait (2) 85:8;134:24 waiting (2) 170:5;182:13 Wales (4) 67:25;68:1;81:18; 101:18 walking (1) 62:19 wall (5) 107:23;108:13; 110:15,21,23 wants (2) 88:11;128:17 warm (3) 178:11;180:23;181:8 warranted (1) 58:4 Washington (5) 46:4;47:7;51:13; 54:5;61:9 wasn't (1) 132:6 way (35) 9:4,9,18,25;19:2; 21:20;31:2;32:16;38:7, 7,12,12;39:8;43:13; 53:22;58:5;63:5;64:16; 69:5;71:8,10,23;93:22; 98:12,20;114:10;</p>			

29:4;39:21;173:24 worked (3) 22:20;39:19;72:19 working (2) 40:2;84:1 works (2) 16:12;58:5 world (1) 57:14 Worth (3) 130:16,19;133:4 Wow (1) 70:15 write (1) 4:18 wrong (3) 109:10;141:24;150:2	122:5 1:15 (1) 87:19 10 (6) 4:9;62:24;64:24; 76:22;120:10;182:20 10:26 (1) 27:15 100 (15) 63:4;71:3,13;72:12; 79:4,21;80:14,16; 104:22;105:1,4,5,9; 114:9;175:22 11 (10) 65:10;102:22,25; 136:6,11,14,21,22; 147:15;148:13 11160 (1) 4:8 11th (1) 136:16 12 (6) 27:24;46:4;48:9; 90:12,22,23 12.2.1 (1) 147:19 12:03 (1) 78:6 12:29 (1) 87:22 12-13 (1) 6:4 13 (1) 103:1 130 (1) 100:17 13-12 (1) 4:4 1395 (1) 178:21 1397 (7) 168:8;172:8;175:18; 177:14;178:2;181:24; 183:10 14.3 (1) 176:4 14.5 (1) 168:22 15 (7) 120:1;121:21,22; 122:25;178:8,12; 180:20 150 (2) 63:5;97:5 16 (3) 4:7;122:14,25 17 (4) 122:25;167:25; 169:4,9 17.5 (1) 168:23 18 (3) 74:3;157:7;176:7	190 (1) 105:6 1983 (1) 175:11 1984 (2) 96:25;97:14 2 2 (47) 33:17;58:9;79:14,19, 20;88:16,23;89:20,21; 90:9,10,11,22,23; 100:13;104:23;106:13; 136:10,12,13,14;137:4, 8,13;138:12,13,15,15, 17,20;139:5;140:5; 141:1,11;144:10; 168:8;173:4,5;175:17, 20,23;177:12;181:20, 23,24;184:8,9 2.5 (4) 117:10,18;120:11; 182:14 2:53 (1) 134:9 20 (10) 5:13,17;80:14,16; 176:10,13;182:4,5,8,22 200 (1) 63:5 2009 (2) 80:9,11 2010 (11) 11:22;12:3,11,15; 19:14;23:11;56:1; 79:17;117:24;118:4; 134:21 2011 (18) 11:25;12:2,9,15; 19:14;20:4,5;21:21; 23:10;27:5;28:5;32:7; 56:1;69:18,20;70:18; 89:4;143:7 2012 (4) 10:15,24;11:8;17:23 2013 (7) 4:12;11:8;14:21,21; 112:11;141:8;142:2 2014 (5) 4:13,14;6:4;7:21; 185:8 20-minute (1) 182:11 20th (1) 121:7 21 (5) 44:3;82:7;89:9; 143:8;181:25 21st (1) 57:2 22.1 (1) 176:10	23.0 (1) 176:10 24.1 (2) 176:11;182:1 244 (2) 85:17,18 25 (28) 18:13;19:4;43:8; 58:2;74:14,17;75:6; 99:19,21;100:25; 150:1,5,6;152:11,18; 153:11;158:3;160:1; 161:7;162:5;166:17; 168:11,17;173:14,14; 176:14;181:14;184:18 25.3 (1) 176:11 26 (1) 4:12 285 (2) 12:2;30:13 29 (5) 4:13;6:9;23:11; 185:8;186:18 29th (1) 186:19 3 3 (41) 24:8,12;29:5,18,25; 33:18;55:8,21;57:8; 58:1;68:6,7;73:13; 83:2,5,7,9;88:16,23; 89:20,23;91:13; 100:14;104:24;106:16; 138:11;139:23;140:5; 141:12;144:11;160:3, 20,21;162:13;166:20; 167:3;168:18;171:4; 176:18;181:14;184:6 3- (2) 74:2;157:6 3.1.2C (1) 24:18 3.7 (1) 184:12 30 (10) 19:8;176:18,23; 177:2,3,6,20,21;178:4, 9 30- (1) 180:20 300 (1) 59:1 31.5 (1) 177:4 318 (7) 74:10,11;114:24; 115:11;149:13;156:25; 157:5 3-18 (3) 115:14;149:18,18	32 (1) 180:2 32.5 (2) 168:13;177:5 33 (10) 73:23;74:2;75:11; 136:3,4;160:11,16,20; 175:23;181:25 3-3 (10) 76:13,20,24;114:24; 115:10,11,14;149:13, 18;156:25 34 (1) 185:18 35th (1) 4:2 36 (1) 175:25 39 (1) 176:6 391a (1) 12:3 4 4 (5) 24:25;66:2;123:13, 14;124:12 4:07 (1) 169:23 4:23 (1) 175:1 4:52 (1) 186:22 40 (32) 9:7;18:12;19:5,15; 58:2;67:8;73:21,24; 74:15,17,18;75:6,15; 76:11,21;79:12;80:17; 91:11;93:8;99:19; 110:20;137:22;144:8; 149:8,25;150:2; 161:12;165:15;184:4, 10,15,18 400 (1) 59:1 407 (9) 12:3;24:7;27:7;28:4; 32:7;44:3;89:7;91:23; 143:8 41 (1) 119:1 411 (1) 104:14 42 (1) 176:9 43 (1) 101:21 44 (1) 89:22 45 (1) 176:10 461 (1)
--	---	---	---	---

119:2 466 (3) 119:2,3;160:11 47 (1) 82:19 48 (1) 176:10	82:16;91:15;144:9; 177:19;178:3,4 600 (2) 6:2;70:16 601 (1) 6:5 602 (7) 70:18,22;74:2;115:3; 149:3;153:9;157:6 603 (6) 133:2,5,6,20,21; 135:10 604 (3) 175:7,7,12 62 (1) 145:22 63 (1) 89:24 65 (1) 80:18 68 (2) 80:16;85:16 68230 (4) 12:18,20;26:14; 30:13 68244 (1) 85:14 68246 (1) 41:7 6th (1) 6:9	40:22;41:5 9:30 (3) 4:15;185:7,9 98th (7) 43:15;89:22;104:16, 19;106:11;114:6; 160:23		
5				
5 (13) 23:9,23;42:16,22; 57:21;58:3;67:5;68:5, 23;73:14,16;74:13; 149:9 50 (8) 18:11;82:22;83:1; 89:22;91:11;160:3; 161:15;162:8 50/50 (1) 98:21 51 (2) 145:20;176:11 54 (1) 176:11 56 (1) 80:15 567 (1) 136:2 581 (2) 59:17;119:22 583 (4) 51:19;52:2,18,18 59 (1) 82:20 593 (8) 103:20,21;104:10, 11,12;111:16;112:24; 114:1 596 (1) 5:18 597 (1) 5:20 598 (1) 5:23 599 (1) 5:24 59G2.06 (1) 4:5				
6	7			
6 (29) 4:14;24:7,12;61:24; 115:25;116:5,14; 117:3,17,22,25;118:7; 120:11,25;122:5; 124:11,21;126:17; 127:2,15,19;132:16; 133:23;134:1,21; 138:8;145:5;168:21; 177:16 60 (6)	7 (1) 121:21 70's (1) 36:8 75 (2) 79:16;160:6 7th (1) 80:10			
	8			
	8 (2) 63:20;64:1 8.3.1.2 (2) 85:15,19 8.5 (1) 177:2 80 (9) 15:23,25;18:16,19; 79:14,17;123:7;141:1, 22 85 (5) 79:4,5,9,24;82:18			
	9			
	9 (1) 77:19 9.1.1 (2)			