

OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY

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

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on
December 5, 2013, commencing at 9:42 a.m., at the Office of
Zoning and Administrative Hearings, 100 Maryland Avenue, 2nd
Floor Council Hearing Room, Rockville, Maryland 20850
before:

Martin L. Grossman
Hearing Examiner

A P P E A R A N C E S

For the Applicant:

Patricia Harris, Esq.

Mike Goecke, Esq.

Lerch, Early & Brewer, Chartered

3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 460

Bethesda, Maryland 20814

For Kensington Heights Civic Association:

Michele Rosenfeld, Esq.

The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld, LLC

11913 Ambleside Drive

Potomac, Maryland 20854

C O N T E N T S

Witnesses: Direct Cross Redirect Recross

Henry Cole

By Ms. Rosenfeld 14

E X H I B I T S

Exhibit No. Marked/Received

405 January 15, 2010, Phase I study of environment on the site 12

406 Revision of Exhibit 404(a), Henry Cole's slide show 145

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the 22nd day of a public
2 hearing in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Board
3 of Appeals No. S-2863, OZAH No. 13-12, petition for a
4 special exception pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section
5 59-G-2.06 to allow petitioner to construct and operate an
6 automobile filling station which would include 16 pumps.
7 The subject site is located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silver
8 Spring, Maryland. That's Lot N, 631 Wheaton Plaza, Parcel
9 10, also known as Westfield Wheaton Mall, and is zoned C-2,
10 general commercial.

11 The hearing was begun on April 26, 2013, and we've
12 had, as I say, we already had 21 other sessions. It was
13 noticed to resume again today, and the next session has been
14 noticed for Friday, that is tomorrow, December 6, 2013, here
15 in the second floor hearing room of the Council Office
16 Building at 9:30 a.m.

17 This hearing is conducted on behalf of the Board
18 of Appeals. My name is Martin Grossman. I'm the Hearing
19 Examiner, which means I will take evidence and write a
20 report and recommendation to the Board of Appeals which will
21 make the decision in this case. Will the parties identify
22 themselves for the record, please?

23 MR. BRANN: Erich Brann for Costco.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Brann.

1 MS. HARRIS: Good morning. Pat Harris on behalf
2 of Costco.

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Harris.

4 MR. GOECKE: Good morning. Mike Goecke for
5 Costco.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke.

7 MS. ROSENFELD: Michele Rosenfeld for Kensington
8 Heights --

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.

10 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Civic Association. I'd like to
11 note for the record that Karen Cordry cannot be here today,
12 she has a conflict for work; and Eleanor Duckett will not be
13 here today, she has some chronic hip and back problems that
14 are not helped by these chairs; and Donna Savage will not be
15 here today because her mother passed away earlier this week.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I'm sorry to hear that. Well,
17 I'm sorry to hear that the others are not here also, but I'm
18 sure your organization is ably represented by you being
19 here.

20 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.

21 MR. SILVERMAN: Good morning, sir. Larry
22 Silverman for the Coalition, Stop Costco Gas.

23 MS. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman. Abigail
24 Adelman for Stop Costco Gas Coalition.

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Good morning. Dr. Adelman.

1 MR. ADELMAN: Good morning, Mr. Grossman.
 2 Dr. Mark Adelman for the Coalition.
 3 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And I see that Dr. Cole
 4 has already assumed the seat of honor. Do we have anybody
 5 else in the audience who is here to testify today?
 6 (No audible response.)
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. All right. Then let me
 8 mention a few preliminary matters. Since our last session,
 9 we've had additional exhibits, 400 through, I think to 403
 10 unless I'm mistaken -- make sure that the exhibit list I
 11 have is the up-to-date one. Ah, there's a 404 too. Okay.
 12 So let's go through those: 400, an e-mail between
 13 Dr. Adelman, or from Dr. Adelman to me, transmitting files
 14 with more descriptive names; 401 was an e-mail on November
 15 25 between Pat Harris and Michele Rosenfeld regarding
 16 witnesses for the hearings today and tomorrow; 402, e-mail
 17 from Ms. Rosenfeld with questions from Dr. Cole re
 18 Mr. Sullivan's testimony; 403, an e-mail from Dr. Adelman to
 19 Mark Lewis DeGrace regarding -- I hope I'm pronouncing his
 20 name correctly -- regarding vehicle counts; and 404, an
 21 e-mail from Ms. Rosenfeld with copies of items that Dr. Cole
 22 plans to reference during his testimony.
 23 Okay. All right. Witnesses scheduled for today
 24 are Dr. Cole, Mark Meszaros, if we can fit him in, of the
 25 Kenmont Swim Club, with a backup of Mrs. Adelman. Do we

1 have any agreement on future dates? I've watched the
 2 back-and-forth; so, unfortunately, seems to be few dates
 3 that are available to all parties in January. I would love
 4 to be able to complete this case in January as it has been
 5 some time since we started, on April 26th.
 6 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman --
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
 8 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Dr. Breyse is available on the
 9 10th which I understand is not a date that's available, and
 10 after that he's going on several trips out of the country
 11 and is unavailable again until the 13th and 14th of
 12 February.
 13 MR. GROSSMAN: The 10th is a date available for
 14 me.
 15 MS. HARRIS: Our point was that either the 9th or
 16 the 10th, we cannot do both. So if he is available on the
 17 10th, we can be available the 10th but not the 9th.
 18 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. He was --
 19 MR. GROSSMAN: So let's do the 10th, which is --
 20 MS. ROSENFELD: -- he was looking. But Maria
 21 Jison is only available on the 9th. We've been trying to --
 22 our experts have been holding dates and holding dates.
 23 MR. GROSSMAN: As opposed to dating.
 24 MS. ROSENFELD: As opposed to dating. I'd like to
 25 put this out as a possible suggestion.

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
 2 MS. ROSENFELD: The last half of February seems to
 3 be relatively open for everybody, including our experts, and
 4 I was thinking perhaps we could schedule two days the week
 5 of the 13th and 14th and two days the following week and two
 6 days the following week, which should be more than an ample
 7 number of dates, I would hope, to finish, and we can just
 8 sequentially move through and --
 9 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a preference on the 9th
 10 versus the 10th?
 11 MR. GOECKE: No.
 12 MR. GROSSMAN: I mean, I personally prefer to do
 13 it on a Friday rather than a Thursday --
 14 MR. GOECKE: That's fine.
 15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- because I have other obligations
 16 on Thursday morning, but I can modify them as need be. So
 17 if the 10th is as convenient, why don't we get one of the
 18 witnesses in. You said Dr. Breyse was the one available on
 19 the 10th?
 20 MS. ROSENFELD: He was hoping he could juggle his
 21 schedule to make that work. He knew he couldn't make the
 22 9th work.
 23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
 24 MS. ROSENFELD: Ms. Cordry is the one who's been
 25 coordinating his calendar; so I will check with her and see

1 if he can confirm that.
 2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
 3 MS. ROSENFELD: So the 10th would be preferable.
 4 And then Ms. Jison is available later in the month of
 5 February, and I'll have to check her dates.
 6 MS. HARRIS: It sounded like January 27th and 29th
 7 were available, I believe. Is that, at least --
 8 MR. GROSSMAN: What about that?
 9 MS. ROSENFELD: Dr. Breyse is not available for
 10 any of those dates.
 11 MS. HARRIS: No, but --
 12 MR. GROSSMAN: No, but if Dr. Breyse were doing
 13 it on January 10th, what about Dr. Jison for the --
 14 MS. ROSENFELD: I will check with her.
 15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I mean, for us, I mean,
 16 we're, since we have other rooms usually we can get in this
 17 building if we know far enough in advance, it's not a
 18 problem with our schedule. We can undoubtedly provide a
 19 room any time. It's nice to be able to be in this room
 20 because it's more convenient, but if we have dates that
 21 everybody can agree to, even if we have a conflict on our
 22 calendar here, we would, you know, we would try to
 23 accommodate that, we would check it out.
 24 So let's, if we can fit everybody in in January
 25 and finish this up, that would be -- ideal is probably not a

Page 10

1 word I should apply to the progress of the case -- but it
2 would be better. So --
3 MS. HARRIS: Based on my calculation of the dates,
4 if we were to take the 10th and then the 27th and 29th, it
5 still looks like we will need one date in February --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
7 MS. HARRIS: -- and I believe people indicated
8 that the 3rd and 4th are available.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: When do you think, Ms. Rosenfeld,
10 when do you think that you would find out about the
11 availability of your witnesses? So what I'm going to
12 suggest is that you folks have a conference call with each
13 other or, if need be, just you and Ms. Harris or Mr. Goecke
14 and try to work out dates rather than e-mail exchanges. I
15 think that would be more efficient.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, if I can reach Dr. Jison and
17 Breysse today by e-mail, I might be able to confirm them by
18 the end of the day if we can do that.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Then just --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: The other witnesses I think are
21 flexible enough that we can work around them. It's their
22 two schedules. They both --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: -- are, you know, booked with
25 other obligations.

Page 11

1 MR. GROSSMAN: You can subpoena them. But, in any
2 event, let's try to do it, let's try to squeeze as many
3 dates as the parties can agree to in January, and you know,
4 if not, we'll have some in February. And just let me know
5 what the dates are, and then we'll check out, if the room is
6 occupied those dates -- such as Wednesdays, the Board of
7 Appeals always has it -- we'll see if the seventh floor room
8 is available first and then after that the wonderful
9 auditorium downstairs. So --
10 MS. HARRIS: We'll come full circle.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay. So try to get back
12 to me by the latest early next week. All right. Any other
13 preliminary matters?
14 MS. HARRIS: We had distributed by Dropbox the
15 Phase I, and I have a physical copy that I can provide for
16 you --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 MS. HARRIS: -- either now or at a break is fine.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's just, let's wait
20 until we --
21 MS. HARRIS: Okay.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- go through the preliminary
23 matters. Any other preliminary matters?
24 (No audible response.)
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Hearing none, okay, do you want

Page 12

1 to --
2 MS. HARRIS: Certainly.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- give me the -- that'll be
4 Exhibit 405 and that's the Phase I, and if I remember
5 correctly from looking at the electronic copy, it's
6 essentially, this was pre-building the warehouse; this was
7 the study of the area prior to the Costco warehouse being
8 built.
9 MS. HARRIS: But it also included --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Included the site area --
11 MS. HARRIS: Yes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- as well, but it was prior to --
13 MS. HARRIS: Correct.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- the construction of the
15 warehouse. Right. Okay. That's a fat old exhibit, I'll
16 give you that. All right. So -- it's a good thing I've
17 been going to my rehab so I can lift it. By the way, I do
18 have to leave today for rehab at 4:45; so -- all right. So
19 this will be Exhibit 405, Phase I study of environment on
20 the site, dated 1/15/2010. I didn't, in my quick review of
21 this study, I didn't see anything that was that exciting.
22 Did anybody else? Are there some areas of the study that I
23 should be paying particular attention to?
24 (Exhibit No. 405 was marked
25 for identification.)

Page 13

1 MR. SILVERMAN: I can't answer that question yet,
2 but I -- it was more than I wished for.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, they are --
4 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- these exhibits often are.
6 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes, so -- but I'll advise you
7 probably tomorrow.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. Then are we
9 ready to proceed with our first witness?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, we are.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I take it that's
12 Dr. Henry Cole. Would you --
13 MR. COLE: Good morning.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- state your full name and address
15 for the record, please?
16 MR. COLE: Yes. It's Dr. Henry Cole, Henry S.
17 Cole. You want my address?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Please.
19 MR. COLE: It's 11229 Mattaponi Avenue, or Road,
20 Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772. I will spell Mattaponi:
21 M-A-T-T-A-P-O-N-I. Some people call it Mattaponi; others,
22 Mattaponi. Take your pick.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: How about Mattaponi? Just another
24 possibility. Would you raise your right hand, please?
25 MR. COLE: Okay.

Page 14

1 (Witness sworn.)
2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may proceed.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.
4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q Good morning, Dr. Cole.
7 A Good morning.
8 Q Would you please explain to the Hearing Examiner
9 your academic background, please?
10 A Yes. Back -- a long time ago, I went to Rutgers
11 University. I was enrolled at the College of Agriculture.
12 My curriculum was preparation for research. And I chose the
13 College of Agriculture because it was a perfect place for my
14 interest in earth science, particularly soils, drilling
15 things in soil, but also meteorology and that was a place
16 where they had both -- all of those interests I could do
17 under the preparation-for-research curriculum. So my joint
18 majors or my two majors were soil science and meteorology.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: I then went to the University of
21 Wisconsin at Madison where I earned my Ph.D. in meteorology.
22 I was there from 1965 to 1969. My dissertation involved
23 climate change; however, to get through the Ph.D. exams, you
24 have to have a full background in meteorology. And so my
25 training involves dynamic meteorology, which is the study of

Page 15

1 movement; thermodynamics, which is the study of energy in
2 the atmosphere; micrometeorology, which is what happens near
3 the ground and in smaller places, such as a mall and its
4 surroundings; physical meteorology, which has to do a lot
5 with the physical characteristics of the atmosphere,
6 including the particles in the atmosphere. And my major
7 professor was Reid Bryson, the late Reid Bryson. He was
8 quite well-known in the field of climate change. His focus
9 was particulates in the atmosphere and their ability to
10 either reflect or absorb solar radiation and long-wave
11 radiation, in other words, the radiation that the earth
12 gives off.
13 I started to get very interested in air pollution
14 as a result of those experiences. It was, 1969 was a time
15 of great interest in the environment, and I happened to live
16 -- when I moved to Racine, Wisconsin, to take a faculty job
17 at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside, which is in
18 neighboring Kenosha, I happened to live in a very
19 air-polluted area, and I soon learned that Lake Michigan had
20 a profound effect -- in fact, I lived right on the lake --
21 it had a profound effect on the meteorology and on the
22 dispersion of air pollution.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: And on snow.
24 THE WITNESS: And what?
25 MR. GROSSMAN: And on snow.

Page 16

1 THE WITNESS: Yes, it does, yes, absolutely.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. But let's move along to
3 what's directly affected here.
4 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm trying to connect the
5 dots --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: -- so that you'll see all of the
8 areas that have sort of gotten me to where I am now. Okay.
9 So, so I got my Ph.D. I, as I said, I then accepted a
10 position at Parkside, which was a new campus at the time,
11 and taught environmental earth sciences and atmospheric
12 sciences -- meteorology, air pollution meteorology -- even a
13 geology course. At the same time, I did three things that
14 are of note to this case. One is, as I said, I got very
15 interested in the lake effect on pollution, and the lake
16 breeze, for example, has a tremendous influence in
17 circulating pollutants. There's also a boundary between the
18 lake, which in the summertime is cold relative to the land,
19 and that sets up -- and there's also differences in the
20 roughness of smooth water versus a rougher land surface --
21 so all of this, it comes into play in the area of modeling
22 and air pollution meteorology.
23 I partnered with a meteorologist named Walter
24 Lyons, who was, conveniently was at the University of
25 Wisconsin-Milwaukee --

Page 17

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I'd ask you to skip the side things
2 that don't really have to deal with your qualifications
3 because once you've --
4 THE WITNESS: Okay. Hold on. We --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- once you've finished with your
6 qualifications, I'm going to open up to what they call a
7 voir dire, which is to have you examined about that. So I
8 want you to stick to things that directly pertain to your
9 qualifications.
10 THE WITNESS: Okay. Ph.D., meteorology; assistant
11 professor, then associate professor at the University of
12 Wisconsin-Parkside in the field of earth sciences, teaching
13 meteorology, climatology, and other courses, environmental
14 science.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And, Dr. Cole, what years were you teaching?
18 A Excuse me?
19 Q What years were you teaching?
20 A That would be from 1969 to 1977. In 1977 I was
21 offered an intergovernmental loan position with the United
22 States EPA. I had that for two years in the modeling
23 section, the Source Receptor Branch, which is the very
24 branch that writes guidelines for modeling. After two
25 years --

Page 18

1 Q And could you please explain a little bit more
2 about what you did during that two years working on the
3 receptor issues?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: This was an EPA loan, did you say,
5 or a grant or --
6 THE WITNESS: There's a program called
7 Intergovernmental Loan --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: -- in which someone from a state
10 university or another governmental department can go to
11 another agency, the agency picks up the funding, and then
12 the person can go back to their institution. Well, after
13 two years I was offered a position as senior scientist and
14 later as a section chief at the EPA's Office of Air Quality
15 Planning and Standards.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q So let me just clarify the loan. They loaned you;
18 it wasn't a financial loan to you?
19 A No, no, no, no. It was, I was -- I was the loan.
20 Q You were the loan. It was a physical, they got --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Now, I did have that
22 confusion. I --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Right.
24 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I was the loan.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 19

1 Q The one agency loans you --
2 A I was loaned --
3 Q -- the person, for your expertise, right?
4 A -- from the university to U.S. EPA, the Office of
5 Air Quality Planning and Standards. You asked my role?
6 Q What did you do during that --
7 A I was a senior --
8 Q -- those two years?
9 A I was a senior scientist, and I provided advice to
10 the branch and to the division that dealt with modeling, air
11 quality modeling.
12 MR. GOECKE: And this is from 1979 to 1981 or --
13 THE WITNESS: My full period at EPA was from 1977
14 to 1983.
15 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
16 THE WITNESS: Okay? So my job there was to
17 provide scientific input advice, and I later became the
18 section chief of the model application section where I had
19 responsibility for a number of projects and people under my
20 direction who were involved in model applications.
21 In 1983, after being there for five or more than
22 five years, I -- well, let me put it to you this way:
23 Mr. Reagan became president. He appointed Madam Gorsuch,
24 Anne Gorsuch, whose mission was basically to freeze out the
25 agency from any regulatory --

Page 20

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's keep the politics out
2 of this --
3 THE WITNESS: I am telling you why I --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and just go directly with your
5 qualifications.
6 THE WITNESS: Okay. I left. I became the science
7 director of Clean Water Fund and Clean Water Action -- those
8 are 501(c)(3), (c)(4)s and -- (c)(3) is the fund; (c)(4),
9 the organization -- where I engaged in multiple studies
10 involving hazardous waste sites, involving hazardous waste
11 incinerators.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: And this is called the Clean Water
13 Fund?
14 THE WITNESS: Yes.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 THE WITNESS: I did a series of reports on mercury
17 contamination, some of the earliest reports signaling the
18 problems with incineration and coal burning as a, releases
19 into the atmosphere the mercury fumes, and then their
20 deposition into bodies of water and the food-chain
21 accumulation in the aquatic food chain.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: And you were in this post from 1983
23 until when?
24 THE WITNESS: 1983 until 1993. Then I started
25 Henry S. Cole & Associates, environmental --

Page 21

1 MR. GROSSMAN: You didn't go back to University
2 after your loan to the --
3 THE WITNESS: No. No.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. You weren't
5 re-institutionalized, in other words?
6 THE WITNESS: No.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead. And
8 after 1993?
9 THE WITNESS: 1993 to the present I founded Henry
10 S. Cole & Associates, an environmental science consulting
11 firm, and my clients have ranged from community
12 organizations to very large corporations and the federal
13 government, county governments.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
15 THE WITNESS: So the rest, I imagine, will come
16 out on voir dire.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS: Is that how you say it?
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Voir dire.
20 THE WITNESS: Voir dire.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Voir dire, yes. Any other
22 questions regarding the witness's qualifications?
23 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24 Q Dr. Cole, have you written any publications that
25 would be germane or inform your views on this case?

Page 22

1 A Yes. I wrote numerous publications on several
2 subjects. One was on the air pollution of coastal
3 meteorology as it affects air pollution. If you look at
4 any, at any article on shoreline fumigation or lake-breeze
5 circulations, the shoreline model, which I was a major
6 contributor to both before I went to EPA and at EPA, you'll
7 find Lyons and Cole or Cole and Lyons referenced in, in any
8 of those journal articles. Really, the work that I did at
9 EPA, which was to, was the basis for the so-called shoreline
10 model, Shoreline Dispersion Model, I did the prototype, it
11 was later further developed by others, but it was my
12 interest and my knowledge about coastal meteorology which
13 fueled that particular model and project.

14 Q Now, Dr. -- oh.

15 A The second area was on photochemical smog, and I
16 did a lot of work on the Urban Airshed Model, which is an
17 urban scale photochemical grid model. I wrote -- we in our
18 section did a lot of applications, St. Louis was one city,
19 Los Angeles another, where the model was used with all of
20 its inputs, emissions, meteorology, and whatnot and
21 chemistry, atmospheric chemistry, and our job was to see how
22 accurate this model was in producing the fields of air
23 pollution, particularly during warm summer conditions when
24 -- which is when you get photochemistry going on in the
25 atmosphere. Okay.

Page 23

1 Q And, Dr. Cole, in your role at EPA, were you a
2 regulator? Did you review and approve or deny permit
3 applications?

4 A No. No.

5 Q Did you review applications or advise anybody on
6 modeling?

7 A Yes. I provided advice actually to the assistant
8 administrator of EPA, David Hawkins, on at least one case,
9 which was a very critical case involving international
10 transboundary pollution from the United States to Canada.
11 It was the Eastport refinery in Maine where coastal
12 meteorology was a big factor. So I had to go to Washington
13 and talk to Mr. Hawkins a number of times and provide
14 advice. I provided scientific input into modeling
15 questions, into modeling guideline questions. The branch
16 chief was Joseph Tickvart, who really was at the corner of
17 putting together the modeling guidance for many, many years.
18 He was my supervisor. So I got to advise him.

19 Q And so was your role more in the function of
20 reviewing, reviewing modeled information and analyzing it?

21 A Yes. Were the right models used for the site
22 conditions properly incorporated into the modeling, those
23 kinds of questions; how do you, how do you account for
24 certain atmospheric transformations, for example, NO2
25 formation. I did a paper, a research paper on methods,

Page 24

1 various methods to figure out how much of the oxides of
2 nitrogen from automobiles or power plants were being
3 converted to NO2. So those were the kinds of -- my job was
4 to give scientific input to the regulators and that's pretty
5 much what I did.

6 Q Okay, thank you.

7 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I'd like to move
8 Dr. Cole as an expert in the field of meteorology and in the
9 field of air quality and in the science of air modeling.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So meteorology, air quality,
11 and air modeling, is that it?

12 MS. ROSENFELD: And the scientific protocols of
13 air modeling.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Air modeling and its scientific
15 protocols?

16 MS. ROSENFELD: Right.

17 MR. GOECKE: Is that a subset or two different
18 categories in --

19 THE WITNESS: Mr. Hearing Examiner --

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: -- if I could suggest, also, the
22 general category of scientist --

23 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS: -- which I believe is critical.

25 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I don't know. I mean,

Page 25

1 that's so general as to, but --

2 THE WITNESS: Can I --

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir.

4 THE WITNESS: -- answer that?

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly.

6 THE WITNESS: Science has certain practices. It's
7 a discipline maybe founded on curiosity, but the second
8 thing that comes in is doubt. Issues like uncertainty are
9 so critical when it comes to the atmosphere. So an
10 understanding of the basic premise of scientific research,
11 hypotheses, theories, how you get from one to the other, the
12 critical process of examination of evidence, does the, does,
13 are the findings properly supported by the conclusions --
14 all of those are present in every science but, I would
15 state, are particularly important in this particular case
16 and whenever you're dealing with complex issues like the
17 dispersion of pollutants in the atmosphere.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So do you think this
19 description adequately identifies your expertise:
20 meteorology, air quality, air modeling, and scientific
21 protocols and scientific methodologies?

22 THE WITNESS: And I would add one more for the
23 record.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: I always want to add one more to my
25 qualifications too.

Page 26

1 THE WITNESS: Well, you're going to like this one.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
3 THE WITNESS: I received my driver's license in
4 1961. That means I've been driving for almost 50 years or
5 more than 50 years.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
7 THE WITNESS: So I have a lot of on-the-road
8 experience with traffic. I suggest everyone else in this
9 room, including you, do as well, but I think that happens to
10 be germane to this particular case.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: That's more of a layman's thing.
12 Yours is more driving home a point than driving a car. So
13 we'll leave that off --
14 THE WITNESS: You can --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- off of the qualifications.
16 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm just saying that because
17 I think sometimes everyday experience informs the scientific
18 process.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but we'll consider
20 that more in the layman's area. Did you get any training in
21 Windows 8 while you were -- I see it up on the board there.
22 THE WITNESS: No --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, so that's --
24 THE WITNESS: -- I'm not an expert in that. I
25 have to -- my son is the expert.

Page 27

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that's the way it is. All
2 right. And before we begin voir dire, it just popped into
3 my mind also, in terms of the dates available, if the
4 parties wanted to have further dates in December, we could
5 make some of those available as well. I generally try to
6 avoid --
7 THE WITNESS: Christmas.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, well, certainly on Christmas
9 Day, but I generally try to avoid them in the last couple of
10 weeks because people take vacations and whatnot and then it
11 makes it harder for the public to attend. So I didn't
12 schedule any in late December, but if the parties think that
13 that would be better, you know, please let me know.
14 I have a hearing on December 13 myself, and we
15 have some others, but we could probably get a room. But I
16 think that, other than my hearing on December 13, I think my
17 calendar would be relatively clear up, at least up until
18 the, you know, through the second week in, well, I guess we
19 get kind of close, maybe through the third week. So,
20 anyway, you ought to consider that and see if there are any
21 dates that you all want to agree to and then just contact
22 me, and I'll make sure they're clear on my calendar.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Grossman, I can go ahead
24 and put that to rest.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 28

1 MS. ROSENFELD: In accommodating the five days
2 that we had just before and after the Thanksgiving holiday,
3 I had taken other matters that I had planned to work on and
4 pushed them. I have briefing schedules and hearing dates in
5 other matters, and there is not a chance I will be able to
6 accommodate a hearing date between now and Christmas.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, fair enough.
8 Okay. Voir dire --
9 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- of Dr. Cole.
11 MR. GOECKE: Yes. Dr. Cole, while you worked at
12 EPA, you testified that you reviewed air modeling reports
13 or --
14 THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah. Yeah.
15 MR. GOECKE: Did you ever conduct them yourself?
16 Did you ever perform your own air modeling?
17 THE WITNESS: Yes.
18 MR. GOECKE: And tell us about that.
19 THE WITNESS: Well, I developed something called
20 the Ozone Limiting Method, which is a very simple model.
21 MR. GOECKE: So you developed a method --
22 THE WITNESS: A method. I --
23 MR. GOECKE: -- and did you actually apply that
24 anywhere?
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's very easy to use.

Page 29

1 MR. GOECKE: Where did you apply it?
2 THE WITNESS: Where did I apply it?
3 MR. GOECKE: What did you model with this method?
4 THE WITNESS: Various cases that -- to try it out,
5 see how good it worked. I can't recall the exact issues.
6 Now, when you say did I conduct the model, I have to be
7 careful here because in those days the modeling was actually
8 done by a computer division. It was called the, I believe,
9 the model support section. So what we did in my section was
10 to put all of the inputs together, be it a power plant or in
11 one case it was a hazardous waste pond, a lot of power plant
12 stuff, where, as branch chief, I mean, as section chief, I
13 would be very involved in creating the inputs and then
14 working with the people on my staff and then the modeling
15 was done.
16 MR. GOECKE: By a computer or --
17 THE WITNESS: Yeah, by the computer. In those
18 days, it was a big, I mean, we're -- this was a while ago;
19 so you didn't have something like this where you could, you
20 could do it. But I had to be on top of all of the modeling
21 that was done in my section.
22 MR. GOECKE: Right, but -- so it sounds like you
23 were part of a team that gathered numbers.
24 THE WITNESS: I was the head of the team.
25 MR. GOECKE: You were the head of the team?

Page 30

1 THE WITNESS: The head of the team.
2 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And in your role as head of
3 the team, exactly what were your responsibilities?
4 THE WITNESS: To make sure all of the output of
5 that team passed muster, because it was passed up to the
6 next level and it had to be right.
7 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Well, that's sort of general
8 when you say the team had to pass muster. So what was your
9 team doing? They were -- was this theoretical modeling?
10 Were these actual sites they were modeling?
11 THE WITNESS: Actual sites.
12 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And during your time at EPA,
13 how many, how many modeling projects do you estimate you
14 were in charge of?
15 THE WITNESS: That's a hard question to ask.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a hard one to answer
17 maybe but not to ask it.
18 THE WITNESS: Oh, okay, right. Well, I'm asking
19 myself; so it's --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
21 THE WITNESS: I got to say it's, you know, 50, 70.
22 I'm not sure.
23 MR. GOECKE: And were you responsible for
24 developing the data, or did other people develop the data
25 that was put into the computer and you quality-checked it?

Page 31

1 MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean by developing the
2 data? Do you mean actually collecting the data or -- is
3 that what you mean?
4 MR. GOECKE: Yes. That's a better way to put it,
5 I think.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 MR. GOECKE: Did you actually collect the data
8 that was used for the air modeling?
9 THE WITNESS: My job was more to examine the data
10 that was being used --
11 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
12 THE WITNESS: -- to make sure that it was
13 representative, that it considered the prevailing
14 circumstances, did they use a representative meteorological
15 site, that sort of thing.
16 MR. GOECKE: Okay. So your answer is you did not
17 collect the data; you evaluated the data?
18 THE WITNESS: Right.
19 MR. GOECKE: Is that correct?
20 THE WITNESS: Right.
21 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: That is not to say that in my career
23 I have not collected data. In my work at the university, my
24 research work, which was funded by EPA, I had the great
25 opportunity to ride around in a helicopter, getting

Page 32

1 nauseous, following plumes from the Oak Creek power plants,
2 using an SO2 meter. I also conducted micrometeorological,
3 on a mesoscale, meteorological testing, using tethered
4 balloons and radiosondes and radiosondes. So before I got
5 to EPA, I was very active in collecting data relevant to
6 modeling.
7 MR. GOECKE: Okay. So is it fair to say that
8 since you started working at EPA, you haven't collected data
9 for any air modeling?
10 THE WITNESS: Since I worked at --
11 MR. GOECKE: So you gave examples of when you
12 collected data from the time period before you worked at
13 EPA.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean personally as opposed to
15 his team?
16 MR. GOECKE: Personally, yes.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS: After EPA or at EPA? What are you
19 -- I'm sorry. Rephrase your question.
20 MR. GOECKE: Your examples of when you actually
21 collected data were from the time period before you worked
22 at EPA, correct?
23 THE WITNESS: Correct.
24 MR. GOECKE: And at EPA you evaluated data, but
25 you didn't actually collect it?

Page 33

1 THE WITNESS: Well, let's take a step back.
2 There's data, which is things like five years of
3 meteorological data, right? Other people collect that.
4 That's called the National Weather Service. They do that.
5 You take a file from them. So, in a sense, it's normal to
6 use data that others have collected. Point No. 2 is that
7 there's another kind of information that I did do in spades
8 which is literature, looking at the studies that other
9 people have done, which give profound insights into the
10 modeling process, into air pollution meteorology, into
11 special circumstances.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: I think this question goes more to
13 physical collection --
14 MR. GOECKE: Correct.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- of data yourself.
16 THE WITNESS: All right. So physical collection,
17 most of that was done at the University of Wisconsin,
18 EPA-funded research.
19 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Okay. Now, let's move along
20 to after you left EPA and went to the Clean Water Action and
21 Clean Water Fund. Did you do air modeling while you worked
22 at the Clean Water Action?
23 THE WITNESS: I may have used screened, screening
24 models. I didn't do -- at Clean Water Fund, I was far more,
25 did far more research into sources of air pollution,

Page 34

1 particularly in connection with mercury contamination. We
2 did --
3 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Just going back to the
4 modeling, though --
5 THE WITNESS: Yeah, right.
6 MR. GOECKE: -- so you said you might have done
7 screening modeling. What does that mean?
8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's like -- well, now it's
9 SCREEN3, but the early screen programs that you could get
10 just a general idea of, an approximation of what a model
11 would show given certain sources, emission levels,
12 characteristics, plume height, that sort of thing.
13 MR. GOECKE: So is it fair to say that it was, it
14 was less precise --
15 THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
16 MR. GOECKE: -- than the modeling you were doing
17 at EPA?
18 THE WITNESS: Yeah, absolutely.
19 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: Yep.
21 MR. GOECKE: And it was probably less involved of
22 a process as well?
23 THE WITNESS: Excuse me?
24 MR. GOECKE: The screening is a less-intensive,
25 less-involved process than --

Page 35

1 THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah, definitely.
2 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
4 MR. GOECKE: And you said you may have done that.
5 You're not sure whether or not you did?
6 THE WITNESS: I'm sure I played around with it,
7 but I wouldn't call that modeling as much as staying in
8 touch with the field.
9 MR. GOECKE: Okay. So in the 10 years that you
10 were at Clean Water, you didn't do any of the type of air
11 modeling that you were involved in at EPA?
12 THE WITNESS: No.
13 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And then in 1993 you formed
14 Henry S. Cole & Associates.
15 THE WITNESS: Right.
16 MR. GOECKE: Since forming your company, have you
17 done any air modeling of the type that you were doing at
18 EPA, that your team was doing at EPA?
19 THE WITNESS: Yes, we did, yes.
20 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And tell me about that.
21 THE WITNESS: Okay. The most important case was
22 for the Attorney General, Science Division, of the State of
23 New York. My team did, modeled Kodak's industrial, Kodak
24 Eastman's industrial facility. There were issues about
25 whether their facility was violating air quality standards,

Page 36

1 and we were asked to do the modeling. We used the ISC
2 model.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: What is --
4 THE WITNESS: Industrial Source Code model, which
5 is sort of the precursor, I won't say it's -- I'll say it's
6 the precursor of AERMOD.
7 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
8 THE WITNESS: I had --
9 MR. GOECKE: And what year was this?
10 THE WITNESS: -- just to be very clear, I had a
11 computer person who I familiarized with the model; then it
12 was my job to make sure -- and, by the way, this was a
13 complex issue because we had complex terrain -- and I had to
14 make sure that the way we were doing this fit the
15 circumstances. There was a power plant down in the river
16 valley there next to Eastman and that power plant was one of
17 the issues affecting air quality in the region.
18 MR. GOECKE: And what year was this?
19 THE WITNESS: Oh, I'd have to look at -- I can
20 come back to that if I look at my publications --
21 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Are there any --
22 THE WITNESS: -- but it was, it was maybe -- I'm
23 going to take a stab and say it was maybe 2007, 2006.
24 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Are there other cases that you
25 worked on that required you to participate in air modeling

Page 37

1 of a site?
2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
3 MR. GOECKE: And what are they?
4 THE WITNESS: Not to conduct the modeling, but to
5 review the modeling done by others.
6 MR. GOECKE: Not to review, to actually conduct
7 it.
8 THE WITNESS: No.
9 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
10 THE WITNESS: Just, as I said, I've used SCREEN3
11 many times to get a feel for what was going on, but my firm
12 does not have the resources to do all of the complicated
13 work that's, all of the input work, and that's not my
14 specialization. My specialization is air pollution, the
15 critical review of techniques.
16 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry. Your specialization is
17 not what?
18 THE WITNESS: I'm saying, I'm saying, as a
19 scientist --
20 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
21 THE WITNESS: -- I have had a number of cases --
22 and I can give you specifics -- of where I've had to review
23 the modeling -- most of it was AERMOD -- that others have
24 done, taking a critical look at what they've done.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: But you cut yourself off when

Page 38

1 you --
2 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- you started to say my specialty
4 is not, and then you didn't finish the sentence.
5 THE WITNESS: Well, my activity -- let me rephrase
6 that -- my activity in other modeling cases, and including
7 very recent cases, has to do with the critical review of
8 other modelers' work. Okay? Now, I have also worked in
9 partnership in my firm with another modeling group, David
10 Weeks' group, which is out of Texas, it's RME, where the
11 question has been the effects of landfills, emissions and
12 odors from landfills, and he has done the modeling in those
13 cases.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: So are you saying that your main,
15 if you want to say specialty, your main occupation has not
16 been doing the modeling yourself but rather to critical
17 review of --
18 THE WITNESS: Yes, right.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 MR. GOECKE: So it's fair to say that since
21 leaving EPA, you've only conducted air modeling once?
22 THE WITNESS: Okay.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, is that fair to say? I mean,
24 that's --
25 THE WITNESS: I said yes.

Page 39

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, you said okay. I just
2 want to --
3 MR. GOECKE: Has air modeling changed much in the
4 past 30 years?
5 THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
6 MR. GOECKE: So the air modeling that's done today
7 on sites is very different than the types of modeling that
8 was done when you worked at EPA in the late '70s and early
9 '80s?
10 THE WITNESS: Yes, and by the way, we were laying
11 the groundwork. We understood and I understood some of the
12 problems with the existing models. Now, AERMOD, which is
13 what Mr. Sullivan has used in this case, is in fact a
14 tremendous advancement over previous models, and if you want
15 examples, I can give you examples of the kinds of changes.
16 MR. GOECKE: If your company doesn't have the
17 wherewithal to do air modeling, how was it that you did the
18 air modeling on the Kodak site you talked about in 2006 or
19 2007?
20 THE WITNESS: I told you I partnered with a firm
21 that had the computing capacity -- no, wait a minute. Which
22 period are you talking about?
23 MR. GOECKE: The Kodak project you talked about.
24 You said it was 2006 or 2007.
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Normally --

Page 40

1 MR. GOECKE: So you partnered with another firm?
2 THE WITNESS: -- we don't do that, but I partnered
3 with Hampshire Research that had a computer, a person who
4 was familiar with models and computation.
5 MR. GOECKE: So Hampshire Research did the
6 modeling there?
7 THE WITNESS: Yes.
8 MR. GOECKE: So you did not conduct the modeling?
9 THE WITNESS: I supervised. In other words, it
10 was sort of like what I did at EPA --
11 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
12 THE WITNESS: -- making sure that the modeling was
13 being done -- you know, modeling is a very involved process,
14 as Mr. Sullivan, I'm sure, will tell you.
15 MR. GOECKE: You testified that you worked for
16 some major --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you cut the witness off.
18 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: As Mr. Sullivan, say --
20 THE WITNESS: There are so many inputs and choices
21 and databases to massage and whatnot to convert to the
22 proper form. It's very complex work, but -- I'm sorry.
23 What was your question?
24 MR. GOECKE: I think you answered my question.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think you were finishing

Page 41

1 answering. I just --
2 THE WITNESS: Oh.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I stopped him because I think he
4 cut you off in the middle of your sentence --
5 THE WITNESS: Okay. So --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- when you said Mr. Sullivan, and
7 then you were cut off.
8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So my -- that would not be
9 the best use of my scientific expertise --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean?
11 THE WITNESS: -- so I partner with others. I told
12 you. It's the insurance that the science, the
13 circumstances, the topography, the land use, the conditions
14 of the source are incorporated into the modeling.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 MR. GOECKE: And I'm sorry. Did you say it would
17 not be the best use of money to hire you to do the air
18 modeling? Is that what you --
19 THE WITNESS: I didn't say anything about money.
20 I said my, my, the role that I play -- the best role that I
21 can play is to use my scientific expertise to guide or to
22 review modeling.
23 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Earlier you mentioned that you
24 worked for, I think you said, major, major corporations.
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

Page 42

1 MR. GOECKE: Who did you work for?
2 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll start with, start with
3 Church & Dwight.
4 MR. GOECKE: Church & White?
5 THE WITNESS: Dwight.
6 MR. GOECKE: What did you do for Church & Dwight?
7 THE WITNESS: That's the company that makes Arm &
8 Hammer Baking Soda products.
9 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
10 THE WITNESS: There, I would say, that was part of
11 the work that I've done in environmental assessments that go
12 beyond the scope of air pollution. What I had to do for
13 them was to do an assessment of the environmental benefits
14 of using concentrated detergent as opposed to the normal
15 detergent that was on the market at that time. They came
16 out with one of the first concentrated detergents, and there
17 were many, many benefits, including air pollution benefits
18 because the weight -- there was a reduction in weight of the
19 transfer of these products because the material was
20 concentrated, had less water.
21 MR. GOECKE: Okay. Have you ever worked for --
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Let him finish.
23 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
24 THE WITNESS: Let me finish --
25 MR. GOECKE: Sure, sure, sure.

Page 43

1 THE WITNESS: -- because you asked for a listing
2 and that was the first. Okay. Glass Packaging Institute,
3 okay? There we were comparing, or doing an environmental
4 assessment, comparing glass bottles versus plastic bottles,
5 and that involved air pollution issues as well, not
6 modeling, but emissions.
7 Third, Allstate Insurance Company. There I was
8 doing a, what I would call a forensic study. There was an
9 issue of a perchloroethylene spill at a dry cleaners which
10 was contaminating the water and which was giving off fumes;
11 groundwater was contaminated and there were fumes that --
12 and the issue, the key issue there, it was a fascinating
13 case because the key issue was the timing of that spill, and
14 the claimants claimed that the spill was after the coverage
15 took effect, and Allstate said no, no, no, your spill was
16 way before we had a policy with you. I used three or four
17 lines of evidence to prove that in fact the spill occurred
18 way before.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: I used, looking at the ratios of the
21 chemicals and its decayed products in the groundwater, I
22 used a number of tools. I had to look at records of when
23 perchloroethylene was delivered to the site. I inspected
24 the place and found telltale evidences of previous practices
25 at -- which would never be used in the coverage period.

Page 44

1 So --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: -- it was a fun, a fun project.
4 Let's see. Let's go to Philips Electronics. Now,
5 there, in case you think that I only work with environmental
6 groups, I had to come up against environmental groups,
7 working for Philips Electronics, and there the issue was the
8 -- in the State of California, the, several of the competing
9 fluorescent light manufacturers wanted a recycling bill.
10 They wanted the credit for source reduction -- in other
11 words, the lowest possible mercury content of the light --
12 removed from the regulations and replaced by a recycling
13 provision. Well, I did an analysis that showed that source
14 reduction, toxic use reduction, having the lowest amount of
15 mercury to get into the atmosphere, was far better than any
16 attempts to try and recycle all of the fluorescent lights, a
17 near impossibility. So that was -- where am I? That was
18 Philips Electronic.
19 Chemical Specialties, Incorporated, known as CSI,
20 but I didn't say CSI because --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: It has other --
22 THE WITNESS: Right, has other -- right. CSI is
23 now owned by Dow Chemical. I was not a consultant for Dow
24 Chemical. I was, this was --
25 MR. SILVERMAN: Glad you clarified that.

Page 45

1 THE WITNESS: -- anyway, this was -- I think I
2 worked for them for seven years, and the issue there was,
3 the market standard for pressure-treated wood was a product
4 that contained both arsenic and chromium, it's called CCA,
5 and there were mounting concerns about bringing this stuff
6 into homes, playgrounds, where children and whatnot would
7 come into contact with, with arsenic and chromium, both of
8 which are carcinogens. They came up with a product which
9 had neither chromium nor arsenic, and they used a common
10 household disinfectant or one that's used all over the place
11 instead, upped the copper content a little bit, and my job
12 was to do sort of an analysis of their product versus the
13 other product in terms of environmental impact. And they
14 were very, very concerned about, would this add copper to
15 the environment, would it add copper to the aquatic
16 environment, which copper is toxic to fish, and so I had to
17 do a lot of work with the releases of copper from wood in
18 terms of literature reviews, in terms of looking at
19 experimental evidence. So I would say, I emphasize the fact
20 that an environmental assessment is an important part of
21 what I do. I look at the evidence and try to come to
22 conclusions.
23 Now, I'm very proud of my work there. For my work
24 I was co-recipient of a very prestigious award called the
25 U.S. EPA's Presidential Green Chemistry Challenge Award,

Page 46

1 along with CSI, was a very proud moment to get that
2 certificate that said that. And the reason for that was
3 that the work that we did collectively, including my work,
4 which included communication to health groups and
5 communication to environmental organizations and whatnot,
6 resulted in a phaseout of those preservatives which
7 contained both copper and arsenic --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Any other
9 corporations --
10 THE WITNESS: -- and chromium. I'm sorry,
11 chromium and arsenic.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Any other corporations that you
13 wanted to mention?
14 THE WITNESS: I think those are the, I may be
15 forgetting one or two, but I think -- there was, yes, there
16 was a real estate company called Gravestar in the Boston
17 area which I worked for for a number of years. They owned
18 and operated the real estate that had shopping centers. If
19 anyone's here from the Boston area or if you've ever heard
20 of a Star Market, that was -- wherever you go to a Star
21 Market that's those places. So there were a number of
22 environmental issues, such as spills, such as redesigning
23 one of them in particular to make them more sustainable, and
24 my role there was scientific advisor, making sure they were
25 making good decisions.

Page 47

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Any further voir dire
2 questions?
3 MR. GOECKE: Just a few. In terms of your
4 purported expertise in air quality, you're not planning to
5 give any medical testimony, are you?
6 THE WITNESS: No, absolutely not.
7 MR. GOECKE: And you're not a medical doctor?
8 THE WITNESS: Correct.
9 MR. GOECKE: You're not a toxicologist?
10 THE WITNESS: Correct.
11 MR. GOECKE: You're not an epidemiologist?
12 THE WITNESS: I would say, however, that one of my
13 important projects has been work that's been funded,
14 retained by the CDC, Centers for Disease Control and
15 Prevention, specifically the Agency for Toxic Substances and
16 Disease Registry. I was a critic of that agency when I was
17 at the Clean Water Fund, and I had reviewed a number of
18 their so-called health assessments and health studies at
19 Superfund sites. So a lot of my work had to do with
20 Superfund and hazardous waste sites, and as a scientist, I
21 was appalled at those assessments and health studies that
22 were being done.
23 I had a debate at some event with the director
24 then, who was Barry, Dr. Barry Johnson, a very respected
25 person in the field, and two weeks after I left Clean Water

Page 48

1 Fund, I got a phone call from Mr. Johnson, Barry Johnson,
2 and he said we need to bring you in and make sure that the
3 quality of those assessments are a lot better, and this
4 involved things like air pollution impacts, groundwater
5 impacts, all sort of things. So I had to become familiar
6 with the area of risk assessment, for example. I had to be
7 able to read those, understand the techniques, and I don't
8 claim to be an expert in risk assessment or in health
9 assessments, but I sure know one when I see it and I can
10 tell you what is not included. For example, a lot of them
11 didn't --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's not get into the
13 substance --
14 THE WITNESS: Okay.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- of your testimony.
16 THE WITNESS: All right.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: We're first dealing with your
18 qualifications.
19 THE WITNESS: So I had, I worked for them for a
20 number of years, major projects. The last project that I
21 had with them was as a liaison in a very complex case
22 involving a cancer cluster in coal country in northeast
23 Pennsylvania where there was an outbreak of a very rare
24 blood cancer and they -- Senator Specter, through his work,
25 got \$8 million to fund a number of studies. There were 10

Page 49

1 different studies underway. My job was to help the
2 community understand what those studies were and to get
3 community input into those studies. For example, someone
4 might say, well, you didn't, you didn't look at this area or
5 there are five other cases of polycythemia vera that are not
6 in your database, five people died just last year, those
7 kinds of things, make sure you look at this Superfund site.
8 There were six Superfund sites and six coal-burning power
9 plants in that area.
10 So this was a very complex -- air pollution was an
11 issue; another issue was the, which I was heavily involved
12 in, was the windblown dust from coal ash. Coal ash is very
13 toxic, small particles that can be breathed in, and this
14 stuff was -- there was evidence that it was being released
15 into the atmosphere. So that was an important facet of this
16 work that I felt was being neglected in terms of the
17 environmental assessment that was going on, and I made
18 recommendations, sadly to say, not all of which were
19 followed, but nevertheless --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21 MR. GOECKE: Just one final question --
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
23 MR. GOECKE: -- Mr. Grossman. Dr. Cole, you
24 testified about a few publications you authored relating to
25 air modeling. As I look through your résumé, it seems like

Page 50

1 those publications were all in 1976 or before, I'm sorry,
2 1979 or before.
3 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think that's -- well, I did
4 reports on mercury contamination, but if you're talking
5 about modeling --
6 MR. GOECKE: Modeling, yes.
7 THE WITNESS: -- with the exception of the report
8 that was given to the attorney general's office, which was
9 not a publication.
10 MR. GOECKE: The Kodak matter?
11 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
12 MR. GOECKE: Okay. And that was not
13 peer-reviewed?
14 THE WITNESS: Well, it was, it was reviewed by the
15 science department of the attorney general, a pretty sharp
16 outfit, I must say --
17 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS: -- under the direction of, was it
19 Spitzer at the time? I don't know.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: What's the exhibit number for
21 Dr. Cole's résumé?
22 MR. GOECKE: 76(h). It's a part of 76(h).
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 76(h)?
24 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does the

Page 51

1 Coalition have any voir dire questions?
2 MR. SILVERMAN: No, we don't.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 MS. ADELMAN: No, we do not, sir.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I may, I just
7 have several follow-up questions.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
9 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10 Q Dr. Cole, you explained how, during your time at
11 the EPA, the modeling itself was done by the computer
12 division, that you would put together, you called them
13 inputs, and then they were actually run by the computer. Is
14 that correct?
15 A Yes, that's correct.
16 Q And although the form of computer has changed, is
17 that essentially the way modeling is done today? Does
18 somebody calculate those numbers by hand or can you, is it
19 different --
20 A It's so much easier today. Mr. Goecke asked how
21 modeling has changed. I mean, in some cases, we were using
22 punch cards. Today you can take stuff from the National
23 Weather Service, five years of data, you put it into
24 something that makes it compatible to AERMOD, and it can all
25 be done with great simplicity. It's easier than it was. So

Page 52

1 in those days --
2 Q I guess my --
3 A Yes, what's -- your question is?
4 Q My question is, although the look of the
5 computer --
6 A Yeah.
7 Q -- and the size of the computer, no doubt, has
8 changed --
9 A Yeah.
10 Q -- are those modeling runs today done by computer?
11 A Yes. Yes.
12 Q As they were when you were at the EPA?
13 A Yes. The models are more advanced, but you have
14 computers --
15 Q Computer software.
16 A -- sorting through bits and making calculations
17 and --
18 Q Okay. Mr. Goecke asked you a great number of
19 questions about whether and when and where you actually
20 collected physical samples of data.
21 A Most modelers --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, she hasn't asked the question
23 yet.
24 THE WITNESS: Okay, sorry.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 53

1 Q Oh, yes. My question is, did Mr. Sullivan collect
2 any physical samples of data in this case for air modeling?
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's not a voir dire
4 question.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: We're talking right now about his
7 qualifications.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: All right.
9 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10 Q In your description of what you do currently, in
11 your current practice --
12 A Right.
13 Q -- you, I think -- is it accurate to say that you
14 take a look at scientific models that other people have run
15 and you review them to determine if, in your opinion, they
16 meet certain standards of accuracy? Is that correct?
17 A That's correct.
18 Q And is that essentially the same role that you
19 served in when you were chief of the air division at EPA?
20 A More or less. I had other, you know, yeah.
21 Q And finally, would you please -- have you
22 qualified as an expert in other proceedings?
23 A Yes.
24 Q And could you give three or four examples of when
25 you qualified as an expert?

Page 54

1 A Let's see. Well, I'm going to trial on one case
2 in February.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Have you testified as an expert?
4 THE WITNESS: Yes.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: When have you testified, not when
6 you --
7 THE WITNESS: Okay.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- you said you were going to.
9 THE WITNESS: All right. My -- the best example I
10 can give you is I wrote a report on the modeling that was
11 done on a municipal waste incinerator in the Netherlands. I
12 was commissioned to do that by the local community of the
13 town because they felt that the license that the Province of
14 Friesland had given, an air quality, an air pollution permit
15 to this facility, was flawed. So they had me look at the
16 modeling and review the modeling, write a report. I
17 submitted that report to the highest court in the land for
18 disputes between residents or citizens and the executive
19 branch governance -- it's sometimes called the Supreme Court
20 of Administrative Matters -- and so I was qualified in that
21 as an expert.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: They took your report. Did you
23 testify on the stand under oath?
24 THE WITNESS: Yes, I testified in open court
25 between --

Page 55

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 THE WITNESS: -- was, you know --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: That's the question.
4 THE WITNESS: -- testified, cross-examined,
5 et cetera.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: And what was your area of expertise
7 that you --
8 THE WITNESS: Air pollution, meteorology, and
9 modeling.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Any other testimony,
11 Doctor?
12 THE WITNESS: I would also say that my work there
13 was reviewed by two preeminent experts in the field,
14 Dr. Misra in Ontario, who did a lot of shoreline modeling,
15 and also Dr. Van Dop in Netherlands, who testified --
16 Dr. Van Dop testified --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Did you --
18 THE WITNESS: -- supporting my evidence there.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- testify as an expert in any
20 other proceedings?
21 THE WITNESS: I'm having to focus, or having to
22 think this through because I have testified in, let's say,
23 quasi-judicial hearings, which are a little bit different --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, this is a --
25 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, this is.

Page 56

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- quasi-judicial hearing as well.
2 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: The question is, did the, whoever
4 was running the proceeding qualify you as an expert and in
5 what.
6 THE WITNESS: Well, I testified before the Public
7 Service Commission in the State of Wisconsin.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: And I, see, I don't know -- what I
10 was able to do was to give a presentation and to
11 cross-examine -- I was cross-examined, and I cross-examined
12 the expert witness. It was a process where everyone could
13 cross --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: A free-for-all.
15 THE WITNESS: Free-for-all.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: But did the commission designate
17 you as qualified as an expert?
18 THE WITNESS: See, I don't remember. That was a
19 while ago.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Anything else?
21 Any other testimony as an expert?
22 THE WITNESS: I know I'm forgetting some things
23 because I'm in the process now of a number of cases, one of
24 which will come to trial in February.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right now the question is not

Page 57

1 whether you collected information, given advice. The --
2 THE WITNESS: Well, how about --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- question is whether you've
4 testified as an expert, and you listed two cases, one in the
5 Netherlands --
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and one before the Public
8 Service Commission in Wisconsin.
9 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 THE WITNESS: -- can I come back with --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we're going to handle the
13 question of your qualifications now.
14 THE WITNESS: Okay.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't have any problem with
16 your --
17 THE WITNESS: Okay.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- supplementing additional ones --
19 THE WITNESS: Okay.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- unless they're objected to by
21 the other side, so --
22 THE WITNESS: If --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- because they haven't had the
24 opportunity to cross-examine you on it, but any -- is that
25 it?

Page 58

1 MS. ROSENFELD: That's it. Thank you.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Any recross on this additional
3 questioning?
4 MR. GOECKE: Do you know what year the Wisconsin
5 hearing was?
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah. That would be 1977.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: And when was the Netherlands
8 proceeding?
9 THE WITNESS: That was 2011.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 THE WITNESS: I -- yes, wait a minute. I
12 testified. I have another one.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: The issue here, there's a nuclear
15 power plant going in on the shoreline of Lake Ontario. The
16 power company there wanted to expand, and there were some
17 issues about the use of AERMOD, and there were regulations
18 in place that said you had to consider site-specific
19 information in the modeling. They did not incorporate the
20 effect of Lake Ontario in that --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't really want to know
22 that much about the, about the case. I want --
23 THE WITNESS: Okay. So, yes, I testified in that
24 case.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to know whether you testified in

Page 59

1 that case.
2 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: So what agency or --
4 THE WITNESS: It was called --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- body were you before?
6 THE WITNESS: It was a joint commission. It was a
7 combination of energy and environment.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Joint commission of what?
9 THE WITNESS: I'm going to have to get back to you
10 on that. It was --
11 MR. SILVERMAN: The Great Lakes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, what year was that?
13 THE WITNESS: That was, I want to say, 2010.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And you were qualified as an
15 expert on that?
16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I testified.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Any further
18 questions, Mr. Goecke?
19 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry. You testified in a court?
20 I missed that part.
21 THE WITNESS: No. It was a quasi-judicial
22 hearing.
23 MR. GOECKE: In the United States or in Canada?
24 THE WITNESS: I was in the United States. I was
25 on, phoned in to the hearing which was taking place. I was

Page 60

1 cross-examined. I was direct- and cross-examined over the
2 phone into a, wherever it was, in Canada.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 MR. GOECKE: I have no further questions.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Do you have any
6 objection to this witness being qualified to testify as an
7 expert in meteorology, air quality, and air modeling, and
8 scientific protocols and scientific methodologies?
9 MR. GOECKE: I would stipulate to his expertise in
10 meteorology and air quality but would object to him being
11 designated as an expert in air modeling and in scientific
12 protocols and scientific methodology.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: And what's your basis for your
14 objection?
15 MR. GOECKE: That he hasn't conducted a single air
16 modeling in the last 30 years; he hasn't written about it
17 since 1979. He has consulted on several projects, but he
18 has never been certified, from what I can tell, in an
19 American court as an expert in air modeling or its
20 protocols. So no other jurisdiction has deemed him as an
21 expert in this area.
22 On the one hand, he says it's much simpler to do
23 air modeling these days, but he also acknowledges there's
24 been a lot of changes and there's been a lot of -- it's a
25 lot more complicated and it's a lot more sophisticated

Page 61

1 today, and we've heard no testimony about what his training
2 has been in the AERMOD which, he testified, did not exist
3 when he was at EPA. So the methodology that's being used
4 here in this case is something entirely different than what
5 he was doing at EPA, and while he may have been peripherally
6 involved in these issues through the course of his
7 consulting career, he is not an expert on this issue.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, any
9 response?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: And my response to that is that he
11 not only has extensive educational background in air
12 modeling and scientific protocols and its methodology but he
13 has extensive professional background in that. Certainly,
14 some of the work that he's done in his consulting career has
15 involved not only the review of air modeling reports and
16 protocols but he's testified as an expert on such and he's
17 been involved in projects relating to that. He certainly is
18 familiar with the current air quality standards, current air
19 modeling protocols, as his reports that have been provided
20 in this case demonstrate. And so I would ask that you
21 qualify him as an expert in that area as well.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Anything from the Coalition on this
23 point?
24 MS. ADELMAN: No, sir.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Yes, I find that objection

Page 62

1 goes really to weight issues, not to his qualifications
2 per se as an expert. So I do accept Dr. Cole as qualified
3 as an expert in meteorology, air quality, and air modeling
4 and the scientific protocols and scientific methodologies.
5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: You're welcome. All right.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q Dr. Cole, have you reviewed Mr. Sullivan's
9 November 2012 report in this case?
10 A Yes, I have.
11 Q And have you reviewed his August 2013 report in
12 this case?
13 A Yep.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: And for the record --
15 THE WITNESS: Yes.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Mr. Hearing Examiner, those are
17 Exhibits No. 15(a) and 255(a).
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
20 Q Have you reviewed or are you generally familiar
21 with Mr. Sullivan's other submissions in this case?
22 A Can you repeat that?
23 Q Have you reviewed Mr. Sullivan's other
24 submissions --
25 A Yes.

Page 63

1 Q -- in this case?
2 A Yes.
3 Q And are you generally familiar with his testimony
4 in these proceedings?
5 A Yes.
6 Q And are you generally familiar with the Planning
7 Board's staff report and the Planning Board recommendations
8 in this case?
9 A Yes.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Speaking of which, let me interrupt
11 your question, if I may. I take it you all saw my e-mail
12 exchange with technical staff about that the technical
13 staffer who was working on the air modeling issues or on air
14 quality issues had a family issue? So we may -- we probably
15 won't receive any additional comment from technical staff on
16 that issue. I just want to make sure you all saw that --
17 MS. ROSENFELD: I did see it.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- exchange and had no problem.
19 Okay. All right. Go ahead.
20 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
21 Q This case requires the Board of Appeals to make a
22 number of findings --
23 A Uh-huh.
24 Q -- and Mr. Grossman will provide the Board with a
25 report and recommendations based on the testimony and

Page 64

1 evidence that's provided to him in this case. Are you
2 generally familiar with the size and location of the gas
3 station at issue in this case?
4 A Yes, I am.
5 Q Among other findings, the Board of Appeals must
6 find that the proposed gas station, quote, will not
7 adversely affect the health or general welfare of residents,
8 visitors, or workers in the area at the subject site,
9 irrespective of any adverse effects the use might have if
10 established elsewhere in the zone, end quote. Do you know
11 what the subject site is in this particular case?
12 A The subject site is the proposed gas station, and
13 I have been at the site a number of times, and I'm familiar
14 with its location, including its relationship to adjoining
15 residential properties. I'm aware that the site is
16 surrounded on two sides by buildings and, and that there
17 will be a wall to the south of the gas station. So --
18 Q And do you understand the subject site to include
19 the mall parcel itself that's been discussed in this case?
20 A Yes, that's my understanding, that it includes the
21 entire mall parcel, the adjoining areas, the swim club, and
22 the school --
23 Q And --
24 A -- the Stephen Knolls School.
25 Q And any of the adjoining homes?

Page 65

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's make a distinction
2 here --
3 THE WITNESS: Yes.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- between the subject site and the
5 neighborhood because --
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that's, that's a distinction --
8 THE WITNESS: The subject site is the proposed gas
9 station.
10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11 Q Okay. And what is your understanding of the
12 neighborhood?
13 A I've toured the neighborhood a number of times. I
14 see -- it's a pleasant neighborhood with tree-lined streets.
15 There are homes. I think the nearest home is about 125 feet
16 south of the proposed site, of the site location, and I'm
17 familiar with the location of the swim club and the Stephen
18 Knolls School.
19 Q And are there characteristics of the subject site
20 or in the vicinity of the subject site that are unique in
21 your view?
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me, before you answer
23 that question, you described a portion of the neighborhood
24 as defined. What we have been using -- well, number one,
25 the applicant has suggested a definition of neighborhood

Page 66

1 that includes only the mall parcel. The technical staff has
2 suggested a definition of neighborhood that includes the
3 area that you described, to the south and to the west of the
4 mall.
5 THE WITNESS: Okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: So I think the question that
7 Ms. Rosenfeld asked you was what do you understand as the
8 neighborhood. You then described a portion of it. Do you
9 understand that the neighborhood as defined by technical
10 staff, which we have been generally using, except in terms
11 of needs analysis, which is a whole nother area, but in
12 general, using their description of the general neighborhood
13 as including the mall as well?
14 THE WITNESS: Yes. I'm confused on one point, I
15 have to say, because you said that Costco's, the applicant's
16 definition --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: The applicant proposed a definition
18 of neighborhood that was restricted to the mall property.
19 THE WITNESS: Okay.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: The technical staff of the
21 Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
22 recommended a definition of neighborhood that extended
23 beyond the mall and included properties to the south and
24 southwest of the mall, which you described as a pleasant --
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

Page 67

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- residential area.
2 THE WITNESS: Okay. So one point of confusion
3 that I have --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
5 THE WITNESS: -- on this subject is that most of,
6 almost all of Mr. Sullivan's findings are based on
7 concentrations at the units surrounding the mall. I don't
8 understand. So is that a de facto acceptance that the
9 neighborhood, that the surrounding residential --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: He measured an area which I guess
11 he was contracted to measure --
12 THE WITNESS: Okay. Well --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and I don't know that it's a
14 de facto acceptance. I think I have said and I would intend
15 to accept as the definition of the neighborhood what
16 technical staff recommended. Yes.
17 MR. GOECKE: We would stipulate to that
18 definition.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So the applicant has
20 accepted that also. So --
21 THE WITNESS: Okay, great.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to me, it makes, it makes much
23 more sense, in terms of evaluating those who are going to be
24 most affected --
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

Page 68

1 MR. GROSSMAN: -- as to not stop the limit of the
2 definition of neighborhood at the mall itself but also to
3 include those who are in the close proximity and those
4 residences.
5 THE WITNESS: Okay. So we're all on the same --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: So, yes, the --
7 THE WITNESS: -- we're all on the same page.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: We're all on the same page.
9 THE WITNESS: Right.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure
11 that we're clear on that. All right. So I'm sorry,
12 Ms. Rosenfeld --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: No. That's --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I interrupted your questioning.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: -- quite all right. That's one
16 issue we don't have to dispute any longer.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Don't have to fight, right.
18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19 Q Does the scope of Mr. Sullivan's report include
20 his projected levels of certain air pollutants for the home,
21 the school, and the pool parcels?
22 A Yes. Yes.
23 Q And does his report include projected air
24 pollution levels within the mall parcel itself?
25 A Yes, it does. It doesn't -- there are certain

Page 69

1 aspects which were not modeled for the mall itself, but
2 their August 2013 report clearly shows results within the
3 mall, okay?
4 Q On June 17th, during the hearing, Mr. Grossman
5 asked Mr. Sullivan if he could determine what percentage of
6 certain pollution concentrations would result from the gas
7 station. For your reference that's the June 17th transcript
8 at page 178. Mr. Sullivan said that he could and that he
9 would. Does Mr. Sullivan's August 16th report break out the
10 pollution impact of the gas queues or other gas station
11 sources that would impact receptors at the pool, school, or
12 home location?
13 A Yes, it -- yes, he does. Yes, it does.
14 Q And do you have, do you have --
15 A We have a, I can put that --
16 Q Can you show that?
17 A Let's see. I can maybe blow this up a little bit.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: And, Mr. Grossman, this would be
19 Slide 1 of the PowerPoint --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: -- provided by Dr. Cole, and it is
22 Exhibit No. 404(a), and I believe everybody should have a
23 copy of that.
24 MS. ADELMAN: Thank you.
25 THE WITNESS: Can everyone see that?

Page 70

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I can.
2 MR. GOECKE: If you go to Slide Show, it'll go
3 full screen.
4 MS. ADELMAN: When Mark comes back, I think he can
5 make it a bit larger.
6 THE WITNESS: I think if we just put -- can we dim
7 the lights?
8 MS. ADELMAN: I think the size is the issue, Hank,
9 but I don't know how to do it.
10 THE WITNESS: Oh. Oh, okay. How about that?
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Does that help?
12 MR. GOECKE: I think if you go up to Slide Show,
13 Dr. Cole, you could enlarge the image of what we're looking
14 at.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Right there?
16 MR. BRANN: No.
17 MR. GOECKE: In the middle of the, toward the top.
18 THE WITNESS: Ah, you're right. I forgot about
19 that.
20 MR. BRANN: If you go to Current Slide.
21 THE WITNESS: There we go. Thank you.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Is that too -- should I turn the
23 lights back on or are you --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: The lights weren't interfering with
25 me, so yes. I prefer to be able to see my notes, not that I

Page 71

1 can read them a day later. So I --
2 MS. ADELMAN: I hear that it's a little out of
3 focus, Dr. Cole; so let me see if I can work on that a bit.
4 Not much. I guess that's as good as it's going to get.
5 THE WITNESS: I think -- so --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q So, Dr. Cole, looking at page 1 of Exhibit 404(a),
9 can you show how it is that you can identify the
10 contributions of the gas station to particular pollutants
11 at --
12 A Well, if I'm understanding the table correctly,
13 which comes from, this is from the August 2013 report, and
14 if I'm understanding it correctly, what Mr. Sullivan has
15 done was to estimate the contribution of specific sources to
16 the concentrations at the, at the various homes, at the
17 school, and at the pool. Here the closest home is shown,
18 the school, and the pool. And this is, by the way, urban;
19 the top one is urban, and you see that of whatever the total
20 level is, the queue contributes five micrograms per cubic
21 meter at the home. That's an attempt to isolate just the
22 impact of the queue. You see it's a little bit higher for
23 the rural case below, but the levels were generally, in the
24 mall area, were much higher.
25 Q And is there anywhere in his August 13th, August

Page 72

1 2013 report that provides a similar breakout of information
2 for the mall parcel itself?
3 A No, not that I'm aware of.
4 Q So, in your view, does that make this a complete
5 report?
6 A Well, if one of the issues was what is the
7 incremental contribution -- in this case, we're dealing with
8 NOx, or NO2, more properly -- and we wanted to know the
9 incremental impact within the part of the neighborhood that
10 is the mall, I would have no -- my reading of the results
11 doesn't show that. As a matter of fact, we requested that
12 recently in a memo, which I believe is part of the record,
13 and the answer was that that work had not been done. Is
14 that -- maybe you can produce that document.
15 Q And, in fact, is that information available for
16 the subject site, for the special exception area itself?
17 A No.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: When you say that information, what
19 information?
20 MS. ROSENFELD: The breakout of the --
21 THE WITNESS: The breakdown was done for the
22 receptors, which you see: home, school, pool. A similar
23 breakdown was not done within the mall.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are we talking about
25 just for NO2, NOx, or for everything?

Page 73

1 THE WITNESS: Right here I'm talking about NO2 --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: -- but I believe that's true for
4 other contaminants as well.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: And specifically, Mr. Grossman,
7 we're talking about the percentage of the pollution
8 concentrations that would result directly from the gas
9 station.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: So if I understand your point,
11 Ms. Rosenfeld, you are saying that the Sullivan reports --
12 well, the Sullivan reports, although they gave figures for
13 the percentage of the pollutants from the gas station at
14 these discrete sites -- the home, the pool, and the school
15 -- did not give those figures for the incremental increase
16 from the gas station for other locations on the mall?
17 MS. ROSENFELD: That is the question I asked him.
18 I think that's Dr. Cole's testimony --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: -- yes.
21 THE WITNESS: That is my testimony.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
23 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24 Q Do you understand that the applicant has argued
25 that if the predicted levels of certain air pollutions,

Page 74

1 based on modeling, do not exceed the federal EPA National
2 Ambient Air Quality --
3 A I'm having trouble hearing you. Could you
4 please --
5 Q Okay. I think I'm going to need some water. Do
6 you understand that the applicant has argued that if
7 pollution levels do not exceed the federal EPA air quality
8 standards, that they have met their burden of proof in
9 showing that the proposed station will not adversely affect
10 the health or general welfare of residents, visitors, or
11 workers in the area at the subject site?
12 A Are you talking there about the paradigm or of the
13 -- why don't you rephrase the question. You're --
14 Q Is it your understanding --
15 A Uh-huh.
16 Q -- that the applicant's position is that if they
17 satisfy or fall below National Air Quality Standards, that
18 there will be no adverse health effect on residents,
19 visitors --
20 A Yeah, okay, right.
21 Q -- and workers at the site?
22 A Okay. I believe that is their -- it's my judgment
23 that that is the paradigm which they've applied to this
24 site.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: What does that mean? What do you

Page 75

1 mean that's the paradigm they've applied to this site?
2 THE WITNESS: What I mean is that their contention
3 is that if they can show that they meet EPA's National
4 Ambient Air Quality Standards --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
6 THE WITNESS: -- that they have met the burden of
7 proof.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And was your question --
9 MS. ROSENFELD: That was my question.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, he answered --
12 THE WITNESS: That --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: -- he answered my question.
14 THE WITNESS: That doesn't mean I agree with it.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And in your professional judgment, does
18 Mr. Sullivan's analysis provide a reasonable basis for the
19 Board of Appeals to conclude that the special exception will
20 fall below or meet the EPA National Air Quality Standards
21 for certain pollutants?
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the problem with that
23 question is it has will fall below or meet. You have to
24 choose one or the other in the question then.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 76

1 Q In your opinion, will they fall below EPA National
2 Air Quality Standards?
3 A I think what you're asking is, is there -- does
4 the modeling analysis which was done, is it sufficient to
5 show that they've met the standard that they've accepted --
6 Q That's correct.
7 A -- the air quality standards. My answer is no.
8 Q Okay. And do you have specific reasons for
9 reaching that conclusion?
10 A Okay. Number one -- and remember that the model
11 that they're using is EPA standards, meeting or not; so
12 there's a certain obligation that goes with that to follow
13 EPA guidance in determining that answer -- so number one is,
14 by Mr. Sullivan's admission, he did an analysis and showed
15 that the area should be classified as rural, meaning using
16 rural dispersion coefficients. He's done the analysis that
17 shows, following EPA guidance, that the site should be
18 classified as a rural dispersion site, using dispersion
19 coefficients. That's important because rural dispersion
20 coefficients are more conservative, give you higher numbers.
21 So if you go to urban, the numbers, the predicted
22 concentrations will be lower, okay? So the answer is he did
23 not follow EPA guidance.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, do you disagree with his --
25 he testified that EPA guidance, and he pointed to a number

Page 77

1 of provisions in the EPA guidelines for the proposition that
2 you do, you look at the modeling overall technique but then
3 you modify it to get as close to truth as you can, and
4 that's what he says he did when you're talking about a mall
5 area, which is urban in that immediate area of the mall.
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you disagree with that
8 statement?
9 THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me, let me respond.
10 Mr. Sullivan, in his November 2012 report, looks into that
11 issue and uses some professional judgment. And, you know,
12 this is a very difficult area because you've got a
13 transition zone between something that's more suburban rural
14 and something that's urban, which has a number of
15 characteristics, which affect the turbulence in the
16 atmosphere, okay? So he thought about it and wrote an
17 interesting paragraph in his November report that states he
18 felt that this particular site, the dispersion would fall
19 somewhere between urban and rural, in other words, an
20 intermediate value.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
22 THE WITNESS: So, unfortunately, he didn't do that
23 in his modeling. He's relying primarily on -- I mean, he's
24 presented both rural and urban --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

1 THE WITNESS: -- results, but I think it's fair to
2 say that his conclusions tend to favor the urban dispersion
3 coefficients, but he didn't --

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, but let's get to my direct
5 question --

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that is, do you disagree -- you
8 said that he didn't follow EPA guidance --

9 THE WITNESS: Right.

10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and then he testified that he is
11 following EPA guidance because they say that even though
12 there's this general overall rule about characterizing the
13 three-kilometer radius, that you also want to get closer to
14 the truth by more accurately describing your area, and so he
15 said he followed that guidance. Do you say he did not
16 follow that guidance?

17 THE WITNESS: No, he did not follow that guidance
18 because he made an assertion about what that guidance would
19 be. He said the value is going to lie between urban and
20 rural, would be the best approximation.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

22 THE WITNESS: So that, apparently, is his
23 response, as he's written very clearly -- and I think it's a
24 fair statement -- that it's his response to the guidance
25 that you just described, some discretion for professional

1 judgment in a complex situation.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: For part of it, but others, where
3 he had more specific areas that he was measuring, for
4 example, right at the loading dock, that sort of thing,
5 where he didn't, where it's directly on the mall property,
6 he had a different, a different standard that he applied.
7 Are you saying that he is not following EPA guidance in
8 doing this, or is that exactly what EPA asks you to do?

9 THE WITNESS: EPA has a specific, which he spelled
10 out very beautifully, the whole procedure. He then
11 explained how he followed it. He has a nice diagram. How
12 do I -- this is from his report, and he looked at the
13 three-kilometer circle --

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

15 THE WITNESS: -- found that most of it was
16 qualified as rural.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

18 THE WITNESS: EPA guidance says if it's mostly
19 rural, you need to use dispersion unless, unless there are
20 circumstances. So, yes --

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he says there were
22 circumstances. He says --

23 THE WITNESS: Yes.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that you've got a huge urban
25 qualifying mall here, and you're talking about properties

1 that are right next to it. And I'm trying to get from you
2 whether or not you think he is incorrect in applying the EPA
3 guidelines in that, in that fashion, to try to get -- to try
4 to somehow take into account the fact that you're right next
5 to an urban-styled object: a mall.

6 THE WITNESS: Okay. The answer has two -- the
7 question has two answers.

8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

9 THE WITNESS: First, I think he followed the
10 guidance in terms of the judgment which he exercised. He
11 looked at trajectories, and he said some of them are, you
12 know, come into the mall from rural areas or areas that
13 would be characterized as rural under EPA guidance, some are
14 mostly over the mall, and he then said, well, let's use the
15 best -- my best judgment would be an intermediate value. So
16 that's -- the answer is he did look at that. I think he was
17 diligent in doing that little analysis. Part 2 answer, did
18 he incorporate that judgment into the modeling? The answer
19 is, no, he did not.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Ms. Rosenfeld.

21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

22 Q And to follow up, did he incorporate that in his
23 modeling in the 2012 report?

24 A No. He used -- in the November 2012, he relied,
25 in his isopleths figures, on the rural results; he followed

1 that in the November report, and he, however, presented
2 findings for the receptors around, around the, around the
3 mall, the homes, et cetera. He also presented urban
4 results. So he showed both. I don't necessarily disagree
5 with that. He showed both.

6 Q And, Dr. Cole, when you talk about receptors, can
7 you explain what a receptor means?

8 A Well, there are two definitions. One is the
9 modeling definition, which is you make a grid or you put, or
10 a monitoring grid, you put out monitors or you model the
11 intersections of grid lines or the middle of grid lines,
12 depending upon how you want to do it, and you see what the
13 model shows you for each of those receptors.

14 However, there's another meaning for the word
15 receptor, and that is, people, people who are affected. I
16 don't think I have to be a medical expert to say that when
17 you breathe, you're breathing the ambient air. So receptors
18 are people who breathe ambient air, the impact of whatever
19 emissions are in the area.

20 Q So when you talk about the pollution
21 concentrations at a particular receptor in a study, that
22 would translate into the concentrations that a person
23 standing at that location at that point in time would be
24 breathing; is that -- if the model were translated into real
25 life?

1 A Well, you have to be wary of the averaging time of
2 the standard and the averaging time of the modeling. There
3 are one-hour standards, eight-hour standards, 24-hour
4 standards, and annual standards. So in terms of, you know,
5 in terms of -- you have to look at the specific, okay? So
6 for NO2, for example, I think the critical factor is the
7 one-hour modeling results, okay?

8 Q We were going through the reasons that you --

9 A Oh, right.

10 Q -- thought that Mr. Sullivan's report would not
11 provide a basis to conclude that --

12 A Right.

13 Q -- air pollution --

14 A The first was, we talked about dispersion
15 coefficients.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think you finished your
17 question.

18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

19 Q That the air pollution levels from the gas station
20 would not meet federal EPA standards and --

21 A Uh-huh.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you think this is a good time,
23 actually, for a five-minute break before you continue,
24 because it's --

25 MS. ROSENFELD: It's certainly fine with me, sure.

1 MR. SILVERMAN: Sounds like a good idea, yes.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we'll come back at
3 20 to 12:00.

4 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld.

6 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you.

7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

8 Q Dr. Cole, when we left off, we were talking about
9 a summary of the reasons why you thought that Mr. Sullivan's
10 analysis would not provide a reasonable basis for the Board
11 of Appeals to conclude that the special exception would meet
12 the EPA National Air Quality Standards, and you had talked
13 briefly about the difference between the urban versus rural
14 coefficients. Are there other grounds for your conclusion?

15 A Yes. Yes, there are. The second area is that
16 Mr. Sullivan, in estimating motor vehicle emissions, used an
17 obsolete model called MOBILE6. EPA's approved model for
18 emissions is called MOVES2010. I can get into that later,
19 but certainly the analysis with MOBILE6 has the effect of
20 reducing predicted concentrations of both PM2.5 and NO2.

21 I bring up those two pollutants, and will
22 repeatedly, because in the case of NO2, very strong evidence
23 that there's an exceedance of the standard from
24 Mr. Sullivan's documents and, secondly, PM2.5 annual is
25 very, in his final report, is very close to the standard.

1 So anything such as emissions, if you underpredict
2 emissions, you're going to have problems accurately
3 predicting concentrations for those mobile source emissions.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan testified that he
5 wanted to use MOVES model but he was unable to get certain
6 parameters from Council of Governments which were
7 required --

8 THE WITNESS: Well --

9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to apply it. Do you disagree
10 with that or --

11 THE WITNESS: I have two responses. One is that
12 the model was issued in an earlier form, the MOBILE2010,
13 back in 2010, number one. Guidance was issued at around
14 that time as well. Secondly, there are other ways to get at
15 the data, I believe, that, or to get at the answer, that
16 Mr. Sullivan has acknowledged but did not follow through on.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: What are you talking about?

18 THE WITNESS: Okay. So, for example, in the area
19 of particulates, he acknowledged that idling cars, when you
20 apply MOVES as opposed to MOBILE6, you get an answer that's
21 10 times higher.

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

23 THE WITNESS: For NO2 the correction would be a
24 factor of two. Now, that's Mr. Sullivan's assessment.

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

1 THE WITNESS: Okay? But he didn't follow through
2 and use those corrections, or corrections between MOBILE6
3 and MOVES which he refers to, but he didn't actually do
4 that.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's another question, but
6 my question is, he's testified that the reason he didn't use
7 the MOVES model was because he couldn't get certain
8 information that is necessary to apply that model from the
9 Council of Governments. That's my recollection of his
10 testimony. Do you disagree with that testimony? Was that
11 information available from the Council of Governments, and
12 is it needed to apply the MOVES model?

13 THE WITNESS: I think there are ways of getting
14 the data. He said in one of his testimony, he said default
15 values could be used, he didn't want to use default values,
16 but he didn't explain why he didn't want to use default
17 values. That's for MOVES2010. So there are other ways to
18 use MOVES and --

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, first, answer my question.
20 Do you disagree with his statement that he was, that the
21 information necessary to apply MOVES is, that is necessary
22 to apply it is not available or he was unable to obtain it
23 and he cannot obtain it from the Council of Governments yet?

24 THE WITNESS: That is his assertion.

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm asking you whether his --

Page 86

1 THE WITNESS: Well --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Did you check? Did you check with
3 the Council of Governments to try to find out if that
4 information was available?
5 THE WITNESS: I take his word that the kind of
6 information that he's talking about was not available. I
7 don't take a position on whether there were other ways to
8 simulate the data. That's -- the explanation for that or
9 the rationale for that or the reason why he didn't do it is
10 not for me; it's for him --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Well --
12 THE WITNESS: -- he's the one that's doing the
13 analysis.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: But right now it's for you, sir,
15 because I'm asking you that question as an expert. Do you
16 think that it is improper to not use the MOVES model when he
17 could not get the data that he felt was necessary from the
18 Council of Governments?
19 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to answer in two
20 parts. I don't know, is the first answer.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: Whether or not he could have
23 obtained that data or simulated it in another way, I don't
24 know the answer. Secondly, he said his, gave his best
25 judgment for correction factors. That would have been

Page 87

1 another approach, but he has testified that he did not apply
2 those correction factors.
3 So, once again, we're in a situation where he
4 acknowledges there's a problem, even comes up with
5 suggestions for a solution in the case of dispersion
6 coefficients, intermediate, in the case of this, apply
7 correction factors, but he doesn't follow through
8 incorporating them into the results that he presents.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand what you're saying but
10 that doesn't really -- once again, you haven't really
11 answered my question, but I'm going to let you -- I'm going
12 to leave it like that.
13 THE WITNESS: I said I don't know the first -- I
14 repeat, I don't know. The answer is --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'll take your I don't know.
16 Ms. Rosenfeld.
17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
18 Q And what other areas did you base your conclusions
19 on with respect to the report?
20 A Well, the next thing was I don't believe that the
21 modeling, the emissions modeling, takes into consideration
22 the level of congestion (a) current during, especially
23 during peak periods; and, secondly, the impact of placing a
24 gas station, with queues, with delivery trucks, on -- the
25 congestion -- in the area of the mall, in particular; so,

Page 88

1 and there, as I will explain later, there's a very strong
2 relationship between levels of congestion, number of cars,
3 vehicle speeds, and emissions. If you get that wrong, if
4 you don't have the right level of traffic, you're not going
5 to have the right level of emissions. I will get into that
6 in detail. So that's the third area.
7 The fourth thing I find as a huge problem is that
8 he made an assumption, apparently based on back of the
9 envelope or picked it out of the air, that people exposed to
10 gas station queues or the level of pollution in that area
11 would only be exposed for 20 minutes. He --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: In which area? Exposed in which
13 area, would only be exposed for 20 minutes? Which area are
14 you talking about, sir?
15 THE WITNESS: In the area of the gas station and
16 its immediate --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, people moving through the gas
18 station?
19 THE WITNESS: People moving around in the parking
20 lot and the gas station, whatnot. Some people, for example,
21 may be there for -- someone who's a service employee or
22 something may be there for a lot, for a whole hour or for
23 two hours or for five hours or 10 hours. This is not -- the
24 standards are written by EPA to be a one-hour concentration.
25 I have never seen this done, this sort of thing done, and if

Page 89

1 you're going to --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. You've never seen what
3 sort of thing done?
4 THE WITNESS: This kind of reduction based on
5 assumptions about exposure. The standard is a one-hour
6 standard.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I think that --
8 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9 Q Dr. Cole, could you explain what reduction you're
10 talking about? Quantify what it is --
11 A Okay.
12 Q -- that you're talking about.
13 A Okay. The normal way of looking at whether or not
14 you meet a standard is you calculate, based on your
15 modeling, the hourly concentration, in this case, for an
16 hour. In this case, he, what Mr. Sullivan done was assume
17 that no one would be exposed for a whole hour; so he divided
18 his, the reduced air emissions by two-thirds.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I think from, if I recall
20 the testimony, it is as, in terms of people passing through
21 the queue to get through the gas thing. I think that's
22 what's applied to. It's not clear here yet, an argument or
23 an issue, as to whether, for the workers who are there,
24 whether that's OSHA standards or EPA --
25 THE WITNESS: Well, how about people --

Page 90

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me finish this, sir --
2 whether it's OSHA standards or EPA National Ambient Air
3 Quality Standards that apply to them, but I think that the
4 20-minute figure, if I recall, is based on how long it takes
5 to get through the queue of a person --
6 THE WITNESS: Okay.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- getting gas there. So I think
8 that's where that comes from.
9 THE WITNESS: Okay. So what he did was he assumed
10 20 minutes exposed to what's in the queue in the gas station
11 area, right?
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
13 THE WITNESS: For the rest of the hour, 40
14 minutes, he assumes background concentration and that
15 neglects the fact that someone might buy gas, take their
16 car, search for a parking space, get out of the car, move to
17 wherever, two or three shops or one shop or wherever they're
18 going, they got the kids with them, they got the, on the way
19 back, they've got a shopping cart that they have to load
20 into the -- now, those parking lot areas are going to be way
21 higher; in fact, his own, Mr. Sullivan's results show that
22 in the area of the mall, the concentrations are way higher,
23 let's say, for NO2 than they are background. So you've got
24 people who may be exposed for 20 minutes at the queue, but
25 they may be moving to other places.

Page 91

1 So putting aside the OSHA issue, I think there's
2 no evidence that's produced here to show the validity of the
3 assumption that he used.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So you say the
5 20-minute assumption is potentially understating the
6 exposure of --
7 THE WITNESS: Absolutely, yes.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- at least some people in the
9 area? I understand.
10 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that there's no
12 evidence, but I understand --
13 THE WITNESS: And there's another, there's another
14 issue, too, which I can get into if you want. When you look
15 at a shorter averaging period, it's well-known in air
16 pollution meteorology that the exposures in a smaller time
17 -- the maximum exposures for a smaller time period are going
18 to be higher. So you can't have it both ways. If you're
19 going to reduce the exposure time, you also have to look at
20 higher maximums, and there's scaling factors that EPA
21 recommends to use when you go from one averaging period to
22 another. He did not do that.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
24 THE WITNESS: So he's trying to have it both ways.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 92

1 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 Q Dr. Cole, are you aware of anywhere in the EPA
3 regulations or guidance that would support the reduction of
4 these concentrations based on exposure, the NO2
5 concentrations based on exposure?
6 A I'm not aware of that.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me, which -- the NO2
8 concentrations under, are you talking about the 24-hour, the
9 one-hour? Which are you talking about?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: The one-hour, for the --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: -- one-hour NO2 standard.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: A one-hour standard in my history on
15 these subjects is a one-hour standard.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And so --
18 A And to make another assertion without supporting
19 evidence is, in my opinion, and without considering the
20 impact on maximum concentrations over further periods, is
21 just a mistake.
22 Q Does Mr. Sullivan's analysis try to conflate
23 emissions modeling with dosage or exposure?
24 A I don't understand.
25 MR. GOECKE: Objection. He doesn't know the

Page 93

1 intention of Sullivan's report.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know if she meant in terms
3 of intention, but I'm not sure I understand the question
4 anyway. You're saying, does he conflate these two concepts
5 in some way? I'm not sure which part of his testimony
6 you're talking about and what exactly you mean by the
7 question.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: The two-thirds reduction of the
9 NO2 --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
11 MS. ROSENFELD: -- does he, is that reduction
12 based on his assumption of the exposure level that a person
13 would have?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you know the answer to that
15 question?
16 THE WITNESS: I don't know what he based that on,
17 frankly --
18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19 Q Okay.
20 A -- it's an assumption.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: And he's testified he doesn't feel
22 there was a sufficient, or any evidentiary base for that
23 assumption. Whether there is or not is a separate question,
24 but that's this witness's testimony.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

1 Q And, Dr. Cole, are there other points that you
2 wanted to make in terms of just summary deficiencies?

3 A Yes, there are a couple general points. One is
4 that there have been numerous revisions of the modeling and,
5 in some cases, the documentation for the changes that have
6 been made are not clear, in my judgment. Also, this gets to
7 the question of uncertainty.

8 In any analysis, the standard norm in science is
9 to state what your errors could be, what your uncertainties
10 are, and I see none of that in Mr. Sullivan's reports. It's
11 critical because, when there are many, many uncertainties --
12 and I'll be discussing more uncertainties --

13 MR. GROSSMAN: You're not going to get into the
14 Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

15 THE WITNESS: No. No. No, no, no, no. I'll give
16 you an aside later about Heisenberg.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think I can take
18 off-the-record asides from witnesses, but it's okay.

19 THE WITNESS: Later, later, when the case is over.
20 When you have many uncertainties -- and in this analysis,
21 there are so many uncertainties: predicting emissions,
22 predicting what atmospheric turbulence, which is a very
23 complex issue, will do -- one way to deal with it is to err
24 on the side of conservatism, to use those assumptions and
25 methods which will cover the potential for errors and

1 uncertainty, because -- and the reason why you want that
2 safety zone, let's say, is because the question applies to
3 the protection of human health. If you're wrong and you're
4 over and you don't do something, you haven't harmed public
5 health, but if you do something that in fact harms health,
6 you can't reverse that.

7 So there's a -- and I was glad, when we first
8 started the dialogue to arrive at a protocol here, that
9 Mr. Sullivan was, used many conservative principles. I am
10 deeply concerned that when subsequent modeling, such as the
11 correction of the background for NO2, shows that there's an
12 exceedance, that Mr. Sullivan pulls away the conservancy.
13 He's done that in a number of cases. We can talk about
14 that, but the general --

15 MR. GROSSMAN: He says it's less conservative but
16 it's still conservative, is what he says.

17 THE WITNESS: Yes. So I would argue --

18 MR. GROSSMAN: More accurate, I think, is what --

19 THE WITNESS: Well, I don't, I'm not accepting
20 that. When you have an emissions factor that's either 10 or
21 twice below what EPA standard emission model is, that's not
22 conservative. When you, when you don't adequately account
23 for congestion in your emissions, that's not conservative.
24 So I'm not saying that about accurate. What I'm saying is
25 there's a great deal of uncertainty.

1 I can tell you, as someone who's done modeling,
2 that there are many choice points. All you have to do is
3 read either the guidelines for AERMOD or the guidelines for
4 modeling. There are so many places where you can make
5 Choice A or Choice B, and every one of them affects the
6 results. Now, I'm not going to judge every single thing
7 that he did, but I can say that your choice on all of those
8 points adds to the uncertainty, and in a situation where you
9 have uncertainty, I would argue that you stay with
10 conservatism. I'm a liberal, but in this case, I'm
11 advocating conservatism, okay?

12 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

13 Q Dr. Cole, we've spent a great deal of time in this
14 case --

15 A Oh, let me add one thing, please.

16 Q Sure.

17 A Having looked at all of the many reports and the
18 changes that I've talked about, places where I feel there's
19 inaccuracy, places where I feel there's a lot of
20 uncertainty, or the retreat from conservatism, I believe
21 that these, that the problems, that the deficiencies and the
22 uncertainties, individually and more so in combination, do
23 not give you or the appeals board the green light on this
24 particular case. They have not made the case that they are
25 meeting EPA standards, okay, and in fact, I have a contrary

1 opinion.

2 I feel, I believe, it's my judgment that the
3 evidence that they have generated supports the contention
4 that the NO2 one-hour standard would be exceeded and,
5 potentially, the PM2.5 annual standard would be exceeded --
6 (a) the report doesn't rule it out with sufficient evidence,
7 accounting for uncertainties, and (b) tends to, in a number
8 of important instances, underpredict emissions and
9 overpredict, in my opinion, dispersion. Those kinds of
10 things reduce predicted concentrations. And the fact that
11 changes were made once results showed exceedances is deeply
12 concerning to me as a scientist.

13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

15 Q Dr. Cole, we've spent a lot of time in the case
16 talking about air modeling --

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q -- and before you get into the real substance of
19 your testimony, I want to make sure that we all are using
20 the same terminology in the same way, at least with respect
21 to your testimony.

22 A Okay.

23 Q Would you just give us a brief review of air
24 dispersion and air quality modeling before you get into more
25 detail?

Page 98

1 A Is it possible for me to go up there?
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, or you can use my wanted laser
3 pointer --
4 THE WITNESS: Beautiful.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- which the government invested 10
6 or 12 bucks.
7 THE WITNESS: Okay. How do I do it?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: There's a button on it. Just don't
9 point it at anybody. Right on top.
10 THE WITNESS: Oh, I got it.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
12 THE WITNESS: Be good. I won't point it at you
13 because --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: That's good, yes. That's --
15 THE WITNESS: Okay. So this is -- I want to talk
16 about area sources, okay, because that's what we're really
17 talking about here.
18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19 Q And, Dr. Cole, before you move forward, this would
20 be page 2 of Exhibit 404(b) --
21 A Okay.
22 Q -- the figures on --
23 A Right.
24 Q -- on that exhibit.
25 A The first -- the upper panel here is sort of a

Page 99

1 bird's-eye view looking down. It's the lateral, we're
2 looking at lateral spread of the plume. Here are the
3 concentrations of a low-level area source, and we're talking
4 about fairly low-level emissions from automobiles and
5 whatnot. So the concentrations near the surface and in the
6 area of the source tend to be the highest. Then, when you
7 go out, the effect of wind and the effect of turbulence
8 spreads the plume in the horizontal.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: So the darker area is the heavier
10 source --
11 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- heavier concentration?
13 THE WITNESS: I didn't want to put numbers on
14 here, but the darker it is, the more concentrated. Right?
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 THE WITNESS: And now we go to the vertical cross
17 section, and the same thing is true under most
18 circumstances: the concentrations are highest near the
19 source; they tend to spread in the vertical. And so that
20 the concentrations, because of both vertical spread and
21 lateral spread, are diminishing away from the source.
22 That's a basic tenet. Does anyone have, do you have
23 questions on that?
24 MR. GROSSMAN: No.
25 THE WITNESS: Okay. There's something else,

Page 100

1 though, that affects dispersion, and that is, atmospheric
2 turbulence. Okay. Turbulence is one of the most
3 complicated macroscientific puzzles known to the scientific
4 world. It depends on whether the surface is hot or cold,
5 whether the surface is rough or smoother. You never know in
6 a unit of time what wiggles and waggles you have. The wind
7 has gusts, which is another function of turbulence. In some
8 cases, there may be an inversion over the, at some level
9 above the plume and that acts as a lid, which keeps
10 concentrations higher. I tried to make this diagram so that
11 the concentrations would trail off more slowly, because
12 there's less vertical headroom for the contaminants to
13 disperse into, okay? So now --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: How did you determine the pattern
15 of the squiggly lines and --
16 THE WITNESS: Oh, that's a great question. I'm
17 glad you --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: I thought they looked somewhat
19 like, Dr. Adelman would say, the pattern that a slime mold
20 might --
21 THE WITNESS: Yes.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- might make as a --
23 THE WITNESS: Right. I have an acknowledgment to
24 make, that it was late at night and I just used the computer
25 to make any squiggles that I could.

Page 101

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I see, random squiggles.
2 THE WITNESS: Random squiggles, and I wasn't happy
3 because it looks so crude. It doesn't, I haven't -- you
4 know, you can tell by my slides that I like things to look
5 okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
7 THE WITNESS: This does not look okay, but there's
8 a point in that, in that incorporation of turbulence into
9 models is about as primitive, in my judgment, as the
10 squiggles on the screen. It's very hard to know exactly
11 what's going on. It's affected by so many different things,
12 the history of the air parcel, is it going over the suburbs,
13 is it going over a city, what happens when it hits the
14 parking lot, what happens when there are buildings present,
15 which greatly adds to the uncertainty and to the turbulence.
16 In this case, we have a building to the north, we have a
17 building to the east, very near the -- the one to the east
18 is very near the gas station. How does that affect
19 dispersion? Are there cases where that actually leads to
20 more concentration?
21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22 Q And, Dr. Cole, could you go back to the prior
23 figures just for a moment?
24 A The prior slide?
25 Q Yes. And these are very basic questions, but if

Page 102

1 there's more wind speed, would there be faster dispersion?
2 A Yeah. I have a slide on that, actually. Let me,
3 let me just answer it. Okay. Picture this in your mind.
4 This is -- I've done this in my classes, but instead of a
5 smokestack or a car, pretend it's a kid with a bubble
6 machine, okay? They actually sell bubble machines; you
7 don't even have to blow it anymore. I mean -- so here's the
8 kid with the bubble machine and there's no wind, okay? The
9 bubbles are sort of amassing around; there's a little bit of
10 turbulence in the area. So the kids are looking marvelously
11 at the bubbles, and they're bursting, of course. Now let's
12 increase the wind speed to two miles an hour. These bubbles
13 then are stretched out. There's more air that's moving by.
14 So the effect of wind speed is to reduce
15 concentrations, and in every model a basic tenet is that
16 concentrations are inversely proportional to wind speed. So
17 the higher the wind speed, the lower the concentrations,
18 because you're stretching the atmosphere. Another way of
19 saying it is you're --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
21 THE WITNESS: -- providing more dilution air per
22 unit time.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
24 THE WITNESS: Okay? Does that --
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 103

1 Q Well, one other question. There's been a lot of
2 discussion about urban versus rural, and can you explain how
3 urban coefficients and rural coefficients affect the
4 dispersion of air pollution, if they're a factor?
5 A Okay. Let's take -- the rural case is a case
6 where you have less, the technical term is surface roughness
7 elements are smaller, are lower, a grass lawn, very small
8 little things that affect the roughness. So below that
9 surface roughness you have turbulence, and above it you can
10 find a place where the wind speed is zero, but this is too
11 much, I'm sorry, this is too much technical detail. Let me
12 -- your question was?
13 Q Really a comparison. Why --
14 A Okay.
15 Q -- why is the difference important?
16 A Right. Rural is relatively smooth, okay? A lake
17 is smooth in parts, less physical turbulence, okay?
18 Mechanical turbulence is a result of the resistance of
19 objects to the moving wind. Urban, you've got buildings;
20 you've got -- and in this case, you have buildings very near
21 -- you have a surface that has automobiles or trucks; you
22 have, admittedly acknowledge, I acknowledge that the
23 dispersion is better in urban areas and that's why, when you
24 use the urban coefficients, you get lower concentrations,
25 because there's more spread of the atmosphere, there's more

Page 104

1 turbulence to spread the pollutants.
2 So the complicating factor is that air -- any
3 fluid has a memory. So that this air that's moving from one
4 kind of topography to another, there's a transition zone.
5 Now, I've studied transition zones in the area of
6 shorelines. They have a profound effect on turbulence.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Explain what you mean by fluids
8 have a memory. I don't understand that.
9 THE WITNESS: Okay. Good question. In other
10 words, you don't suddenly -- the air, right, the air is
11 moving downwind; the air is moving in a certain direction.
12 It's flowing over a rural surface, let's say, and then
13 suddenly it comes to the edge of a more urbanized area.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
15 THE WITNESS: There is -- what happens is that the
16 turbulence initially affects the lowest part of the
17 atmosphere. The area affected grows as the air moves
18 further into the urbanized area. So there is a transition
19 zone between, and it may be --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: There's more of a lag in the effect
21 than a memory.
22 THE WITNESS: Yes, absolutely. This is not an
23 exact comparison, but if you look at this, the vertical area
24 here downwind of the source, you see that it takes some time
25 for the turbulence to disperse the plume upward. Similarly,

Page 105

1 the air coming in from the rural area would be less
2 turbulent.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Wouldn't your diagram have to be
4 reversed then? Shouldn't it be darker on the top if it
5 takes longer to disperse it --
6 THE WITNESS: Well, it --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- based on the, based on the
8 change?
9 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. What?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Your diagram on the board --
11 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- shows it being lighter,
13 generally, towards the top, further away from the ground.
14 Is that correct? Am I seeing that correctly? A lighter
15 color, that means --
16 THE WITNESS: Right. Yeah, sure.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: -- meaning a lower concentration.
18 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Shouldn't it be darker there?
20 THE WITNESS: No.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Because, if you're, if you're
22 telling me that as it meets the changing surface, it
23 disperses faster at the low level and then has a lag at the
24 higher level, shouldn't the higher concentration remain at
25 the higher level longer and therefore you should be showing

Page 106

1 darker at the top than lighter?
2 THE WITNESS: All right. Let me back up. I wish
3 I had one of those pads to draw a picture.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: You can use the laser pointer.
5 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can I ad lib?
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Can you ad lib? Sure. This is an
7 ad lib. This is what we're all about. We're all ad lib.
8 THE WITNESS: Okay. Good. Thank you.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: You need to draw a picture on here?
10 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm going to go to this, and
11 I'm going to, how do I get -- all right. Now I want to go
12 to New and Create, and bear with me. Where's the way out
13 thing?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Did you understand my question?
15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I understand your question. I
16 want to address it here. How do I get rid of these boxes?
17 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know.
18 THE WITNESS: I can't find -- oh, here we are.
19 Let's see. Slide way out. Ah. All right. Let's go here
20 and let's get rid of this. All right. So I'm going to draw
21 a surface.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: I'll tell you what. Rather than
23 having you do it here, you can do it over the lunch hour for
24 me and show me later, if you want to answer my question
25 later.

Page 107

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay?
3 THE WITNESS: What I'm saying -- let me see if I
4 can put it into words.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6 THE WITNESS: Stop thinking about concentrations
7 for one minute, and let's just think about turbulence.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
9 THE WITNESS: So you've got air moving from a
10 relatively smooth area to a rough area.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
12 THE WITNESS: The turbulence starts to build, to
13 erode the smoothness, as a way of saying, but it builds over
14 distance. So near the source you have, yes, you have
15 concentrations near the surface, but the overlying air is
16 relatively smooth. So, in other words, the dispersion can't
17 take full advantage of the urban turbulence until that
18 turbulent, that boundary layer builds up and that takes some
19 distance.
20 So near the source you're going to, it's true,
21 you're going to have a lot of turbulence down at the
22 surface, but you're going to have that air moving above that
23 boundary layer, which is still rural, has less dispersion.
24 So you can't take full credit for urban dispersion near the
25 source if the wind is blowing from a relatively smooth area

Page 108

1 to a rougher area. I don't know if that makes sense.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I'm not sure that
3 answers my question, but I understand what you're saying
4 there. So let's go on. My -- I don't think my question is
5 that important in the grand scheme of things. So --
6 THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me get back to --
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q Mr. Sullivan's report references a term called
9 AERMOD. Can you explain what that is?
10 A Okay. I want to get the acronym. AERMOD stands
11 for American Meteorological Society, AMS, slash
12 Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, Regulatory Model.
13 It's now the preferred recommended modeling. To
14 Mr. Sullivan's credit, he used the standard; he used the
15 gold-standard model, AERMOD. It has many improvements over
16 the older models, okay? So he's used the proper model.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 THE WITNESS: All of these models, including
19 AERMOD -- now, the, all models, as I said, the larger the
20 emission rate, the higher the concentration. So there's a
21 proportionality between emissions and concentration.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
23 THE WITNESS: I've already said the higher the
24 wind speeds, the lower the concentrations, inverse.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 109

1 THE WITNESS: Thirdly, the more turbulence, the
2 faster the pollution disperses.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 THE WITNESS: AERMOD, the advance that I
5 appreciate in AERMOD more than anything else is the handling
6 of the vertical dispersion. Instead of just sort of taking
7 a stab, as earlier models did, and using a Gaussian, meaning
8 a normal distribution in the vertical, no, AERMOD does a lot
9 better. It says we're going to look at the kind of
10 situation, the kind of surface, whether there's a lot of
11 moisture or not, whether the surface is reflective or not,
12 because if it's reflective, you're not going to get as much
13 heating. Heating has an important impact on turbulence, on
14 convective turbulence. The surface roughness, I mentioned,
15 has an impact on the mechanical turbulence. So that AERMOD
16 uses some very sophisticated understandings of the dynamics
17 of turbulence and uses something called a probability
18 density function; so that instead of just saying Gaussian,
19 it looks at the kind of situation and simulates the kind of
20 turbulence, the size of the turbulent cells, the frequency
21 of wind changes, and all of that comes out of this greatly
22 improved model.
23 What the model doesn't do well is the situation
24 with discontinuities, because it assumes -- basically, you
25 have to choose parameters that apply to the whole area and

Page 110

1 -- so that there's an assumption about (a) steady state,
2 meaning that for the hour that's modeled, the concentrations
3 in it, all of the factors are the same. The second
4 assumption is that you may vary from hour to hour the
5 roughness parameter based on wind sector, okay, but it
6 doesn't specifically incorporate the change in topography or
7 the change in, I'm sorry, not -- it does deal with
8 topography. It doesn't deal with the changes in the surface
9 roughness and other characteristics which affect turbulence.
10 It does, has very good things to deal with topography, such
11 as a plume intercepting a mountain or something like that.
12 It has sophisticated algorithms.
13 So that, that's a rough summary of AERMOD.
14 However, I want to emphasize one other point: the devil is
15 in the details. There are many bells and whistles. It's
16 part of its sophistication. There are many choice points.
17 The choice points that you make affect the outcome. And so
18 some modelers, for example, would do a sensitivity analysis
19 to see if, how changing certain models would affect the
20 results. From those kinds of analyses, you get a view of
21 the uncertainty --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Changing certain models or changing
23 certain parameters of your model?
24 THE WITNESS: No, you would use the same model.
25 You change --

Page 111

1 MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. You said, I thought you
2 said changing certain models --
3 THE WITNESS: Right. You would --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: -- but you change certain
5 parameters.
6 THE WITNESS: Certain parameters to see, well,
7 what if we use this roughness instead of this roughness,
8 what if we assumed a wet surface instead of the dry -- those
9 kinds of things.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
11 THE WITNESS: But there are many choices of
12 representative meteorological data. There are sources of
13 what averaging time you use for the wind measurements.
14 There's just a lot in there and that's one of the reasons
15 why I believe that conservatism is warranted, because you
16 don't -- if you don't do all of these analysis to see
17 exactly what your choices do --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
19 THE WITNESS: -- you've got to have a safety
20 margin. That's my view.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q Dr. Cole, I'd like to go back now to the points
24 that you raised as your, I think, most significant concerns.
25 The first one was the choice of urban versus rural

Page 112

1 dispersion coefficients.
2 A Yeah.
3 Q You answered some of Mr. Grossman's questions on
4 that point, but could you go in more detail and explain why
5 you think that the report doesn't accurately reflect which
6 of those dispersion coefficients should be used?
7 MR. GROSSMAN: The Sullivan report?
8 MS. ROSENFELD: The Sullivan report.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Which one?
10 MS. ROSENFELD: 2013 --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: -- the August 2013.
13 THE WITNESS: Well, he presents, in his favor, I
14 think it's fair that he presented both urban and rural
15 results. That gives some choice to look at when you're
16 looking at the results. As I said, the more conservative is
17 the rural dispersion coefficients. He does present that,
18 but he, in his judgment, he seems to put the weight on the
19 urban characteristic. He does say in his November report,
20 as I said before, that he feels the most accurate
21 representation would be to choose some value between urban
22 and rural coefficients that would be intermediate between
23 the two, but I don't see evidence that he's applied that
24 principle, which he states is his best judgment. I'm not --
25 he could have, for example, taken the concentrations from

Page 113

1 the urban and the concentrations from the, let's say he took
2 the maximum of each -- in fact, I believe I did this -- and
3 looked at the average of the two as one reasonable
4 hypothesis about where the, where the middle ground is.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, by having both sides of that,
6 anybody could do that arithmetically, correct?
7 THE WITNESS: Yes.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
9 THE WITNESS: I would caution, in some of the ways
10 that you would adjust the figures, you need to subtract out
11 background, make the averages and then add the background;
12 or, if you're multiplying by a correction factor, you really
13 need to take out, because that correction factor for MOVES
14 versus MOBILE, for example, applies only to the modeled
15 sources and not to the background. The background is added.
16 So --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
18 THE WITNESS: -- when you make adjustments, you
19 really want to subtract out what's modeled.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 THE WITNESS: Okay?
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q Dr. Cole, in your opinion, which would be the most
24 accurate way to model these concentrations? Would it be the
25 urban, would it be the rural, or would it be a combination?

Page 114

1 A Okay. You used the word accurate? Okay. I think
2 -- there's two ways I want to answer. First is what might
3 be reasonably accurate, and remember that we're dealing in a
4 very hypothetical realm here. Modeling is not the same as
5 going out and doing a detailed field study of turbulence and
6 all those parameters. It's using data that, in most cases,
7 is your best judgment about approximations.
8 So the first answer is, in terms of accuracy, is I
9 will -- Mr. Sullivan made a good stab at it. He said, you
10 know, the urban coefficients give you one thing, rural
11 coefficients give you something else, and he felt the best
12 judgment was intermediate, between the two. On the other
13 hand, my view is, if I were doing this analysis, I would say
14 there's so much uncertainty here and we're in a transitional
15 zone that we want to err on the side of safety; we want to
16 do -- we want to have a more conservative analysis so that,
17 in the case of a serious error, we have some protection.
18 Q Could you go to Figure 3 of Exhibit --
19 A Of the slides?
20 Q Of the slides. I believe that's the one.
21 A Is this it?
22 Q No. Actually, it's page 6.
23 A This?
24 Q Right there, yes. Yes. Is that a figure from
25 Mr. Sullivan's 2012 report?

Page 115

1 A It's from his November report.
2 Q Okay. And I believe you testified earlier that
3 this was prepared consistent with EPA guidance --
4 A Yes.
5 Q -- on how to determine urban versus rural --
6 A Yes.
7 Q -- is that correct?
8 A Right. This analysis was, according to the
9 guidelines, how you do, how you make a determination.
10 Q And, in your opinion, would the more conservative
11 approach be to use the rural coefficients?
12 A Yes, the more conservative approach. Giving
13 higher concentrations would be more conservative.
14 Q And can you show what the difference would be
15 between using the urban and rural coefficients, how the
16 results would differ?
17 A Well, you can compare, yes, you can compare the
18 results that Mr. Sullivan's -- for example, his August
19 report has some comparisons. I think we have some of those.
20 Let's see. This was, this --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me, while you're cogitating
22 that --
23 THE WITNESS: Is this urban? This was the urban,
24 or it says urban in yellow, okay? And this is the same
25 modeling emissions and whatnot but is for rural.

Page 116

1 MR. GROSSMAN: When Ms. Rosenfeld asked you which
2 is the more conservative approach, you said using the rural
3 coefficients, but I understood you to say before that you
4 thought that Mr. Sullivan made a good stab at getting to
5 accuracy or a splitting the difference.
6 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Are you saying that the more
8 conservative is the rural approach but the more, potentially
9 more accurate approach is to split the difference? Is that,
10 do I understand that correctly?
11 THE WITNESS: I'm not using the word accurate
12 here. I'm using the word as a reasonable choice --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: More reasonable approximation?
14 THE WITNESS: -- given the choices that the
15 modeler has --
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17 THE WITNESS: -- okay? Are those accurate
18 choices? Some cases, yes; some cases, maybe not, but given
19 two alternatives, he did what I think a reasonable person
20 doing an investigation like this would do. He said, sure --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: -- look at the intermediate value.
23 My only problem is he didn't apply it.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
25 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

Page 117

1 Q And looking at Figures 9 and 10, just so the
2 verbal record reflects it, what was the urban --
3 A Okay.
4 Q -- one-hour NO2 concentration?
5 A Well, in this diagram he says 168. In another
6 diagram he says 160. I'm not sure what the difference is,
7 but let's take either one. Let's say the urban is 168 or
8 160, fine, and the rural, you can see, the maximum is 217.
9 Your distinction is important because a 217 is above the EPA
10 standard of 190 for the one-hour NO2 concentration.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
12 THE WITNESS: Okay?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: So if you were to do your concept
14 of what you think he should have done --
15 THE WITNESS: Right.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- here but you have to take out
17 the background, too, and then add it back in, what would
18 you --
19 THE WITNESS: Okay.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- end up being at, your estimate
21 of the more accurate way of estimating this?
22 THE WITNESS: I think I did that somewhere. Okay.
23 Well, let's see. Okay. Here it is right here. I believe
24 this is the slide.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let me see which slide

Page 118

1 that is.
2 MS. ADELMAN: 18, I think, is --
3 THE WITNESS: Oh, this was, I'm sorry, this was
4 for MOVES. This is not right. I thought I had done that
5 and incorporated here. Let me, because I did exactly --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: What I'm saying, yes.
7 THE WITNESS: So if you take 217 --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
9 THE WITNESS: -- for the rural, okay, subtract out
10 the background -- and, in fact, because of this equation,
11 you don't even have to do that; the average will work out --
12 but let's just take out 90, and you get 127, right?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: Then you do the urban, say, 160,
15 take out the 90; you get 70, right?
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17 THE WITNESS: So you add those two together. You
18 get 79, 197. Divide that two -- 98.5, I believe.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
20 THE WITNESS: Now let's add that to the
21 background, and you get --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: One eighty-eight point five?
23 THE WITNESS: Yeah, 188.5, but these were based, I
24 want to caution, these numbers were based on certain other
25 assumptions which I don't agree with, assumptions that --

Page 119

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Just for the record, we're talking
2 about micrograms per cubic meter.
3 THE WITNESS: Absolutely --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
5 THE WITNESS: -- micrograms per cubic meter. So
6 this is just under the standard, but I'm going to talk about
7 other methods or assumptions and tools that were used that
8 would compound this.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. Also, just for the
10 record, we're talking about the one-hour NO2 --
11 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yep.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- readings or measurements.
13 THE WITNESS: Right.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, sir.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: I don't know what time it is.
16 Actually, this would be a good time to take a break for
17 lunch, if that's okay with you.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: We're going to move into another
20 subject that's going to take some time.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I want to make sure
22 Mr. Silverman gets his food because I don't want him to be
23 grumpy at me.
24 MR. SILVERMAN: I saw the nice food in the
25 cafeteria. I'm sure most of it's gone now.

Page 120

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Probably. I'm not going on the
2 record about that. How much more do you estimate Dr. Cole's
3 testimony? How much longer?
4 MS. ROSENFELD: I would expect probably, easily
5 between two and three hours.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. So shall we --
7 it's about 13 minutes to 1:00 -- shall we come back at
8 around 1:30?
9 MR. GOECKE: Sure.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we'll break for
11 lunch.
12 (Whereupon, at 12:46, a luncheon recess was
13 taken.)
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Back on the record.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q Dr. Cole, over the break were you able to prepare
18 a graphic that would illustrate the effect of air moving
19 from urban to rural or vice versa?
20 A I won't say it's the best graphic in the world,
21 but I think it makes the point. So here's the situation --
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, can you see?
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I can.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: You can use my wanted pointer.

Page 121

1 THE WITNESS: No, that's okay.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh.
3 MR. SILVERMAN: Oh, no.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: This is called crestfallen.
5 THE WITNESS: You really want me to use it?
6 MR. GROSSMAN: No, it's okay. You use whatever
7 you're comfortable with.
8 MS. ADELMAN: He's amortizing it.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. If you want to waste
10 government's money on a physical thing when you have a laser
11 pointer, go ahead. It won't be held against you.
12 THE WITNESS: But it's a battery. It's using
13 battery, which is, has an environmental impact. So --
14 MS. ADELMAN: Oh, dear.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand. You've
16 justified it.
17 MR. SILVERMAN: You have to watch out.
18 THE WITNESS: So we're talking about transitions
19 between urban, between rural or semi-rural or suburban
20 rural, whatever you want to call it. This area has met the
21 EPA's criteria for rural. Here, let's say, is the source
22 and here's the rougher surface. These are supposed to be
23 buildings. So my only point was that the transition zone
24 doesn't happen all at once. It's not abrupt. It occurs
25 from the bottom up because the, the change is on the bottom.

Page 122

1 The rougher surface is on the bottom.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
3 THE WITNESS: So the turbulence is induced, but as
4 the wind -- as the flow moves downwind from the source, the
5 urban turbulence becomes more a problem and becomes more
6 prominent --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8 THE WITNESS: -- and the depth of that layer, that
9 urban layer, increases. But in this case, if the wind is
10 from the south and here's the source -- and the wind is a
11 lot from the south; according to, according to the reports
12 by Mr. Sullivan, that's a quite frequent wind direction --
13 so then you have a transition zone where the depth of the
14 rougher zone is not as deep as it would be hundreds of
15 meters downwind. So my point is that you don't suddenly go
16 from urban -- rural to urban.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
18 THE WITNESS: Okay? It's this --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: It's gradual.
20 THE WITNESS: So in here, what do you use in here?
21 If you were here, urban would be appropriate; if you were
22 here, rural dispersion would be appropriate. It's quite
23 complicated --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
25 THE WITNESS: -- in this other zone. Okay?

Page 123

1 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 Q Dr. Cole, in calculating the average between the
3 urban and the rural earlier -- actually, let me, could we go
4 back to the slide from Mr. Sullivan's report that shows his
5 urban calculations? This would be his 2013 report --
6 A Right.
7 Q -- which shows the urban calculations.
8 A That would be my Slide No. 8, which is
9 hopefully --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. We're on 404(a), Slide
11 8.
12 MS. ADELMAN: Good.
13 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
14 Q And you had averaged the urban and the rural --
15 A Uh-huh.
16 Q -- earlier and come up with a figure, I believe,
17 of about 188.
18 A One eighty-eight point five.
19 Q Would you please calculate that average using the
20 168 that's shown on Mr. Sullivan's Figure 9 from his August
21 2013 report, please?
22 A Well, there, if you, if you use the 168 as the max
23 in Figure 9 and you average that with the next slide, which
24 is 217, there you get an average of, let me see, 192.5.
25 Q And is that above or below the one-hour EPA

Page 124

1 standard for NO2?
2 A The standard is 190. So that would be above.
3 Q Okay, thank you.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Where did the 160 come from, in the
5 first place, that you used initially in that calculation?
6 THE WITNESS: Let's see. I have to go to the
7 report. I have to go to Mr. Sullivan's report --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: -- to answer that. Okay. That
10 would be his Figure i, which is in the executive summary,
11 where he has a 160. And, as I said, the --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Which report? That's the November
13 report?
14 THE WITNESS: No. This is the August.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: This is the August report?
16 THE WITNESS: Yes, the August report.
17 MR. GOECKE: 255(a) is the exhibit.
18 THE WITNESS: It's small Roman number i figure,
19 Figure small Roman number i. It's on page 5 of Exhibit 255.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: So I can't recall if that
21 difference was pointed out during Mr. Sullivan's testimony,
22 where you're saying 168 on Slide, on your, well, you say
23 it's from Sullivan's -- I don't have that report in front of
24 me now. Well, I do have a copy here somewhere.
25 THE WITNESS: Well, this is, this is Slide No. --

Page 125

1 Figure No. 9 in his August report has the 168 value.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Which is on page 24 of the same
3 August 16th report, Exhibit No. 255(a).
4 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And I'm sorry. What page is
6 his --
7 THE WITNESS: 24.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Pardon me?
9 THE WITNESS: They're both shown on, well --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Where's the summary that you read
11 from, that had the --
12 THE WITNESS: Okay. That was on page 5. The one
13 with the 160 --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Was on page 5?
15 THE WITNESS: -- is on page 5. It's Figure small
16 Roman i or 1.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, 160.2.
18 THE WITNESS: Yes.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Do we know what accounts for that
20 difference?
21 THE WITNESS: I don't know what accounts for the
22 difference.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: I see Mr. Sullivan is here. I'm
24 going to break from your testimony for a second.
25 Mr. Sullivan, you're still under oath. What accounts for

Page 126

1 that difference?
2 MR. SULLIVAN: My recollection -- and I'd have to
3 check to confirm -- is the 168 is based on the older
4 background value of 98 micrograms and the 160 is based on,
5 on the more updated background of 90. That's my
6 recollection.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8 THE WITNESS: So there's a -- it appears then that
9 there is a mistake on Figure 9, because it says the
10 background, plus 90 micrograms per cubic meter background.
11 MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Grossman --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
13 MR. SULLIVAN: -- I believe on the record that
14 came up during my testimony. I'm not a hundred percent
15 sure, but I think it did. It should be in the transcript.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
17 THE WITNESS: Okay. So this should be corrected
18 then.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's saying one is based on
20 the newer, yes, it appears that that's -- but I just don't
21 recall that particular issue.
22 THE WITNESS: Okay.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: So --
24 THE WITNESS: Let me make the point that if it's
25 -- if the average of rural and urban, whether it's 188.5 or

Page 127

1 192.5, the average of those two is at the standard, and
2 there are many other reasons why I, and I'll demonstrate,
3 that these values are likely to be underpredicted.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. You're saying, so whether
5 it's 188.5 or 192.5 micrograms per cubic meter, it's still
6 too close to the standard and from your standpoint there are
7 other reasons why it understates the actual value?
8 THE WITNESS: Exactly.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
11 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
12 Q Okay. Dr. Cole, the second major concern that you
13 had regarding Mr. Sullivan's report involved his choice of
14 MOBILE6 versus MOVES, and could you identify which
15 pollutants are most implicated by that choice of modeling?
16 A Yes. One is PM2.5, and that factor, MOVES gives
17 values for slow speeds and idling approximately 10 times
18 higher than MOVES for that same class of speeds --
19 MS. ADELMAN: MOBILE6.
20 THE WITNESS: -- idling and slow speeds.
21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22 Q And --
23 A So we're talking about a tenfold difference from
24 MOVES to MOBILE6, which is what Mr. Sullivan relied on.
25 Q And is there another pollutant that's also

Page 128

1 particularly affected by the choice of --
2 A Yes. That would be NO2, nitrogen dioxide. The
3 one-hour standard is a very critical element here, and in
4 that case, MOVES underpredicts, by the evidence that I'll
5 show, by a factor of two.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: MOVES underpredicts or MOBILE6
7 underpredicts?
8 MR. SILVERMAN: MOBILE6.
9 THE WITNESS: What did I say?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: You said MOVES.
11 THE WITNESS: Oh. MOVES gives you twice the
12 emissions for NOx at slow speeds and idling, and I will show
13 evidence, independent evidence for that. Also, it's --
14 those two differences between MOVES and MOBILE6 have been
15 acknowledged by Mr. Sullivan.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I recall that.
17 THE WITNESS: Okay.
18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19 Q And what does the acronym MOVES stand for, just
20 for the record?
21 A MOVES is Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator.
22 Q And what does the acronym MOBILE6 stand for?
23 A Well, I believe -- I could not find what that
24 acronym, what it stands for. I looked all over the place.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Maybe it's not an acronym. It's

Page 129

1 mobile; so maybe it's --
2 THE WITNESS: Mobile, I don't know. It's a moot
3 question, though, because it's no longer an EPA recommended
4 emissions model.
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q And do you know why EPA replaced MOBILE6 with
7 MOVES?
8 A I would like to read into the record EPA's
9 description, and this is from a report, which I've
10 documented, called EPA Releases MOVES2010b Mobile Source
11 Emissions Model Revision.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Is that physically in the record?
13 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, it is, Mr. Grossman. It is
14 Exhibit No. 404(d), like dog. It's been --
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 MS. ROSENFELD: -- introduced into the record, and
17 hard copies were provided 10 days in advance.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, 404(d). Let me take a look
19 at it.
20 THE WITNESS: You asked why EPA replaced MOBILE6,
21 is that --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: If we have it, you don't have to
23 read it into the record if it's already in the record in
24 hard copy, which it is.
25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me highlight the point --

Page 130

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 THE WITNESS: -- is that MOBILE6 was based on a
3 very limited amount of testing, whereas MOVES is based on an
4 enormous amount of data and information and testing of
5 automobiles. EPA says it was millions of emission test
6 results and reflects the agency's considerable understanding
7 of vehicle emissions since MOBILE6.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: I want to make another point which
10 is that if you're doing a regional analysis, it's one thing
11 to have some problems; however -- and I would like to read
12 this because it's so critical.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: What are you reading from?
14 THE WITNESS: I'm reading from Federal Register,
15 and this is way back in March 10th, 2006, where they first
16 were figuring out the problems with MOBILE6.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, hold on. Is that
18 in the record?
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, it is.
20 MS. ADELMAN: Page 13.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry?
22 MS. ADELMAN: Page 13, right?
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the slide, you mean?
24 Slide 13?
25 MS. ROSENFELD: No.

Page 131

1 MS. ADELMAN: No?
2 MS. ROSENFELD: No. We have introduced the
3 Federal Register into the record -- several times, I
4 believe. Mr. Grossman, I don't see it here right at the
5 moment. I did think it was in the record. If not, I'll
6 certainly supply it.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, what's the point,
8 Dr. Cole?
9 THE WITNESS: I would ask you to let me read one
10 paragraph into the record, because it's critical to this
11 particular case.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. What's the citation for
13 it first?
14 THE WITNESS: The citation is Federal Register,
15 Volume 71, No. 47.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on. Volume 71.
17 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Federal Register, Volume 71.
19 What's the rest of it?
20 THE WITNESS: Number 47.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Number 47.
22 THE WITNESS: March 10th, 2006.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
24 THE WITNESS: Pages 12498 to 12499.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: 12498 --

Page 132

1 THE WITNESS: And here they're talking about --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- to 12499.
3 THE WITNESS: -- what needs to be incorporated,
4 and they're talking about the difference between the new
5 model, MOVES, and the problems with MOBILE6.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead.
7 THE WITNESS: However, at the microscale level for
8 hot-spot analyses, these limitations become very
9 significant. Activity factors such as speed, driving cycle,
10 and number and distribution of engine starts per day do have
11 an important impact on actual PM2.5 or PM10 emissions for
12 motor vehicles. Most, if not all, transportation projects
13 that would need to be analyzed would result in changes in
14 these activity levels that would need to be incorporated
15 into credible hot-spot analyses. For example, and it gives
16 some examples here, construction of a highway interchange,
17 anything that -- it says anything that changes average
18 speeds, driving cycles of vehicles, idling time, et cetera,
19 in the immediate vicinity of the interchange.
20 So here they're talking about an interchange, but
21 I want to focus on the term microscale because a lot of the
22 EPA analyses are for, like, state-implementation plans or to
23 comply with the overall air quality standards for a region,
24 but here we're talking about specific impacts to ensure that
25 at the microlevel, at the level of a particular facility

Page 133

1 which has lots of motor vehicle emissions, that that area
2 not go over the standard. It may be that the regional,
3 regionally, using the monitors that are regional, the
4 standard looks okay or the modeling shows that it's in
5 compliance, but that's not necessarily true at these places
6 where there's a lot of traffic --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8 THE WITNESS: -- and here we're adding more
9 traffic to a place that has a lot of traffic. So it's
10 important that you consider, to get an accurate input for
11 emissions, for motor vehicles, that reflects EPA's current
12 model, which is MOVES2010.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15 Q And --
16 A Yeah.
17 Q Oh, I'm sorry. Dr. Cole, you've stated that, in
18 your view, the emissions levels for PM2.5 and NOx would be
19 understated using the MOBILE6 --
20 A Yes.
21 Q -- modeling. Do you have some independent
22 evidence or information that you can show to support that?
23 And I'd start by referring you to Figure 6.
24 A Figure 6? Is that my --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure 6 of what?

Page 134

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Figure 6 of Exhibit 404(a).
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3 THE WITNESS: Is that the slides?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: That's your slides, yes.
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, wait, wait, wait. Wait.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: But hold on. Stand by.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q Actually, stand by. I'm not sure that that is --
9 one moment. That's the wrong figure. Figure 14. Figure
10 14 --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure 14 in his slides?
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, I'm sorry.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: 404(a)?
14 MS. ROSENFELD: Figure 14 of 404(a).
15 THE WITNESS: Right.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
17 THE WITNESS: 13 is just a summary of what I just
18 said.
19 MS. ADELMAN: Yes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: 14.
21 THE WITNESS: 14 --
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q 14, yes.
24 A -- 14 is from a Federal Highway Administration
25 2010 study.

Page 135

1 MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry. What page is that on?
2 MS. ADELMAN: 14.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: 14.
4 THE WITNESS: 14.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: No. It's -- if it's Figure 14,
6 it's not on page 14.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: No, it's, I'm sorry, it is --
8 THE WITNESS: Figure 14.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: -- Figure --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Figure 14, which is on page?
11 MS. ROSENFELD: No. It is page 14.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: No. Well, page 14 is Figure 10 of
13 his slides.
14 MR. GOECKE: That's what mine says too.
15 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
16 MS. ADELMAN: Mine doesn't have a figure.
17 MS. ROSENFELD: Mine doesn't have a figure.
18 MS. ADELMAN: Mine doesn't have a figure either.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to say anything about
20 my figure. Well, do you want to look at the exhibit that's
21 in the record?
22 MR. GOECKE: Are you still on 404(a)?
23 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm still on 404(a). Let me
24 just --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Don't trip on the wires. My page

Page 136

1 14 has Figure 10 on it.
2 THE WITNESS: Oh, wow.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: May I see what you're --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
5 MR. GOECKE: So does mine.
6 MS. ADELMAN: Oops. Careful, Michele.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Careful, Michele.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: Actually, can you --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. There you go.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
11 THE WITNESS: Are we missing something? Is this
12 the copy of the slides?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. That's what we have, Exhibit
14 404(a).
15 THE WITNESS: Here it says 11. What I'm referring
16 to perhaps on your chart --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
18 THE WITNESS: -- is Figure -- is page 11 here.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: Here it is.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. So, yes, it
22 doesn't have figure number, but it is page 11 in Exhibit
23 404(a).
24 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So they ran, they did a
25 sensitivity analysis, comparing what you would get from

Page 137

1 various formulations, in particular, MOVES versus MOBILE6.
2 And just to eliminate some possible confusion here, the,
3 there are different kinds of traffic links that EPA
4 considers in these kinds of analyses, and the best one to
5 use is urban unrestricted, which is the blue-dashed line.
6 Some of this is a little bit difficult to see perhaps, but
7 what this shows is that as the speed goes down, MOVES
8 predicts higher and higher emissions, and it's an
9 exponential increase as the speed goes down. So that this
10 is at about two, 2.5 miles per hour or so, and you see that
11 MOBILE6 gives a value of about point, looks like it's about,
12 between .1 and .2, whereas MOVES gives a value of about 12.
13 So --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, these are actually factor
15 differences. It's a factor --
16 THE WITNESS: Well, these are --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: -- so there's a 12 percent --
18 THE WITNESS: No, no, no, no, no. No.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Am I misreading that? That's what
20 it says on here: Fleet Average Emission Factor. So I --
21 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- assume that what that means in
23 the vertical column is that MOVES, at the slower speed,
24 let's say of 2.5, is giving -- is a factor of 15 percent,
25 .15 or close to it.

Page 138

1 THE WITNESS: No. Let me explain.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Am I misunderstanding that?
3 THE WITNESS: The print is so small, I can see why
4 you'd --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it wasn't the small print.
6 It's what it says on the vertical column.
7 THE WITNESS: Well, it says, but look at -- the
8 units state, grams per vehicle mile traveled --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
10 THE WITNESS: -- which is an input that's used to
11 get the emissions that are input then to the dispersion
12 model, okay? So that the difference is -- these are not
13 percentages.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
15 THE WITNESS: These are units.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
17 THE WITNESS: So the difference between, let's
18 say, 1.2 and 12 is a factor, whoops, a factor of 10 --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: -- and this is, I would just add
21 that Mr. Sullivan has acknowledged that difference at low
22 speeds and idling for --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I see what you mean now --
24 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and this is the PM2.5

Page 139

1 measurement --
2 THE WITNESS: This is PM2.5.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and --
4 THE WITNESS: Yes.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and yes, I see, I see what
6 you're saying. That's actually not a -- even though it says
7 factor, I thought they meant it in terms of a percentage --
8 THE WITNESS: Right.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- factor, but they meant it in
10 terms of this is a factor --
11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and --
13 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and, yes, it looks like it's, it
15 is considerably higher at the slow speeds. It's a virtually
16 zero difference at 60 miles an hour, but it's --
17 THE WITNESS: Right.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and apparently MOBILE6 is a flat
19 line for --
20 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- at any speed.
22 THE WITNESS: That's right. The problem with
23 MOBILE6 for PM2.5, it's not true for all of the pollutants,
24 but for PM2.5 it is a flat --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 140

1 THE WITNESS: -- line, meaning that it's totally
2 insensitive --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
4 THE WITNESS: -- to driving speed.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think we have to spend any
6 more time on that. I think it's been --
7 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- conceded by Mr. Sullivan and
9 there's no evidence to dispute that MOVES will show a 10
10 times higher level of PM2.5 --
11 THE WITNESS: Okay.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- at those speeds. So I don't
13 think it's a disputed issue.
14 THE WITNESS: Okay.
15 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
16 Q Dr. Cole, just one point of clarification on that
17 graph. Underneath it, it has -- it says, MOVES Urban
18 Restricted, MOVES Rural Restricted. Do those terms urban
19 and rural in this graph have any correlation to the urban
20 slash rural dichotomy that we've been discussing for
21 dispersion?
22 A Not at all.
23 Q Okay. Can you explain --
24 A These are based -- here we're dealing with
25 emissions and emission sources, like a link on a highway --

Page 141

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 THE WITNESS: -- is there a ramp or not? Are we
3 dealing with rural conditions, meaning far fewer traffic,
4 less restriction perhaps? For example, arterial would be,
5 for the MOBILE, would be for roadways. Urban restricted
6 would be, for example, a ramp going up to, let's say, an
7 elevated freeway or something.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: So the unrestricted is what EPA --
10 urban unrestricted is what they would apply to streets and
11 intersections and places where there are a lot of motor
12 vehicles but that are not restricted by a ramp.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I think the distinctions
14 between those lines is very small --
15 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and not material to the kind of
17 analysis we're doing here.
18 THE WITNESS: Right.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. I just wanted to
20 make sure that later in looking at this there wasn't
21 confusion about --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: We didn't get confused.
23 THE WITNESS: Right. This is --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm glad you cleared it because I,
25 I did assume --

Page 142

1 MS. ROSENFELD: -- because we've been using those
2 terms so often.
3 THE WITNESS: No, this has nothing to do with
4 dispersion.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6 THE WITNESS: It has everything to do with
7 emissions.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: Okay.
10 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11 Q And, in your opinion, which of these roadway
12 characterizations most accurately reflects the driving
13 conditions that occur on the surrounding network, roadway
14 network?
15 A That would be urban unrestricted, according to EPA
16 guidance.
17 Q Dr. Cole, if you could turn to page 15, Slide 15.
18 A Is that the right one?
19 Q That is the right one --
20 A Okay.
21 Q -- only I'm not sure if it's the right one in --
22 MR. GOECKE: That's different than mine.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Slide 15?
24 MS. ADELMAN: What's yours look like, Mike?
25 THE WITNESS: It's probably 16 on -- maybe it's 16

Page 143

1 on yours.
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I apologize. I'm
3 not quite sure why these numbers are not correlating. I
4 have a black-and-white copy that appears to correlate with
5 the slides, slide numbers that Dr. Cole has. Could we take
6 a three-minute break, let me run some extra copies,
7 introduce this into the record?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure, or you could -- I'm not sure
9 what accounted for the page differences, but they --
10 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure either, and I will
11 submit a full color copy and account for that. I'm not
12 quite sure why --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Whatever --
14 MS. ROSENFELD: -- but I think so far everything
15 that we've talked about the other side has had a copy of.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: You're not casting aspersions on
17 those rural dispersions, are you?
18 MS. ROSENFELD: No. Whichever is --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't feel it's a successful day
20 unless I've been hissed at least once. So --
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Whichever way you think is better
22 for the record, and I do apologize. We --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Whatever you want.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: If you want to take the break,

Page 144

1 we'll take the break. If not, we'll go forward.
2 MR. GOECKE: I don't think we have a copy of this
3 slide. So if we're looking at a different exhibit than what
4 we've been provided, I would like a copy of the actual
5 exhibit.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Let's do that. So we'll
7 put --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Or you want to just
9 take --
10 THE WITNESS: I would point out that there's a --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- do you want to take a break? Is
12 that what you want to do?
13 MS. ROSENFELD: I'll just run down the hall and
14 make some copies.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 THE WITNESS: That is from Table 1-6 of the August
17 16th report by Mr. Sullivan.
18 MR. GOECKE: Okay.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't you just stick your head
20 in the door of my office when you're ready, and --
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I'll come out.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: We'll recess momentarily.
25 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

Page 145

1 MR. GROSSMAN: So are we raring to go?
2 MS. ROSENFELD: We are, Mr. Grossman, and I do
3 apologize. We -- there are several additional slides in the
4 documents that Dr. Cole and I have been looking at.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: What I'd like to do is submit
7 this. Maybe we can mark it --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 MS. ROSENFELD: -- 404(a)(1), and --
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Since it's a whole new set --
11 MS. ROSENFELD: It's --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- why don't we just make it a new
13 exhibit number.
14 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: 406, and we'll say revised Dr. Cole
16 slide show.
17 (Exhibit No. 406 was marked
18 for identification.)
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
22 MR. GOECKE: And I'm sorry. You called it revised
23 404(a) --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Revised Dr. Cole slide show. We
25 could say Dr. Cole slide show, Exhibit 404(a), just to be

Page 146

1 clear what we're talking about.
2 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: And so you have a copy for --
5 MS. ROSENFELD: For you? Yes, I -- of course I
6 do.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you. I was feeling left out.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. Do you want to go up
9 and do the honors?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Goecke, are
11 there any slides in the new exhibit, 406, that create a
12 problem with proceeding now with these extra slides with
13 Dr. Cole?
14 MR. GOECKE: That's a good question.
15 Ms. Rosenfeld and I went through them, and apparently there
16 are nine pages here that were not in the original 404(a).
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 MR. GOECKE: I haven't studied each of them yet,
19 but I think -- I think some of them are from Mr. Sullivan's
20 report, but then others, I think, are new.
21 MR. SULLIVAN: Page 18 looks new.
22 MR. GOECKE: Page 18 does look new.
23 MR. SULLIVAN: Michele, it would certainly help us
24 to say which pages are new that aren't from one of my
25 reports.

Page 147

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Do we know that, Ms. Rosenfeld?
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. I'm going to start from the
3 beginning. Page 1 comes from Mr. Sullivan's report. Pages
4 2 and 3 had been provided and have already been testified
5 to. Page 4 is simply a recitation of the AERMOD acronym.
6 Page 5 I think is just a summary of something that Dr. Cole
7 had already testified to. He didn't reference the slide in
8 his testimony. I believe this is new. Is that --
9 MR. GOECKE: It's not new --
10 MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, Slide 5 is not new.
11 MR. GOECKE: -- and I don't think he testified
12 about it.
13 MS. ROSENFELD: Slide 6 comes from Mr. Sullivan's
14 November 2012 report, as does Slide 7. Slide 8 comes from
15 his August 13th report. Slide 9 comes from, and 10, both
16 come from his August '13 report. Slide 11 comes from his
17 November 2012 report. Page 12 is a quote and, I believe,
18 comes from Exhibit 404(d).
19 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
20 Q Dr. Cole, do you know if that -- do you remember?
21 Slide 12.
22 A Which slide? Which?
23 Q Slide 12. I believe that comes from Exhibit
24 404(d), which had been provided in full.
25 A Right.

Page 148

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's not a controversial
2 thing anyway. So it's not --
3 MR. GOECKE: Right.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: And same for Slide 13. Slide 14
5 had been provided.
6 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
7 MS. ROSENFELD: Slide 15 comes from Mr. Sullivan's
8 August 16th report, as does Slides, do Slides 16 and 17.
9 MR. GOECKE: I think 18 is new.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: I think Slide 18 is new.
11 MS. ADELMAN: What's it called?
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Estimating Maximum One-Hour NO2
13 Concentrations, but it's a formula that I expect Dr. Cole
14 will testify to.
15 MR. GOECKE: Yes, we have no objection to him
16 testifying about --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18 MR. GOECKE: -- page 18 right now.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. 19 comes from the August
20 2013 report; so does page 20. Slide 21, was that in your --
21 MR. GOECKE: We had that one before.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. And 22?
23 MR. GOECKE: I think it's new.
24 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
25 MR. GOECKE: I think 21 might be new as well. It

Page 149

1 looks familiar, but I don't see it in the original -- oh,
2 here it is. It's --
3 MS. ADELMAN: Have it in color, yes.
4 MR. GOECKE: Yes, we had the first one. We had 21
5 but not 22.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: It looks like 22 just is missing
7 graphs --
8 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and a line that -- and has added
10 a line --
11 MR. GOECKE: Yes.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that says MOBILE6, rather than
13 MOVES, additional negative error, but in any event -- all
14 right. So 23?
15 MS. ROSENFELD: 23 is an excerpt. It's a quote
16 from an exhibit that was provided, Exhibit No. 404(b). It's
17 an excerpt from a document that's in the record at 404(b).
18 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19 MS. ROSENFELD: And 24 as well and 25 as well, as
20 26.
21 MR. GOECKE: These are all from 404(b)?
22 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: These are from 404(b). 27, I
24 believe -- I believe 27, 28, and 29 are all new. Do you
25 have 27 and 28?

Page 150

1 THE WITNESS: Excuse me. I have a --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir.
3 THE WITNESS: Slide No. 25, at least on my screen,
4 which shows this, is from the Michael Claggett report, not
5 the congestion, traffic congestion report.
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: So please distinguish between those
8 two exhibits.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
10 MS. ROSENFELD: And the Claggett report would be
11 404(c).
12 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we're up to --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: 27 and 28.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: 27, on one of your errors.
15 MR. GOECKE: We had those two already.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 29?
17 MR. GOECKE: We do not have this.
18 MS. ROSENFELD: 29 is new, and 30 came from a
19 submission that Dr. Cole --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I've seen this little chart
21 before.
22 MS. ROSENFELD: -- it's in the record already.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay.
24 MR. GOECKE: We have no objection to that.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 151

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Thank you. And I do
2 apologize.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may proceed. Oh,
4 if we didn't have a few mix-ups with this amount of paper,
5 it would be a miracle. So don't sweat it.
6 THE WITNESS: Slide 29 was included in an earlier
7 submittal --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: -- as was Slide, the next one.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: 30. Yes, I've already seen 30. We
11 know that. I hadn't, I didn't remember --
12 THE WITNESS: I think it was in the report that I
13 submitted to you, either you or the --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean this one?
15 THE WITNESS: Yes.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I have seen this one. I just
17 didn't --
18 THE WITNESS: Okay.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I don't recall the one on Slide
20 29.
21 THE WITNESS: This one is, this one --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, you have it as 29. In ours --
23 yes, 29. I didn't recall 29. I recalled 30, but it may,
24 I'm not saying that -- I haven't memorized all of this
25 stuff, decided to maintain my sanity instead.

Page 152

1 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 Q Okay. Dr. Cole, if we could go back to Slide 15.
3 A Okay.
4 Q Could you explain where this, where this slide
5 came from?
6 A This is from Mr. Sullivan's August 16th report,
7 and my only reason for including it was to show that for
8 PM2.5, it doesn't matter what speed they're using, that the
9 emission rate is the same. It's not so for the other
10 pollutants, but for particulates where there's this tenfold
11 difference, they don't -- this is showing they don't account
12 for it.
13 Q And so, in your opinion, what is the modeling
14 result with respect to the PM2.5 idling sources?
15 A Well, they would be underestimated by a factor of
16 10.
17 Q Shifting now to NOx emissions, without going
18 through the same, same chart analysis, I think the testimony
19 uniformly has been that MOVES understates NOx by --
20 A All right. I meant to have a slide with NOx. The
21 curves look very similar as to the PM2.5, but the
22 differences are not as great.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: By a factor of two instead of a
24 factor of --
25 THE WITNESS: Yes. So that's my only point there.

Page 153

1 This turns out --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have anything to say about
3 -- Mr. Sullivan distinguished NOx from NO2 and NO in terms
4 of how far away you were from the source of emission and how
5 fast it, what the impacts were on the analysis based on
6 that, that only 25 percent, if I recall, of NOx is NO2. I
7 forget the exact figures, but do you have --
8 MR. SILVERMAN: It's the opposite.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: No, only 25 percent of NOx is NO2.
10 MR. SILVERMAN: I thought it was the -- well, I
11 thought it was the other way around. He's the expert.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: NOx is the all-inclusive category,
13 if I understand it; NO2 is a subpart of it, but I may have
14 the amounts slightly incorrect. But in any event, do you
15 have -- how does that factor into your analysis?
16 THE WITNESS: Okay. There's no one percent
17 fits-all situations. So the assumption that Mr. Sullivan
18 made was that a hundred percent of the NOx emitted from
19 these many vehicles would be converted to NO2.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
21 THE WITNESS: I agree with that --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that was his most
23 conservative assumption. He changed that for purposes of
24 analysis near the Costco loading docks.
25 THE WITNESS: Are you referring to a, something

Page 154

1 that's in one of his reports or something that he --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
3 THE WITNESS: -- testified to?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: No, I think it's in his August
5 report, as far as --
6 THE WITNESS: Can you show me what you're
7 referring to?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. My recollection is that
9 he said that when you're at -- so close to a point source,
10 it wasn't appropriate to consider it all as NO₂, or whether
11 he testified to that, I can't recall, but let me see if
12 that's in the record. Here it is.
13 Actually, Mr. Sullivan, you could refresh my
14 recollection on that. Was your distinction between NO₂ and
15 NO_x mentioned in your August report, or was that something
16 just that you testified about?
17 MR. SULLIVAN: No, it was mentioned in the August
18 16th, 2013, report.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: I would state, if I may --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir.
22 THE WITNESS: -- it may be mentioned, but in the
23 modeling results he's assumed a hundred percent. The
24 modeling results that we see in tables and in graphs, I
25 mean, in isopleth diagrams are based on a hundred percent.

Page 155

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I think it's, well, my page number,
2 I think, was slightly different, but Section 4.1.1 in his
3 August 16, 2013, report deals with -- and 4.1.2 -- deals
4 with assumed NO_x one-hour emission rate for warehouse HDVD
5 in November 2012 report. Then he talks about 2.5 is a
6 scale-up factor to covert g/mile at idle to grams per hour,
7 which is conservatively stated for NO₂ emissions. Let's
8 see. Mr. Sullivan, do you remember where it is in
9 your --
10 MR. SULLIVAN: I'm looking for it now,
11 Mr. Grossman. I remember -- I ran the model several
12 different ways. In one of them, I did show the effect of
13 more accurately considering the fact that the, there's not
14 sufficient time for conversion where that maximum is
15 occurring.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17 MR. SULLIVAN: I just got to find the page.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, we'll come back
19 to that when Mr. Sullivan finds the page. So you can go on
20 with your questions, Ms. Rosenfeld.
21 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22 Q In his testimony of September 20, 2013,
23 Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that MOVES would be higher than
24 MOBILE6 by a factor of two. He also stated that he did not
25 use a correction factor for NO_x emissions. If you were

Page 156

1 modeling, what would you do to correct for the understated
2 NO_x?
3 A Well, I think the best solution is to use EPA's
4 recommended model, which is MOVES2010, to get the most
5 accurate information for the results of your emissions
6 estimates. A second choice would be to multiply the
7 emissions by a factor of two, which is something that's in
8 the evidence I submitted and the Claggett report. At low
9 vehicle speeds and idling, there's -- MOVES gives you a
10 factor of two higher than does MOBILE, okay? So if you
11 don't want to go and use MOVES -- and Mr. Sullivan has
12 acknowledged that he could multiply by a factor of two, but
13 he's also testified, I believe, on September 20th that he
14 did not do that.
15 Q If you were to turn to Figure I, which is Slide 16
16 of Mr. Sullivan's, of your PowerPoint -- Figure I comes from
17 Mr. Sullivan's 2013, August 2013 report -- I believe he's
18 testified that we could put a factor of two in here and it
19 would make a very small difference. And do you agree with
20 his assertion on that point with respect to NO₂, NO_x?
21 A Not at all.
22 Q And can you explain why?
23 A Well, I did a little analysis. Your question was
24 about the incremental impact?
25 Q The incremental impact of NO_x, yes.

Page 157

1 A Okay. I think one of the ways to see this is to
2 look at two different figures from the August 2013 report.
3 The first figure is based on the November 2012 modeling. It
4 shows very high concentrations of NO₂, one-hour NO₂. I
5 think it was well over 300, perhaps 388 or some very large
6 figure. Now, then what Mr. Sullivan did in the 2013 -- and,
7 by the way, this is with the error of background corrected.
8 So this --
9 Q This being?
10 A -- appeared in the August report, but it was based
11 on the modeling that was done in November but --
12 MR. GROSSMAN: With the mathematical error
13 corrected.
14 THE WITNESS: Yes.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Right, I understand.
16 THE WITNESS: Right. So --
17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
18 Q And when you say this, Dr. Cole, what are you
19 talking about? Are you talking about the blowup of Figure
20 1 --
21 A Yeah. The --
22 Q -- on Slide 20?
23 A On the left-hand side, you see -- and both of
24 these are rural, and the reason I'm using rural here is
25 because it allowed me to do a comparison, because we didn't

Page 158

1 get, we didn't get the November 2012 results in the mall
2 area for urban coefficients. Though we requested it, we did
3 not get those values, as far as I know. So I compared rural
4 and rural.

5 Now, what are we looking at here? The figure on
6 the right is based on a revision in the emissions for the
7 loading dock, okay? If you look at his page 18,
8 Mr. Sullivan has reduced the emissions of the loading dock
9 based on a number of assumptions. Fewer, fewer trucks
10 idling for lesser times I believe is one of the key changes
11 that he made. So it turned out that it was a 93 percent
12 reduction in emissions from the loading dock.

13 Now, without making any judgment on that, this
14 gives us an opportunity to see what happens when you remove
15 the impact of the loading dock. So here Mr. Sullivan has
16 shown what looks like a plume coming from the loading
17 dock --

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
19 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
20 Q And could you use the pointer and --
21 MS. ADELMAN: Yes.
22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
23 Q -- show where you're talking about?
24 A Oh, sure. I'm thinking that you can see my hand,
25 but you can't. Okay. So the loading dock is here. We

Page 159

1 see --
2 Q And you're looking at --
3 A -- very high values, but we also see a secondary
4 area above 200 right in the area of the gas station.
5 Q And you're, again, looking at the blowup of Figure
6 1 on Slide 20?
7 A Yes. When we look at -- let's say for all
8 practical purposes you've removed most of the effect. In
9 this, because you've reduced the loading dock emissions by
10 93 percent, you now are able to see -- without the effect of
11 the loading dock, you're able to see what's happening in the
12 area of the gas station, okay? And you see that the values
13 are well over 200. I think -- forget what the maximum was
14 there, but there's an area over 200, an area that exceeds
15 the standard in this particular result. That's with,
16 without 93 percent of the loading dock emissions.
17 So Mr. Sullivan, I believe, testified, saying that
18 he thought that the problem in the mall was a loading dock
19 problem and not a gas station problem. Well, here he has
20 eliminated basically, or at least 93 percent of the loading
21 dock, and we still see values above the standard in this
22 particular analysis. And I would have to say that I don't
23 know what other explanation you can give but to assume
24 that --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't see a pointer because I

Page 160

1 don't think you're pressing any button.
2 THE WITNESS: Oh, right.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 THE WITNESS: Okay. So what explains the high
5 values in the, in this area? And I --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: This area being the area right
7 around where the gas station is.
8 THE WITNESS: Around the gas station and its
9 surrounding, okay?
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
11 THE WITNESS: So there's a principle in science
12 called Occam's razor, which is that sometimes the simplest
13 explanation is the best unless you have some other
14 demonstration. Now, we have asked Mr. Sullivan to provide
15 his analysis of the incremental effect of the gas station on
16 concentrations in the mall, and we received a memo just
17 yesterday, I believe it was, or the day before, stating that
18 they hadn't done that work. And I find that a serious issue
19 because he has in fact testified that the gas station would
20 have, and its traffic, a minuscule effect on NO2
21 concentrations and, frankly, the evidence is very much to
22 the contrary.
23 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24 Q And, Dr. Cole, as with -- you've noted earlier,
25 Mr. Sullivan stated in his November 20, 2012, report that in

Page 161

1 his professional judgment, the most accurate modeling case
2 for this site would use an intermediate value between urban
3 and rural. Using the numbers from his 2013 report, his
4 corrected and updated numbers, can you make a determination
5 as to what NO2 concentrations would be -- NOx concentrations
6 would be within the mall parcel?
7 A Okay. I think this is -- you're referring to
8 Slide 18, I believe. Okay. So it starts out saying just
9 what you said, with the intermediate, coupled with a factor
10 of two to adjust it, if we're going to use what I believe
11 are the most accurate, reasonable assumptions which agree
12 with statements that Mr. Sullivan has used, the urban
13 background being -- I mean, the background is 90; the urban
14 is 160. So that gives you 70. We get, I don't know, we get
15 a number of 98.5, let's say, but then to adjust for the
16 correction to MOVES, from MOBILE6 to MOVES, which
17 Mr. Sullivan has acknowledged to be a factor of two in that
18 area where you have queues and slow-moving traffic, there
19 you adjust by a factor of two and you get the value of --
20 98.5 times two is 197. If you add 197 to 90, you get a
21 value of 287 micrograms per cubic meter compared to the
22 standard of 190. Let's say that you used a lower correction
23 factor for MOBILE to MOVES based on somewhat faster speeds
24 and you used 1.5 instead of, instead of two -- do I have the
25 rest of that? Let me see what the rest of that -- so

Page 162

1 there --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: What location is this?
3 THE WITNESS: This is the -- what we're doing is
4 looking at max, the maximum location, which would be, as
5 I've said, as shown --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: -- would be right in the gas
8 station --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Right on the gas station area.
10 THE WITNESS: -- and it extends, but remember,
11 this is based on certain refinements and has no correction
12 factor for going from MOBILE6 to MOVES2010, okay?
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14 THE WITNESS: So here, what I did here was I took
15 this average and, based on the rural versus the modeled
16 portion, averaging between rural and MOBILE, came up with
17 98.5 and then, to adjust from MOBILE to MOVES, multiplied
18 that by a factor of two and got 197 and then added that to
19 background, and you get 287, which is much higher, of
20 course, than the standard, which is 190. But let's say that
21 one were to argue that, okay, maybe there's some cars that
22 are traveling slightly faster and maybe the correction
23 factor overall for that area of the max is 1.5 rather than
24 two. So you multiply the 70 by 105, you add the background
25 of 90, and you get 195.

Page 163

1 So my conclusion here is that if you correct for
2 these, what I would call, not following EPA guidance on the
3 MOVES and MOBILE and, also, not correcting for what
4 Mr. Sullivan acknowledged to be the difference between
5 MOBILE and MOVES and not considering an intermediate value
6 for dispersion coefficients, which Mr. Sullivan has
7 testified is, in his opinion, the most accurate, you still
8 come up, even with the 1.5, you come up with 195 micrograms
9 per cubic meter, which is above the standard.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me ask you this, just being
11 devil's advocate here for a second: If you were to -- let's
12 say Mr. Sullivan were to say in response to this, well, if
13 you're going to choose, if you're going to look at a point
14 source such as this, you can't use the full NOx amount, you
15 have to assume some reduction for the percentage, which is
16 NO2 rather than NOx. If he is correct and if I recall his
17 testimony correctly, that would knock off the difference
18 between MOVES and MOBILE6 and then some; in other words, the
19 distinction you've made would be eliminated and more so. I
20 don't know if he, that's his answer, but --
21 THE WITNESS: Well, we need to, I would have to --
22 I'm not going to agree or disagree because I haven't done
23 the calculation --
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
25 THE WITNESS: -- but, okay, here's the issue:

Page 164

1 What percentage do we use? Is it 25 percent? Is it 50
2 percent? Is it 75 percent? And the answer depends on many
3 different variables.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he testified regarding that.
5 I just haven't looked --
6 THE WITNESS: No. Well --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- in the last week or two.
8 THE WITNESS: -- excuse me, but, I'm sorry, but --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
10 THE WITNESS: -- I have to say --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
12 THE WITNESS: -- that in order to come up with an
13 accurate answer would require some kind of chemical analysis
14 and modeling of something that incorporates both dispersion
15 and the chemical conversion. You would also have to include
16 in that analysis what else was in the air. For example, if
17 there's high levels of ozone in the air, in other words, the
18 air quality is already bad, that conversion from NO to NO2
19 is a very fast reaction, on the matter of seconds -- not
20 hours, seconds.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
22 THE WITNESS: My -- from a scientific standpoint,
23 if he wants to come in with a lower percent, he needs to do
24 that kind of analysis. You don't just pick a number out of
25 the air, like 25 percent or 50 percent. You would have to

Page 165

1 go back and do a whole analysis of comparing ozone
2 concentrations with NO concentrations and whatnot, because
3 if the ozone is high, it's the ozone that makes that
4 reaction go very, very fast, and other photochemical
5 oxidants do as well. He has not done that analysis, and I
6 would not accept the contention. In the absence of such an
7 analysis, the conservative -- and I'll come back to this
8 over and over again -- where there are uncertainties you go
9 to the conservative position. He's used that in his
10 results. He may have done a little correction or another
11 modeling; I'm not aware of it. He's used that. I think
12 that is the appropriate, 100 percent conversion in the
13 absence of a much more complete analysis, which has not been
14 done.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17 Q And, Dr. Cole, I just want to be clear, the
18 formula that you worked through on Slide No. 18, those
19 numbers came from Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report --
20 A Yes.
21 Q -- is that correct?
22 A Right.
23 Q And so the 160 background for urban that you
24 picked came from Figure i on page 5 of his report?
25 A No, the 160 maximum.

Page 166

1 Q Maximum.

2 A Right. It could have been -- another, as I said

3 before, another figure showed 168 and that was with the,

4 according to Mr. Sullivan, that was with a background of 98

5 as opposed to 90.

6 Q But you used his lowest number?

7 A I used his lowest number.

8 Q And the rural number there of 217 came from Figure

9 10 on page 24 of his report, August 2013, is that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q So on, just to summarize, on the issue of MOVES

12 versus MOBILE6, in your professional opinion, does the

13 August 2013 report accurately predict the level of vehicular

14 emissions for PM2.5 and NOx?

15 A For motor vehicle emissions, the answer would be

16 no for both pollutants, PM2.5 and NO2.

17 Q I believe Mr. Sullivan testified that the NOx

18 problem in the mall was really a loading dock problem, and

19 in your earlier analysis where you backed out the loading

20 dock and you looked at the comparison, does that demonstrate

21 whether or not there's a loading dock problem?

22 A I didn't back out anything. It was Mr. Sullivan

23 who backed down on his emissions from the loading dock.

24 Without agreeing or disagreeing with his revision, it gives

25 a snapshot of what concentrations and concentration patterns

Page 167

1 are without the interference from the loading dock, because

2 in this analysis the loading dock emissions from the high

3 density, high -- heavy vehicle diesels have been reduced by

4 a factor of 93 percent, and you can see that on page 18 of

5 this report. The original was, emissions were .098. The,

6 his refined, he calls it refined, went down to .007. So if

7 you take the difference and divide by 97, you get a 93

8 percent reduction or a .93 fraction reduction.

9 Q Thank you. I'd like you to turn to Slide 19, and

10 once we turn there --

11 A Okay.

12 Q -- I'm going to ask you a question.

13 A Yeah.

14 Q It's going to start with a fairly long quote.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: You're preparing me?

16 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm preparing you.

17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

18 Q Okay. On September 20th Mr. Sullivan testified

19 that the gas concentration -- that the gas station would

20 only add .024 ug to the m3 to the overall NO2 concentrations

21 and that's on page 46 of that transcript. And I'll --

22 MR. GROSSMAN: That was actually not a u. It's a

23 mu.

24 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

25 Q A mu, and I will read his testimony. He says:

Page 168

1 What I'm trying to get at is, in terms of NO2 and the

2 ambient air around the mall site based on your modeling,

3 what portion of the NO2 would come from the proposed Costco

4 gas station as opposed to what's coming from other sources?

5 And the answer was: Thank you. I'm sorry. It's

6 actually -- we did assess that -- it's actually .024

7 micrograms of that 277, or whatever you want to have, is

8 from the gas station, including the gas station queue, the

9 exits and entrances.

10 The question was: And that's .024 micrograms per

11 cubic meter?

12 Answer: Right, which works out to be .008

13 percent. I mean, it's a warehouse issue, not a gas station

14 issue. That particular bull's-eye that we're talking about

15 there essentially has nothing to do with the gas station.

16 And do you agree with that assertion?

17 MR. GROSSMAN: And what page was that that you

18 quoted from again?

19 MS. ROSENFELD: It was page 46 of the September

20 20th transcript.

21 THE WITNESS: No, I don't. I testified previously

22 that when you eliminated 93 percent of the loading dock, you

23 still had very substantial values. Where were those

24 substantial values? Right in the area of the gas station

25 and adjacent to the gas station.

Page 169

1 So it's true that in this particular table, if I

2 can refer to it, he shows some fairly low increments at the

3 school, .24, I don't know if that's the same figure -- we're

4 only looking here at the one-hour to the left -- and if you

5 use the urban, let's use the urban for a minute, his impact

6 was 5.3 from the gas station only, okay? So that's higher

7 than the value that you're giving.

8 But the essential point that I want to make is, if

9 you go back and you look at the dispersion pattern, you'll

10 see that whatever's happening at the margin at the nearest

11 home, which is, I believe, somewhere in here if I'm not

12 mistaken, those values are going to be much -- incremental

13 values from a ground-level area source are going to be much

14 lower 125 feet away than they are at 20 feet away. There's

15 no way around that. I mean, I showed you that in original

16 slide. The concentrations decrease rapidly downwind of the

17 source. So you cannot, I can't figure out any way that a

18 level of five at the nearest home would be greater than a

19 level right next to the gas station. That defies all

20 modeling logic; in fact, I believe it defies the law of

21 conservation of mass. It doesn't work that way.

22 BY MS. ROSENFELD:

23 Q All right. Dr. Cole, I'd like to turn now to the

24 subject of traffic speeds and congestion --

25 A Okay.

Page 170

1 Q -- which was your third major area of concern with
2 respect to Mr. Sullivan's modeling. And Mr. Sullivan has
3 relied on traffic projections from Costco witnesses as the
4 basis for the amount of traffic in the case of modeling the
5 emissions on the mall parcel, and there was substantial
6 testimony presented by witnesses that included firsthand
7 accounts, photography, videography that indicated that these
8 traffic projections were understated -- traffic counts at
9 the infamous Intersection 16, potential gas queues at the
10 gas station and, in addition, the speed of vehicles within
11 the parking lots and within the ring road.
12 MR. GOECKE: I would object. The testimony did
13 not say that the traffic counts were understated. There
14 were different traffic counts that were provided by members
15 of the opposition, but they didn't, they didn't say that the
16 actual counts and estimates provided in Costco's report was
17 incorrect. And then, in addition to that, the last point
18 about the average speed, I don't believe we had evidence
19 about the average speed.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, there was --
21 MR. GOECKE: Videos of --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, there was testimony from a
23 couple of witnesses about cars going fast or going slow --
24 MR. GOECKE: Exactly.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- depending on the traffic

Page 171

1 situation, just having that statistical evidence --
2 MR. GOECKE: Right.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- regarding speed. I don't think
4 there was anything additional, but I don't know -- they
5 don't have to have statistical evidence to pose a
6 hypothetical based on evidence that was submitted,
7 testimonial evidence.
8 MR. GOECKE: Okay. So long as it's --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: So they can --
10 MR. GOECKE: So long as we agree it's hypothetical
11 and not factual.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, yes, I wouldn't say
13 hypothetical. Hypothetical questions have to be premised on
14 some evidence that's in the record. Hypothetical questions
15 posed to an expert can't be hypothetical in the sense that
16 they're just made up. It has to be premised on some
17 evidence in the record, but there is evidence in the record
18 regarding speed. Now, maybe we can hear your question again
19 because I --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: Well --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I hadn't concentrated on the
22 point that he made an objection to. So --
23 MS. ROSENFELD: I'll rephrase the question.
24 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
25 Q If the evidence of record were to show that there

Page 172

1 were more vehicles on the mall parcel or, and/or if the
2 speed of vehicular travel were lower than assumed by
3 Mr. Sullivan, would that have an effect, in your view, on
4 the quantification of the emissions projected for the site?
5 A Thank you. That helps me give a good answer. I
6 think I'll start with something that's fairly simple, and
7 this is No., Slide No. 25.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Can you start with a yes or a no to
9 that question?
10 THE WITNESS: Okay.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: And then explain it.
12 THE WITNESS: If -- let me rephrase the question
13 to make sure I got it right. You said if there is evidence
14 on the record and if it were deemed to be accurate that
15 showed more congestion or slower speeds, would that
16 influence the judgment about emission levels and
17 concentrations; is that right?
18 MR. GROSSMAN: That's essentially, go ahead --
19 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
20 Q That's correct.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- that's essentially what she
22 said.
23 THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay. Then I've got it. So
24 I want to start with a, just a basic --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Start with a yes or no, if you can.

Page 173

1 THE WITNESS: Oh.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: If you can't, then tell me you
3 can't.
4 THE WITNESS: Which is the right answer? Did you
5 phrase it in the negative or the positive? The --
6 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7 Q Would it change the outcome, and if so, in what
8 manner?
9 A Yes. The answer is yes.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Now you can give your
11 explanation.
12 THE WITNESS: You can't blame me for trying to get
13 a little coaching from the counsel.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: I can blame you for that actually,
15 but I'm not going to in this case.
16 THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you. I appreciate that.
17 Okay. So this figure, for a number of pollutants, based on
18 the Federal Highway Administration, by Dr. Claggett, Michael
19 Claggett, 2010, which we've provided for the record --
20 MS. ROSENFELD: For the record, it's Exhibit No.
21 404(c).
22 THE WITNESS: Right -- shows that for all of the
23 pollutants of concern -- carbon monoxide, NOx, VOC, whoops,
24 let me add PM2.5, PM2.5 and diesel particulate matters to
25 the right -- no matter which of those pollutants you look

Page 174

1 at, if you use MOVES, it shows that those emissions all go
2 up as speed goes down. That is a fact of life. That has
3 been verified by studies, and particularly this one which
4 I'm citing, where they used MOVES and --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Is that because the cars spend more
6 time in a particular area because they're going more slowly,
7 or is it because the vehicles actually have a higher
8 emission rate when they're going more slowly?
9 THE WITNESS: Well, that's a good question. This
10 chart is in grams per vehicle mile traveled.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
12 THE WITNESS: Okay. So --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: So they could be emitting more
14 grams per vehicle mile traveled because they're going more
15 slowly, rather than because the vehicles actually have a
16 higher emission rate per se per period of time.
17 THE WITNESS: Let me consider that for a moment.
18 With your permission --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, sir.
20 THE WITNESS: -- I would like to reflect on that
21 and come back to you with an answer.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it depends on how much time
23 we have in terms of cross-examination. I -- it's beginning
24 to look like we won't finish today, including
25 cross-examination. So I guess you can reflect because

Page 175

1 they'll have an opportunity to cross-examine you tomorrow.
2 THE WITNESS: Correct. So you're asking, if we
3 looked at grams per second rather than grams per vehicle
4 mile --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Essentially, that's another
6 form --
7 THE WITNESS: Okay.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- of that question. I mean, the
9 point is that --
10 THE WITNESS: Right. It's my -- yeah.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- if the vehicle is going more
12 slowly, it's going to spend more time --
13 THE WITNESS: Right.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- in a given area. It may not be
15 emitting more per second, but it just is going to be there
16 longer.
17 THE WITNESS: Yes. I think that's a really, a
18 good question. I think -- and I will say more on this --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20 THE WITNESS: -- but cars that are idling are, or
21 running at slow speeds, are less efficient than cars that
22 are moving freely. And there is some evidence, I don't know
23 if I put it in a slide -- no, unfortunately.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: I'll tell you one thing. If I
25 see --

Page 176

1 THE WITNESS: I will --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: -- if I see emissions coming out of
3 my tailpipe the size of those cherry tomatoes on Slide 30,
4 I'm going to --
5 THE WITNESS: Yes.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- begin to worry.
7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. You --
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
9 THE WITNESS: That's conceptual.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: All right, sir.
11 THE WITNESS: I will have something to say on that
12 because I have some further evidence.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. But you partially
14 answered it by saying that cars going slowly are less
15 efficient. So that's --
16 THE WITNESS: Yes.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: -- a part answer to that question.
18 THE WITNESS: Yes, it's a part answer. I will
19 attempt to give you a fuller --
20 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
21 THE WITNESS: -- answer. Okay. So that's the
22 first part of the answer to the question as why vehicle
23 speed matters in terms of emissions, okay?
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
25 THE WITNESS: Now, what I've tried to do is put

Page 177

1 together a conceptual framework or model -- not a
2 mathematical model, but a conceptual model -- that shows the
3 complexity of these situations and what I call the
4 compounding effects. For example --
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q Excuse me. Dr. Cole --
7 A Yeah.
8 Q -- before you get there, would you go back to
9 Slide 24, please, because I think you did cover the issue of
10 vehicle speed, but I'd like you to speak just for a moment,
11 as well, about congestion.
12 A Okay. I want to acknowledge that the base diagram
13 from this comes from the cited source, the Federal Highway
14 Administration Traffic Congestion study; however, I've
15 added, taken some liberty to add some lines to make it more
16 intelligible. You don't --
17 Q And for the record --
18 A -- the results of what I'm going to say are
19 regardless of which axis, which horizontal axis you use.
20 So let me, let me explain this diagram so that
21 we're on the same page. The vertical axis is the delay in
22 hours per vehicle. So I've marked one-quarter hour and
23 one-half hour just to give you a framework. You could look
24 at 10 minutes if you wanted. The horizontal axis that was
25 in the original report is the ratio of average traffic,

1 hourly capacity, I'm sorry, the average daily traffic over
 2 the hourly capacity. So, because you're dividing by a daily
 3 numerator by an hourly capacity, these numbers look big. I
 4 don't know where you would get, you know, 20 or 15 times the
 5 capacity. I mean, you just couldn't fit that number of
 6 vehicles. So to make it a little simpler, I made some
 7 assumptions about peaks and shifted the, or changed the
 8 readings on the axis so that it was hourly traffic values
 9 over hourly capacity, so that --

10 MR. GROSSMAN: That seems to make more sense. I'm
 11 not quite sure why they did that, the ratio of average daily
 12 traffic over --

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I --

14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- I don't quite understand that.

15 THE WITNESS: You see why I --

16 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

17 THE WITNESS: It just didn't make sense. So if
 18 you use my analysis -- and you could, you could change this
 19 around; it doesn't depend -- anything above 1.0 means over
 20 capacity. Below 1.0 in my framework is under capacity. So
 21 now, which of those curves do we look at? The steepest of
 22 those curves, I think it's blue, this curve right here, is
 23 what's called a bottleneck curve. A bottleneck curve,
 24 according to this study, is what happens when you have
 25 bottlenecks due to volume. The other two curves have to do

1 with interference, such as an accident or a, let's say,
 2 construction or a snowbank or something that physically
 3 interferes.

4 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me see if I understand --

5 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- why you do this analysis. Where
 7 in the mall are you considering applying this analysis to?
 8 Is this supposed to be because of the queue at the gas
 9 station, or is it because of some backup entering the mall,
 10 or where are you looking at this traffic consideration?

11 THE WITNESS: Well, right now what I'm trying to
 12 show is the relationship between the number of vehicles and
 13 the delays. Delays --

14 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand, but if there are no,
 15 if there are no delays --

16 THE WITNESS: Okay. All right.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: -- on the ring road --

18 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and the only --

20 THE WITNESS: The question -- oh, sorry.

21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and the only -- because I saw
 22 your reference in your materials to queues. The queues that
 23 we've talked about here are queues of people lined up to get
 24 gas. They're not the normal highway bottleneck queues that
 25 some of these curves from Highway Transportation may apply

1 to. They're queues for gas. Now, there -- and there was
 2 another discussion from Ms. Cordry about some backups
 3 getting into the mall, but I don't know that those, that you
 4 could argue they have an impact here because there's going
 5 to be some increase in traffic to get to the gas station,
 6 but I don't think those are what you're talking about. So
 7 I'm just trying to find out what you're applying this
 8 curve --

9 THE WITNESS: Okay. Let me, let me --

10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- this curve's bottleneck delay
 11 analysis to. I understand the curve. I just want to know
 12 what you're trying to apply it to in the mall.

13 THE WITNESS: Right. Okay. So I want to go back
 14 to Ms. Rosenfeld's question, which is correct.

15 MR. GROSSMAN: That's how we got into this mess.
 16 Go ahead.

17 THE WITNESS: If in fact the speeds were lower,
 18 there was more congestion --

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

20 THE WITNESS: -- how would that affect emissions?

21 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

22 THE WITNESS: What I showed, the previous slide --

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

24 THE WITNESS: -- showed that using MOVES, the
 25 slower the speed, the greater the emission rate from motor

1 vehicles.

2 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I understand the relevance
 3 of the curve to answer Ms. Rosenfeld's question --

4 THE WITNESS: Right.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: -- but I'm going one step beyond
 6 her question, and that is, so what do you apply this to? I
 7 mean, we've had testimony --

8 THE WITNESS: Okay. All right.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: -- from some, anecdotal testimony
 10 from some folks about cars backing up in the, you know,
 11 intersections entering the mall, but I'm just trying to find
 12 out what you're applying this to --

13 THE WITNESS: Okay. That's fair.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and I'm just wondering whether
 15 you were trying to apply it to the queues for people waiting
 16 to fill up their tank, which are theoretically not supposed
 17 to come out onto the ring road.

18 THE WITNESS: No.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

20 THE WITNESS: The queues, they're going at --

21 MR. GROSSMAN: You're just talking about people
 22 traveling on the ring road?

23 THE WITNESS: The queues of -- cars are idling. I
 24 don't think that's in dispute, right?

25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 182

1 THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, they may be in -- they're not
3 supposed to idle --
4 THE WITNESS: The number of cars, the length of
5 time, and all of that, maybe --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Right. Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: -- but idling is idling, right?
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, they may be idling, or some
9 of them may have their engines off if it's too long, but I
10 don't know.
11 THE WITNESS: Okay. And some, some, remember, are
12 entering and exiting.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
14 THE WITNESS: The entrances and exit, it's my
15 understanding, are in very close vicinity to parking areas.
16 There are other --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, clearly the exit is.
18 THE WITNESS: -- there's both the warehouse, the
19 tire place, the tire whatever it is. There are shops.
20 There's the mall entrance. So that parking lot is being
21 used by a lot of different cars that are coming in --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
23 THE WITNESS: -- from some of the same exits, or
24 going in at the same entrances and leaving from the same
25 exits, et cetera.

Page 183

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 THE WITNESS: There are also, as I've said, there
3 are trucks, big trucks pulling into the loading dock. Now,
4 I'm not talking about the loading dock emissions right now.
5 I'm talking about --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
7 THE WITNESS: -- the compounding effect; that
8 loading docks or tankers coming into a gas station, people
9 having multiple points of views, that creates congestion.
10 So my curve applies, to answer your question, my curve
11 applies to those situations.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it seems to me that the curve
13 that would apply is the curve that shows that there's an
14 increase in emissions at slower speeds if you accept this
15 testimony and factor it in that there are going to be more,
16 traffic going more slowly than was previously estimated.
17 But I don't know that the charts you show on Slide 24 really
18 describes any situation that we have in this mall, because
19 it's really talking about highway backups --
20 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm going to --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and the impacts of bottlenecks
22 on highway backups. I don't know that that has any, any
23 relevance to this at all. I'm not discounting what you said
24 about slower-speed traffic having an increase in the volume
25 of pollutancy. I understand that and what you testified to.

Page 184

1 I just don't see this --
2 THE WITNESS: Okay.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- particular page, 24 chart --
4 THE WITNESS: I hope that 22, Slide -- whoops. I
5 hope that this sheds some light --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
7 THE WITNESS: -- on it. Maybe it will, maybe it
8 won't, but let me try.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: That's page 22?
10 THE WITNESS: Yeah, but it has an extra little
11 box, and it's on there.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
13 THE WITNESS: Okay. So -- notice I'm using your
14 pointer.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I feel rewarded.
16 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Number of vehicles,
17 okay? This curve that I showed shows that -- and it's
18 common sense -- that with the, as the number of vehicles
19 increase and the ratio between the volume of vehicles and
20 the capacity increases, you have more congestion.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
22 THE WITNESS: Okay? The number of vehicles has an
23 impact on vehicle speed. The number of vehicles also has an
24 impact on emissions.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 185

1 THE WITNESS: So if you're off on the number of
2 vehicles, which was the premise of the question, then you're
3 going to be low in this way, you're going to be low, you're
4 going to be low in terms of vehicle speeds. The lower the
5 vehicle speeds, the more -- the lower the emissions.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Higher the emissions.
7 THE WITNESS: Right, higher the emissions. Thank
8 you.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand exactly what this
10 chart is saying --
11 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and I understand your point.
13 I'm just saying I don't think your Federal Highway chart is
14 relevant to this because I think that applies to an entirely
15 different set of circumstances. I don't think you can use a
16 bottleneck curve to describe --
17 THE WITNESS: Okay.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- from highway traffic, to
19 describe what's happening here, but your general point is
20 understood. So I don't think you really have to go further
21 than that. Okay. Ms. Rosenfeld.
22 THE WITNESS: I would like to call your attention
23 to the conclusions from this Federal Highway study on
24 congestion.
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.

Page 186

1 THE WITNESS: So the first one says: The
2 exponential growth in bottleneck delay after the onset of
3 congestion is a major reason why it is so difficult for
4 agencies to keep up with congestion: once congestion
5 starts, things get bad quickly.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
7 THE WITNESS: That's the nature of the exponential
8 curve.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that --
10 THE WITNESS: All right. Okay.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: -- but I don't want to apply a
12 Federal Highway curve, especially -- I don't need to apply
13 that. I have other evidence by which to analyze this --
14 THE WITNESS: Okay.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- case. That's a curve that
16 doesn't truly apply to this situation --
17 THE WITNESS: So you --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: -- a bottleneck curve of that sort.
19 THE WITNESS: I hear you saying that this, you
20 understand this --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
22 THE WITNESS: -- you understand the compounding of
23 errors that can occur here.
24 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I understand the point you're
25 making. Whether or not I accept the argument I'll have to

Page 187

1 figure out later when I consider all the evidence.
2 THE WITNESS: Okay.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4 THE WITNESS: So this is my, one of the pieces of
5 evidence that I provide to answer --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
7 THE WITNESS: -- Ms. Rosenfeld's last question,
8 okay?
9 MR. GROSSMAN: I understood. Ms. Rosenfeld, do
10 you want me to take a five-minute break here, because we
11 are --
12 MS. ROSENFELD: That actually would be helpful. I
13 think we're getting --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
15 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that -- I would like that too.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: Not for you. You're going to have
17 to stay. Just teasing. Yes, you get a break too.
18 THE WITNESS: I'll stay if you stay.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: Let's be fair now.
20 MS. ROSENFELD: I would appreciate that.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And we'll come back at
22 10 to 4:00.
23 MS. ROSENFELD: It would help me to -- we've
24 covered a lot of ground. Let me --
25 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.

Page 188

1 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Rosenfeld, it's up
3 to you.
4 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
5 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
6 Q Dr. Cole, I'd like to turn for a moment to the
7 physical characteristics of PM2.5 emissions but, even more
8 particularly, the physical characteristics of ultrafine
9 particulates. And let me start, start this way: The EPA
10 regulates PM2.5, is that correct?
11 A They regulate PM2.5.
12 Q And is there a subcategory of PM2.5 known as
13 ultrafine particulates?
14 A There are.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: You mean is a subcategory
16 recognized by the EPA or just in general?
17 MS. ROSENFELD: That was my next question.
18 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
19 Q Does the EPA recognize ultrafines as a separate
20 subcategory?
21 A It's not regulated.
22 Q It's not regulated?
23 A There's not a standard, a separate standard for
24 ultrafine particulates.
25 Q Do ultrafine particulates have different physical

Page 189

1 characteristics from larger, or could you explain why
2 they're called ultrafine as opposed to something else?
3 A Let me take a step back, if I can, and say that if
4 we look at the standard of PM2.5, it covers a multiple of
5 sins. There are particles and there are particles. The
6 particles vary in terms of the size distribution. As
7 Ms. Rosenfeld said, there are bigger particles, there are
8 intermediate particles, there are very fine, ultrafine.
9 Okay. They do have very different effects. And the other
10 thing that's different from one particle to the next is its
11 composition and its source: Is it, does it have metal in
12 it? Does it have a heavy, toxic heavy metal, or does it, is
13 it carbon?
14 What I'm saying is that the PM2.5 standard is a
15 category that lumps things that have a variety of toxicity
16 and yet the same study, the same standard, rather, covers
17 every situation. So the premise is one that's being
18 investigated by EPA and by its Clean Air Advisory Council,
19 CASAC. There's the issue of how do we, how do we become
20 more refined in our analysis. So, for example, it's known,
21 well-known that vehicle emissions contain heavy metals and
22 -- which adds to their toxicity. Some kinds of particulates
23 don't have heavy metals.
24 Now, I want to get directly to the question of
25 particle-size distribution, and to do that, did you want me

Page 190

1 to look at a --
2 Q Slide 29, I believe.
3 A What? This is a graph from the National Center
4 for Atmospheric Research, one of the premiere meteorological
5 research institutes in the nation. They have a group that
6 works on ultrafine particles, and this is a very useful
7 graph because it shows another related problem with the
8 PM2.5 standard the way it's currently written.
9 So it turns out that if you look at the bottom
10 curve, the mass is concentrated in the coarser particles.
11 So the bulk of the standard, you may have 10 percent of the
12 particles containing the majority of the mass, but if you
13 look at the number of particles, you'll find that the
14 numbers are highest, the greatest counts are in the
15 ultrafine particle range.
16 MR. GROSSMAN: What's the smallest size that's
17 considered an ultrafine particle and below which --
18 THE WITNESS: Well --
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- you are no longer talking about
20 particles but talking about something else in terms of air
21 modeling and air pollution? I mean, I know --
22 THE WITNESS: Well, in this particular --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- particles in the physics sense
24 goes infinitely tiny, but --
25 THE WITNESS: Here we're looking at micrometers or

Page 191

1 micrometers or mu's, and they have a cutoff at .01. It's
2 varied. I've seen different definitions.
3 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So it goes from .01 up to
4 2.5? Is that --
5 THE WITNESS: The ultrafines in this particular
6 diagram are from .1 micrometer to .01 micrometer. Now,
7 those are very small particles.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9 THE WITNESS: So now, the third curve is in the
10 middle, which is surface area. And there we see that
11 there's very little surface area in the coarse particles,
12 and I think the, on this slide it's yellow, but the
13 difference between the yellow and white here is about at the
14 standard of 2.5. So anything below this level is 2.5, okay?
15 So PM10, for example, would be greater than 10 here.
16 So my point on surface area is that the majority
17 of -- now, what are we talking about when we talk about
18 surface area? I think it would help to show the next slide.
19 Now, I have to confess, these are not micron electroscop
20 diagrams of particulates. On the left we see cherry
21 tomatoes, in the middle we have couscous, and on the right
22 we have sugar. So my point is conceptual.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Is that powdered sugar or --
24 THE WITNESS: Well, I could have added yet another
25 one. So what we're looking at is a lot of mass contributed

Page 192

1 by a small number of large particles, a huge number of
2 particle --
3 MR. GROSSMAN: I got that point from your charts,
4 but --
5 THE WITNESS: Okay.
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- on your chart on page 29 --
7 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: -- or Slide 29 -- whoops, you slid
9 into oblivion.
10 THE WITNESS: I did. I --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: You're caught in Windows 8 hell.
12 MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
13 THE WITNESS: Where's my son when I need him, you
14 know? All right. Go back to square one. Here, where's
15 that little -- here we go. There we go, and now we're
16 going --
17 MR. GROSSMAN: On page 29.
18 THE WITNESS: Okay. All right. You had a
19 question?
20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. It shows the category of
21 ultrafine particles, as you say, between 0.01 and 0.1.
22 THE WITNESS: Yep.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: What falls into the category of,
24 between .001 and .01? What do you call that? They have it
25 on the chart, but they don't name it.

Page 193

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. That's a good question.
2 Well, you're getting pretty close to the molecular level,
3 where you have condensation that's occurring, where vapors
4 are condensing and forming very small nuclei. It might be
5 in the range of Aitken, what are called Aitken nuclei, but
6 those tend to coalesce and form ultrafine particles as those
7 agglomerate.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So we don't have a name
9 for them right now.
10 THE WITNESS: I can get that for you.
11 MR. GROSSMAN: So, basically, when you're talking
12 about ultrafine, you're talking about .1 to .01
13 micrometers --
14 THE WITNESS: Yeah, right.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: -- in diameter?
16 THE WITNESS: Right.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
18 THE WITNESS: And my main point is that while they
19 contribute very little mass, as is shown in the bottom, they
20 contribute the majority of particles. Okay?
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Little mass, lot of mess.
22 THE WITNESS: Right. Surface area -- there's a
23 relationship between particle diameter and surface area.
24 Now, here we're talking about the collective surface area,
25 let's say what's in a cubic meter of air.

Page 194

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Why do I need to know that?
2 I mean, that's an obvious geometric thing, but --
3 THE WITNESS: Right. I'm going to tell you why
4 you need to know it.
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6 THE WITNESS: You need to know it because those
7 ultrafine particles and a tremendous surface area are ideal
8 locations for the deposition and absorption of other
9 contaminants. For example, gases may condense on the
10 surfaces of these tiny particles. For example, one
11 well-known chemical that condenses on these ultrafine
12 particles is polyaromatic hydrocarbons, some of which are
13 known to be carcinogens.
14 So there's, my overall point is there's a huge
15 difference between, if you're at the standard and -- let's
16 say it's just under the standard or something and most of
17 that standard is weighted by these coarser particulates.
18 Those are not as toxic because -- for a number of physical
19 reasons. I gave you the surface area. The tiny particles,
20 and I'm not a health expert, but others will testify that
21 ultrafine particles penetrate and are retained deep in the
22 respiratory system, in the lungs.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: If I take that as a given, the
24 question is, if there's no standard set up for them, how am
25 I supposed to assess what is problematic or prohibited?

Page 195

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. What I'm trying to suggest is
2 in the realm of uncertainties, that where do you err in
3 making a judgment? So if you're looking at vehicle
4 emissions -- and there's evidence that vehicle emissions are
5 a major, major source of ultrafine particulates in urban
6 air, in ambient air, motor vehicles --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: I get your point.
8 THE WITNESS: Okay.
9 MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that even though
10 they're not regulated directly, they, the fact of their
11 existence and their impacts add to the uncertainty factors
12 in the calculations.
13 THE WITNESS: Yes. So --
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
15 THE WITNESS: -- that's another area of
16 uncertainty that needs to be incorporated in decision-making
17 aimed at protecting public health.
18 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
19 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
20 Q Dr. Cole, let me ask the question this way --
21 A Yeah.
22 Q -- if the levels of PM2.5 in Mr. Sullivan's report
23 are understated, would the levels of ultrafine pollutant
24 concentrations also --
25 A I'm sorry. I can't hear your question.

Page 196

1 Q Sure. If the levels of PM2.5 are understated in
2 Mr. Sullivan's report, would the concentrations of ultrafine
3 pollutant concentrations also be understated?
4 A Yes.
5 Q I'd like to refer you to Figure 19 of
6 Mr. Sullivan's August 2013 report, and --
7 A Yeah. Figure 19, you say?
8 Q Yes, I believe.
9 A What page is it?
10 Q Page 29 of his August '13 --
11 A Okay, got it, yeah.
12 Q -- August 2013 report. Under Figure 19 what is
13 the projected level of PM2.5 that he's predicting under the
14 urban dispersion model on the mall parcel?
15 A Okay. The maximum is 11.2.
16 Q And can you remind us what the standard is,
17 please?
18 A The standard is 12.
19 Q Okay. You had spoken earlier about scientific
20 standards, and in your experience, scientific modeling
21 typically includes a margin of error or some sort of
22 statistical --
23 A Say that again. What?
24 Q Some sort of statistical --
25 A But what is it that includes?

Page 197

1 Q Scientific modeling reports.
2 A Well, any kind of analysis where there are
3 predictions made, where models or other calculations are
4 made the standard is to have some understanding of the
5 uncertainties involved, okay? For example, that's why you
6 see scientific reports with error bars -- plus and minus are
7 standard, are two standard deviations -- because, and
8 there's also a prediction called probable errors, which look
9 at the, which even include equations for compound or errors
10 that propagate because there's more than one variable that
11 contribute to the uncertainty, okay? And I -- if you're
12 asking whether that's the norm, and I believe in a case
13 where you're looking at, where the issue is protection of
14 public health, where you're close to standards or exceeding
15 standards, as is the evidence presented in, that you just
16 cited, the 11.2 is very close to 12, and so now the
17 uncertainties become very, very critical because, as the
18 applicants have -- I don't totally agree with it -- but have
19 chosen the standard, the standards as, as the goal, the air
20 quality standards as the thing to measure against --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: What don't you -- you don't totally
22 agree with having, applying the National Ambient Air Quality
23 Standards?
24 THE WITNESS: No, no, no. No. Let me back up so
25 I don't get -- the hour is late. I may be getting a little

Page 198

1 fuzzy. Give me your question again.
2 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3 Q The hour is getting fuzzy.
4 A I get lost.
5 Q The question was, is it typical in a scientific
6 report such as this modeling analysis to have some sort of
7 either an error bar or measure, margin of error?
8 A Okay. So the answer is yes, that's a normal
9 procedure. So you're aware of, well, what are the odds that
10 I could be wrong in my best shot. You're looking at a best
11 shot, okay?
12 Q And does that become more important as you come
13 close to a standard?
14 A I would say so, because if, I mean, you're at
15 one-tenth of the standard and you have a 50 percent chance
16 of being wrong, it's not a big deal. If you're at 11.2,
17 even using the urban model, and you have many uncertainties
18 in the analysis, those uncertainties really take on a
19 critical import.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that point. I don't
21 think we have to belabor that anymore, but you started to
22 preface your answer with a statement that applicants have
23 chosen to apply the National Ambient Air Quality Standards,
24 I may not totally agree with that, but -- and then you went
25 onto something else.

Page 199

1 THE WITNESS: Okay. Right.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: If you don't agree with that, is
3 that the case --
4 THE WITNESS: I think it's a, I think it's a
5 good --
6 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and if not, why not? What do
7 you, what standards do you apply?
8 THE WITNESS: I think it's a good starting point,
9 but then you have to look into the issues that add
10 uncertainty to that analysis because you're dealing with a
11 critical matter, which is public health. You're going to
12 hear testimony from health experts about things that happen
13 even below the standards, and I've pointed out with this
14 diagram that not all particulates have the same impact
15 because they have different physical and chemical
16 characteristics. So given that, if you're going to use the
17 standard and you're very close to it, it would behoove you
18 to use conservative assumptions down the line so that you
19 don't inadvertently err on the low side when you're dealing
20 with public health.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I understand your point about
22 that, but you're not suggesting there's some other set of
23 standards that should be used as the guidance?
24 THE WITNESS: My own view, having some experience,
25 what I said, public health assessments around things that

Page 200

1 are toxic -- air pollution sources, hazardous waste sites,
2 and whatnot -- is that a health assessment is a lot more
3 than just looking at standards. You're looking at issues
4 like sensitive populations, sensitive, we could call them
5 sensitive receptors, but these are people.
6 So, so the answer is, where the issues do no harm
7 to public health -- and I'm not venturing into toxicology
8 here -- but where there's an issue involving public health,
9 a more rigorous assessment of the impact of the particular
10 emissions would, in my opinion, in order to protect people
11 both in the mall and who live, who are going to be exposed
12 over long periods, that there be more than just a comparison
13 with standards which is riddled with the kinds of
14 uncertainties that I've discussed here: the fact that
15 particulates contain a multiple of sins. Some are like
16 serial killers. Some are like minor offenders, okay?
17 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand what you're saying. I
18 have to be careful because I'm not a health official, and I
19 can't just arbitrarily pick out a set of standards to apply
20 to people. That's not fair to applicants. It's not fair in
21 general. So I have to go by some set of standards to guide
22 me.
23 Now, on the other hand, it's also true that
24 there's a concept in our land use law of site conditions,
25 and this is a site condition -- that is, what's immediately

Page 201

1 around the site. So it does factor in but not perhaps in
2 terms of what is the standard, because I am concerned about
3 applying something that is not a recognized standard in the
4 way that might be suggested in your answer, as distinguished
5 from applying the standard and then considering even
6 applying that standard to what's in the area. So there's a
7 distinction in my mind, but in any event --
8 THE WITNESS: Can I respond or --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: Sure. Why not?
10 THE WITNESS: Okay. So let's take your premise
11 that, you know, here you are, you have to make a decision,
12 you would like to use something that is a regulatory
13 standard, right?
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, actually, I have to make a
15 recommendation, but that's --
16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Okay. Then I would ask you
17 to consider issues of uncertainty and look at the results
18 that have been presented to make the case whether there are
19 exceedances of standards or not, to look at the distance, to
20 look at the results --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand the uncertainty issue,
22 and we've gone over that lots of times.
23 THE WITNESS: So the uncertainty issue, so I -- my
24 viewpoint is that in a situation like this you use
25 conservative assumptions.

Page 202

1 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I mean, we've -- I
2 don't want to go over that territory more than another three
3 times. We've already --
4 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 Q Dr. Cole, during the course of this process, you
6 and Mr. Sullivan met to discuss a protocol --
7 A Uh-huh.
8 Q -- and we're now at, I assume, nearing the end of
9 that process. Having reviewed the various iterations of
10 successive reports that Mr. Sullivan has provided, ending
11 most recently with the one of August 2013 --
12 A Uh-huh.
13 Q -- in your opinion, has he adhered to the
14 understandings that were established at the time of the
15 protocol?
16 A The protocol, the process of discussion, we had
17 points of agreement and points of disagreement. One of the
18 things that was, at least I thought, favorable was the issue
19 of conservatism, building into the analysis conservatism.
20 And I'm deeply concerned that every time an analysis shows
21 an exceedance or a near exceedance there's a backing away
22 from conservatism in the analysis. That's happened at
23 several different junctions.
24 For example, the NO2 analysis was fine and showed
25 no exceedance until the background error on conversion was

Page 203

1 corrected. Then suddenly a lot of these modeling
2 projections showed exceedances, and at that point, we begin
3 to get reductions in emissions. I don't feel that's a valid
4 scientific approach. I think that's, frankly -- frankly,
5 it's backing away from the statements that were made early
6 in the process, and I have a lot of trouble with that,
7 particularly given these two pollutants, one-hour NO2,
8 annual PM2.5, either close to the standard or exceeding the
9 standard, depending upon which of the assumptions you use,
10 okay, that -- I think you see my point. It's --
11 MR. GROSSMAN: I do.
12 THE WITNESS: -- I don't want to ascribe motives,
13 but it's deeply disturbing as a scientist to see the methods
14 shift when certain answers occur.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Let me ask you this: If I recall,
16 when you wrote to the Planning Board, you said, you
17 suggested that there be an actual monitoring period --
18 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
19 MR. GROSSMAN: -- is that correct?
20 THE WITNESS: That's correct.
21 MR. GROSSMAN: So what if in this case the Board
22 of Appeals were to order that there be a monitoring period
23 for PM2.5 and for NO2 prior to any operation of a gas
24 station and then it be allowed to operate at some level and
25 continuing monitoring for some period of time to see if it

Page 204

1 was creating the problem that is feared -- would that be a
2 workable solution?
3 THE WITNESS: Not for me.
4 MR. GROSSMAN: Why not?
5 THE WITNESS: Because it has to do with, it has to
6 do with the issue of location, in my opinion. Do you put a
7 major source, a major gas station of an unprecedentedly large
8 size in the county so close to receptors?
9 MR. GROSSMAN: So why did you recommend
10 monitoring? What's the point then if you're not going to
11 have any gas station?
12 THE WITNESS: The point? I'll tell you what the
13 point is. The monitoring, first of all, would have to take
14 several years to get a representative value. Secondly, let
15 me get my train of thought, the monitoring is a sense of
16 what's coming into the area, what's, you would put
17 background monitors -- you would put a series of monitors,
18 let's say, in the mall itself and adjacent to the mall in
19 the neighborhoods, okay? So you would do that, let's say,
20 for three years. In other words, you would have, you would
21 have background monitors which reflected the air coming into
22 this area.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but what's the point in
24 doing that? Let's say you had this three-year scenario. I
25 was thinking more in terms of less than that, but let's say

Page 205

1 you had a three-year scenario. What's the point in
2 recommending three years of monitoring if you're
3 nevertheless, whatever the results are, not going to allow
4 this gas station? What's the point? I don't understand.
5 THE WITNESS: There are two issues here. One is
6 the issue of what would be a scientifically valid
7 measurement of background. My point was that I felt the
8 sites that were used were not representative of conditions
9 in the, in the area, in the area of the mall.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
11 THE WITNESS: Now, they attempted, Mr. Sullivan
12 attempted to bridge that gap by modeling a region around the
13 mall with using MOBILE6 and the emissions on the roadways,
14 the ring road, what have you. In my opinion, that doesn't
15 affect all of the sources of pollutants in what I call the
16 near-field particulates.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: But you haven't referenced my
18 question.
19 THE WITNESS: I'm trying.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: My question is, what is the point
21 in your recommendation of monitoring this area if in fact
22 you're still opposed, no matter what the results are, to the
23 proposed gas station? I don't understand. That seems
24 inconsistent to me. I could understand if you said, if you
25 sent a letter to the Planning Board and said there shouldn't

1 be a gas station here for all of the reasons that you may
 2 have said here, uncertainty, whatever you want, but I can't
 3 understand your sending a letter, saying let's have
 4 monitoring for X period of time to have this baseline, if
 5 you're opposed nevertheless, no matter what the results.
 6 That seems to me to be an inconsistent position.
 7 THE WITNESS: There are two -- I'm trying to
 8 explain this. One is the issue of scientific validity and
 9 uncertainties: how do you get the best -- is, is what the
 10 applicants have submitted sufficient or is it flawed?
 11 MR. GROSSMAN: Try to answer my question. What is
 12 the point of requiring monitoring if, no matter what the
 13 results, you are not going to allow the special exception?
 14 THE WITNESS: There are many -- monitoring isn't
 15 going to give you the whole answer. I see, I see your
 16 point.
 17 MR. GROSSMAN: What's the point in having any
 18 monitoring --
 19 THE WITNESS: All right.
 20 MR. GROSSMAN: That's why I don't understand your
 21 -- I don't understand your --
 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. I see your point.
 23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- recommendation to the Planning
 24 Board.
 25 THE WITNESS: I see your point.

1 MS. ROSENFELD: Maybe I can help.
 2 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
 3 Q Dr. Cole, was your recommendation for monitoring
 4 to establish background in the immediate area --
 5 A Yes.
 6 Q -- before anything was built, so there would not
 7 be speculation --
 8 A Yes.
 9 Q -- about background?
 10 A Thank you. Yes.
 11 Q You were not suggesting monitoring after the
 12 station was built, correct?
 13 A Correct.
 14 MR. GROSSMAN: But still, that doesn't answer my
 15 question. Why go to the expense of monitoring what's
 16 happening in the area if you're never going to use it
 17 towards measuring the results of a station? I don't
 18 understand the --
 19 THE WITNESS: All right. Let me, let me now give
 20 you another answer.
 21 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
 22 THE WITNESS: Remember that when you're putting in
 23 monitors before the fact, you're measuring what's called
 24 existing conditions --
 25 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.

1 THE WITNESS: -- existing conditions. That's all
 2 the monitoring will give you.
 3 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I understand that.
 4 THE WITNESS: There's a whole other set of
 5 analysis that has to be done. Will it be done the right
 6 way? Will it be done using, covering the uncertainties?
 7 MR. GROSSMAN: Apparently I'm not making my point
 8 clear --
 9 THE WITNESS: No, because --
 10 MR. GROSSMAN: -- because -- why go to the trouble
 11 of measuring the existing levels in the area if you're never
 12 going to use them for anything? You're never going to use
 13 those measurements for anything because there's no --
 14 THE WITNESS: No. Excuse me. You're going to use
 15 them because you need to add what's already there to the
 16 projections for a gas station --
 17 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but you've told me --
 18 THE WITNESS: -- they're two different things.
 19 MR. GROSSMAN: But then you answered my question
 20 as to, well, then you're saying, let's say you monitor it
 21 for three years and you get figures, but you're never going
 22 to have a gas station anyway. So you're not adding into the
 23 gas station.
 24 THE WITNESS: I didn't say that.
 25 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I thought that's what you said.

1 You said --
 2 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't say that.
 3 MR. GROSSMAN: -- in your mind, you would not, you
 4 would not recommend the gas station.
 5 THE WITNESS: I said, I said it's a bad location
 6 for a number of reasons. I think we'll discuss that in
 7 greater detail when we talk about non-inherent site factors
 8 here, but what I'm saying is, that's one piece of a bigger
 9 analysis. You're just saying, you're adding -- you have
 10 existing conditions.
 11 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that point, but you
 12 apparently don't understand my question. So let's just go
 13 on. I don't want to waste any more time on it. Go ahead,
 14 Ms. Rosenfeld.
 15 MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have one more
 16 subject to cover, and it's going to take a little bit of
 17 time. It is late. Can we resume in the morning? I suspect
 18 it'll take half an hour or less, but we've spent more time
 19 on this than I expected.
 20 MR. GROSSMAN: That's because that pesky Hearing
 21 Examiner keeps asking questions.
 22 MS. ROSENFELD: I welcome the questions. I'm glad
 23 you ask them.
 24 MR. GROSSMAN: What's your pleasure, Mr. Goecke?
 25 MR. GOECKE: We prefer to use the full day just

Page 210

1 because --
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the full day is only 10
3 minutes longer because --
4 MR. GOECKE: I understand, but --
5 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6 MR. GOECKE: -- I mean, it's your decision, but --
7 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's go ahead
8 and do as far as we can until 4:45.
9 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10 Q Just one final question on the PM2.5. Is it your
11 opinion that if the PM2.5 were properly modeled, that it
12 would, that the concentrations would be below or above the
13 EPA standards for annual?
14 A Well, as I said previously, the emission factors
15 that were used for particulates are much lower for MOBILE6
16 than they are for MOVES10 by a factor of 10. There's the
17 uncertainty associated with departing from EPA's guidance on
18 dispersion coefficients and whether those judgments are
19 appropriate, okay? I believe that given all of the
20 uncertainties, that we ought to be using the rural
21 coefficients or at least using what Mr. Sullivan says is the
22 intermediate.
23 So when you begin to look at those errors in
24 combination or those assumptions, assumptions in combination
25 and being that you're at 11.2 using his own figures, that

Page 211

1 suggests that there is a potential for exceeding the PM2.5.
2 Now, I think in the area of NO2, I would go as far to say
3 that an exceedance is likely --
4 Q Okay.
5 A -- if you correct, if you follow, if you follow
6 EPA's guidance.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: I take it that the NO2 standard
8 you're talking about is the 24-hour one?
9 THE WITNESS: No. It's one hour.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, the one-hour
11 standard.
12 THE WITNESS: It's the PM2.5 annual, the one-hour.
13 MR. GROSSMAN: The one-hour standard, yes. Okay.
14 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15 Q And if you had been hired by Costco to conduct the
16 analysis, what modeling protocol would you have followed?
17 A I have to tell you, it's a -- would you call that
18 a hypothetical?
19 Q I would call that a hypothetical.
20 A I, well --
21 MR. GROSSMAN: I guess another way of asking it
22 is, what is the appropriate modeling protocol to follow?
23 THE WITNESS: Right. I would use MOVES. If I
24 found it difficult to use MOVES because I couldn't get the
25 exact data and I didn't want to use defaults -- apparently

Page 212

1 Mr. Sullivan decided not to use defaults; he didn't explain
2 why, but he stated that he didn't use the more readily
3 doable or feasible MOVES using default values -- so if I
4 were doing it, I would have either used MOVES the best I
5 could, using the best available data; if I couldn't do that,
6 I would use correction factors based on the evidence from
7 EPA and the Highway Administration and other sources to
8 adjust the concentrations upward to reflect what is EPA's
9 regulatory model for emissions, particularly when EPA has
10 gone to great lengths to explain to the world why MOBILE6 is
11 no longer a valid model, why it's been replaced.
12 MR. GROSSMAN: And from your earlier testimony,
13 you would've used AERMOD as the --
14 THE WITNESS: Oh, I would.
15 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
16 THE WITNESS: I would use AERMOD.
17 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
18 Q And in your experience, over time has EPA gotten
19 more stringent or less stringent with the NAAQS standards?
20 A With the National Ambient Air Quality Standards?
21 Q Yes.
22 A They've generally come down.
23 MR. GROSSMAN: When you say come down, just for
24 clarity of the record, you mean they have --
25 THE WITNESS: Been reduced to lower, more

Page 213

1 stringent levels.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Have been -- okay.
3 THE WITNESS: Yes. Right. For example --
4 MR. GROSSMAN: I understand.
5 THE WITNESS: -- PM2.5 was recently lowered from
6 15 to 12. The NO2 standard, my memory is a little bit more
7 fuzzy on that, but it was lower.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I understand that.
9 THE WITNESS: Okay.
10 MR. GROSSMAN: I just wanted to know -- you said
11 that they had been reduced. I wanted to make sure what that
12 meant.
13 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead.
15 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
16 Q And, Dr. Cole, do you have just general
17 observations to make about how easy or difficult it was to
18 find the data, any information to evaluate Mr. Sullivan's
19 conclusions?
20 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not sure what that question
21 means, but maybe if you know --
22 THE WITNESS: Well --
23 MR. GROSSMAN: -- if you have an answer, I'll
24 listen to it.
25 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I found it difficult as an

Page 214

1 evaluator, as a scientist evaluating a study, because there
2 were so many different revisions, presentations where
3 certain assumptions were changed. It's not always clear
4 exactly what assumptions were changed in what particular
5 analysis. You really have to dig to get it. Certain pieces
6 of critical information were not provided.
7 If I'm not mistaken, you've asked -- a concern of
8 yours is about the incremental impact --
9 MR. GROSSMAN: That's true.
10 THE WITNESS: -- of the gas station, not just at
11 the edge, but in the entire neighborhood, which includes the
12 mall. We asked for that analysis, and frankly, it's,
13 there's been no analysis to get at that issue. The only
14 analysis we have is where you expect the contributions, the
15 incremental contributions to be lower, which is at the
16 margins and not in the mall itself. And I've showed
17 evidence, strong evidence, indicating, from their reports,
18 showing that in fact there is a substantial incremental
19 addition of oxides of nitrogen, or NO2 in this case, to the
20 background, to the, at the source, which includes entrances
21 and exits and all of the interferences and all the vehicles
22 that are involved. Those -- when you look at the evidence
23 that's available, you see the area of maximum in the area of
24 the mall. We asked for that analysis. I believe it was
25 something important to you. We were told that that was not

Page 215

1 done. It's certainly not in any of the reports.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Ms. Rosenfeld.
3 MS. ROSENFELD: All right. I'm sorry. What?
4 MR. GROSSMAN: No. I was just saying, you have
5 time for one more question --
6 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
7 MR. GROSSMAN: -- or maybe half a question.
8 MS. ROSENFELD: I'll start the question.
9 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10 Q This one starts with a quote. Dr. Cole, the
11 zoning code states that non-inherent adverse effects are
12 physical and operational characteristics not necessarily
13 associated with the particular use, or adverse effects
14 created by unusual characteristics of the site.
15 I'm going to ask you about several features of
16 this special exception, and would you please explain whether
17 or not, in your opinion, they constitute a non-inherent
18 characteristic with respect to that characteristic's
19 relationship to air quality under the EPA National Ambient
20 Air Quality Standards? The first, is the gas station's
21 location, immediately adjacent to a loading dock, an
22 inherent or non-inherent characteristic in your opinion, and
23 if so, why?
24 A Well, just --
25 MR. GOECKE: Objection. It's beyond the scope of

Page 216

1 his expertise.
2 MR. GROSSMAN: Is he knowledgeable about gas
3 stations in general so that he could answer questions about
4 inherent and -- what's inherent and non-inherent?
5 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I think we can ask Dr. Cole
6 that question.
7 BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8 Q Dr. Cole, have you been familiar with the
9 testimony in this case regarding the proximity of gas
10 stations in general to loading docks?
11 A Is there testimony on the record on that issue? I
12 was going to answer in the following way --
13 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we have an objection. So you
14 can't answer in the following way until we resolve the
15 objection.
16 THE WITNESS: Okay.
17 MR. GROSSMAN: So the question, the question is,
18 you're asking him what's inherent and non-inherent --
19 MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.
20 MR. GROSSMAN: -- and unless he --
21 MS. ROSENFELD: With --
22 MR. GROSSMAN: -- with respect to gas station
23 special exceptions. So he'd have to have some specialized
24 knowledge of gas station special exceptions, it seems to me,
25 to be able to answer that question as an expert, wouldn't

Page 217

1 he?
2 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it seems to me that what he
3 would have to have is information about whether or not it's
4 unique for a gas station to be located proximate to a
5 loading dock. And I think the testimony both -- the
6 testimony from the land use expert as well as from Costco
7 itself is that this is unusual.
8 MR. GROSSMAN: The question is, in his expertise,
9 is it inherent or non-inherent, and if you're telling me
10 that he has some specialized knowledge in that area, that
11 is, of gas stations and their inherent qualities, that might
12 be something he could answer, but if --
13 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I certainly think it's
14 within his expertise, after having reviewed all of the
15 scientific reports, to have an expert opinion as to the
16 effect of the air emissions and the loading dock and whether
17 or not that's a unique --
18 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think that's within the
19 expertise that he's proffered for. I don't think that --
20 THE WITNESS: I have a, I have a suggestion,
21 Mr. Examiner.
22 MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Hold on one
23 second. I don't think that's within the expertise that he's
24 proffered for. I mean, it's certainly an arguable issue
25 based on testimony regarding land use that's in the record,

1 but I don't know that he can testify as to something,
 2 whether something is inherent or non-inherent based on that.
 3 But I'll tell you what. You can think about it, you can all
 4 think about it overnight, and then tell me what you think in
 5 the morning. How's that?
 6 MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
 7 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
 8 MS. HARRIS: Can we clarify two things, please?
 9 One is, is Mr. Silverman also going to be asking questions
 10 of Dr. Cole?
 11 MR. SILVERMAN: I don't think so.
 12 MS. ADELMAN: No.
 13 MS. HARRIS: Okay. And then second of all, can we
 14 identify with certainty, the -- so the witnesses tomorrow
 15 are Mark --
 16 MS. ROSENFELD: Mark Meszaros and possibly
 17 Ms. Adelman.
 18 MS. HARRIS: Okay.
 19 MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know how long the
 20 cross-examination is going to take. Do we need to line
 21 somebody else up as well, or is that --
 22 MS. HARRIS: No, I think that's fine.
 23 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Anything else --
 24 MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
 25 MR. GROSSMAN: -- before we say good night?

1 (No audible response.)
 2 MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Thank you, sir.
 3 MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.
 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 5 MR. GROSSMAN: Good night. We'll see you tomorrow
 6 morning.
 7 MS. HARRIS: Good night.
 8 MR. GOECKE: Good night. Thank you.
 9 (Whereupon, at 4:48 p.m., the hearing was
 10 adjourned.)
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 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 Wholesale Corporation
 Special Exception No. S-2863
 OZAH No. 13-12

By:

Wendy Campos, Transcriber

	accounts (4) 125:19,21,25;170:7	adding (3) 133:8;208:22;209:9	advice (5) 19:9,17;23:7,14;57:1	119:14;121:11;132:6; 172:18;180:16;209:13; 210:7;213:14
§	accumulation (1) 20:21	addition (3) 170:10,17;214:19	advise (3) 13:6;23:5,18	aimed (1) 195:17
§8 (1) 48:25	accuracy (3) 53:16;114:8;116:5	additional (7) 6:9;57:18;58:2; 63:15;145:3;149:13; 171:4	advisor (1) 46:24	air (122) 15:13,22;16:12,22; 18:14;19:5,10;22:2,3, 22:24;9,9,10,11,13,14; 25:20,20;28:12,16; 31:8;32:9;33:10,21,25; 35:10,17,25;36:17,25; 37:14;38:21;39:3,6,17, 18;41:17;42:12,17; 43:5;47:4;48:4;49:10, 25;53:2,19;54:14,14; 55:8;60:7,7,10,11,15, 19,23;61:11,15,18,18; 62:3,3;63:13,13;68:20, 23;73:25;74:2,7,17; 75:4,20;76:2,7,8;1:17, 18,82;13,19;83:12; 88:9;89:18;90:2,9;1:15; 97:16,23,24;101:12; 102:13,21;103:4; 104:2,3,10,10,11,17; 105:1;107:9,15,22; 120:18;132:23;164:16, 17,18,25;168:2; 189:18;190:20,21; 193:25;195:6,6; 197:19,22;198:23; 200:1;204:21;212:20; 215:19,20;217:16
A	accurate (19) 22:22;53:13;95:18, 24;112:20;113:24; 114:1,3;116:9,11,17; 117:21;133:10;156:5; 161:1,11;163:7; 164:13;172:14	address (3) 13:14,17;106:16	Advisory (1) 189:18	
Abigail (1) 5:23	accurately (6) 78:14;84:2;112:5; 142:12;155:13;166:13	adds (3) 96:8;101:15;189:22	advocate (1) 163:11	
ability (1) 15:9	acknowledge (3) 103:22,22;177:12	ADELMAN (35) 5:23,24,25;6:1,2,13, 13,18,25;51:4;61:24; 69:24;70:4,8;71:2; 100:19;118:2;121:8, 14;123:12;127:19; 130:20,22;131:1; 134:19;135:2,16,18; 136:6;142:24;148:11; 149:3;158:21;218:12, 17	advocating (1) 96:11	
able (11) 7:4,9;19;10:17;28:5; 48:7;56:10;70:25; 120:17;159:10,11; 216:25	acknowledged (8) 84:16,19;128:15; 138:21;155:23;156:12; 161:17;163:4	adequately (2) 25:19;95:22	AERMOD (19) 36:6;37:23;39:12; 51:24;58:17;61:2;96:3; 108:9,10,15,19;109:4, 5,8,15;110:13;147:5; 212:13,16	
ably (1) 5:18	acknowledges (2) 60:23;87:4	adhered (1) 202:13	affected (6) 16:3;67:24;81:15; 101:11;104:17;128:1	
above (11) 100:9;103:9;107:22; 117:9;123:25;124:2; 159:4,21;163:9; 178:19;210:12	acknowledgment (1) 100:23	adjacent (3) 168:25;204:18; 215:21	affect (11) 64:7;74:9;77:15; 101:18;103:3,8;110:9, 17,19;180:20;205:15	
abrupt (1) 121:24	acronym (6) 108:10;128:19,22, 24,25;147:5	adjoining (3) 64:14,21,25	affected (6) 16:3;67:24;81:15; 101:11;104:17;128:1	
absence (2) 165:6,13	Action (3) 20:7;33:20,22	adjourned (1) 219:10	affecting (1) 36:17	
absolutely (8) 16:1;34:15,18;39:5; 47:6;91:7;104:22; 119:3	active (1) 32:5	adjust (6) 113:10;161:10,15, 19;162:17;212:8	affects (4) 22:3;96:5;100:1; 104:16	
absorb (1) 15:10	activity (4) 38:5,6;132:9,14	adjustments (1) 113:18	again (10) 4:14;7:11;87:3,10; 159:5;165:8;168:18; 171:18;196:23;198:1	
absorption (1) 194:8	acts (1) 100:9	Administration (4) 134:24;173:18; 177:14;212:7	against (3) 44:6;121:11;197:20	
academic (1) 14:9	actual (7) 30:10,11;127:7; 132:11;144:4;170:16; 203:17	Administrative (1) 54:20	agencies (1) 186:4	
accept (5) 62:2;67:15;165:6; 183:14;186:25	actually (31) 23:7;28:23;29:7; 31:2,7;32:20,25;37:6; 51:13;52:19;82:23; 85:3;101:19;102:2,6; 114:22;119:16;123:3; 134:8;136:8;137:14; 139:6;154:13;167:22; 168:6,6;173:14;174:7, 15;187:12;201:14	administrator (1) 23:8	agency (8) 18:11,11;19:1,25; 47:15,16;59:3;108:12	
acceptance (2) 67:8,14	ad (4) 106:5,6,7,7	admission (1) 76:14	agency's (1) 130:6	
accepted (3) 16:9;67:20;76:5	add (18) 25:22,24;45:14,15; 96:15;113:11;117:17; 118:17,20;138:20; 161:20;162:24;167:20; 173:24;177:15;195:11; 199:9;208:15	admittedly (1) 103:22	agglomerate (1) 193:7	
accepting (1) 95:19	added (5) 113:15;149:9; 162:18;177:15;191:24	advance (3) 9:17;109:4;129:17	ago (3) 14:10;29:18;56:19	
accident (1) 179:1		advanced (1) 52:13	agree (15) 9:21;11:3;27:21; 75:14;118:25;153:21; 156:19;161:11;163:22; 168:16;171:10;197:18, 22;198:24;199:2	
accommodate (2) 9:23;28:6		advancement (1) 39:14	agreeing (1) 166:24	
accommodating (1) 28:1		advantage (1) 107:17	agreement (2) 7:1;202:17	
according (6) 115:8;122:11,11; 142:15;166:4;178:24		adverse (4) 64:9;74:18;215:11, 13	Agriculture (2) 14:11,13	
account (5) 23:23;80:4;95:22; 143:11;152:11		adversely (2) 64:7;74:9	Ah (3) 6:11;70:18;106:19	
accounted (1) 143:9			ahead (11) 21:7;27:23;63:19;	
accounting (1) 97:7				

<p>74:2;75:4;81:17,18; 90:2;168:2;195:6; 197:22;198:23;212:20; 215:19 American (2) 60:19;108:11 Among (1) 64:5 amortizing (1) 121:8 amount (6) 44:14;130:3,4;151:4; 163:14;170:4 amounts (1) 153:14 ample (1) 8:6 AMS (1) 108:11 analyses (5) 110:20;132:8,15,22; 137:4 analysis (59) 44:13;45:12;66:11; 75:18;76:4,14,16; 80:17;83:10,19;86:13; 92:22;94:8,20;110:18; 111:16;114:13,16; 115:8;130:10;136:25; 141:17;152:18;153:5, 15,24;156:23;159:22; 160:15;164:13,16,24; 165:1,5,7,13;166:19; 167:2;178:18;179:6,7; 180:11;189:20;197:2; 198:6,18;199:10; 202:19,20,22,24;208:5; 209:9;211:16;214:5, 12,13,14,24 analyze (1) 186:13 analyzed (1) 132:13 analyzing (1) 23:20 and/or (1) 172:1 anecdotal (1) 181:9 Angeles (1) 22:19 Anne (1) 19:24 annual (6) 82:4;83:24;97:5; 203:8;210:13;211:12 answered (7) 40:24;75:11,13; 87:11;112:3;176:14; 208:19 anymore (2) 102:7;198:21 apologize (5)</p>	<p>143:2,22;145:3; 146:8;151:2 appalled (1) 47:21 apparently (7) 78:22;88:8;139:18; 146:15;208:7;209:12; 211:25 Appeals (10) 4:4,19,21;11:7; 63:21;64:5;75:19; 83:11;96:23;203:22 appeared (1) 157:10 appears (3) 126:8,20;143:4 applicant (5) 65:25;66:17;67:19; 73:24;74:6 applicants (4) 197:18;198:22; 200:20;206:10 applicant's (2) 66:15;74:16 application (1) 19:18 applications (4) 19:20;22:18;23:3,5 applied (5) 74:23;75:1;79:6; 89:22;112:23 applies (5) 95:2;113:14;183:10, 11;185:14 apply (27) 10:1;28:23;29:1,2; 84:9,20;85:8,12,21,22; 87:1,6;90:3;109:25; 116:23;141:10;179:25; 180:12;181:6,15; 183:13;186:11,12,16; 198:23;199:7;200:19 applying (8) 80:2;179:7;180:7; 181:12;197:22;201:3, 5,6 appointed (1) 19:23 appreciate (3) 109:5;173:16;187:20 approach (7) 87:1;115:11,12; 116:2,8,9;203:4 appropriate (6) 122:21,22;154:10; 165:12;210:19;211:22 approve (1) 23:2 approved (1) 83:17 approximately (1) 127:17 approximation (3)</p>	<p>34:10;78:20;116:13 approximations (1) 114:7 April (2) 4:12;7:5 aquatic (2) 20:21;45:15 arbitrarily (1) 200:19 area (98) 12:7,10;15:19;16:21; 22:15;26:20;46:17,19; 48:6;49:4,9;55:6; 60:21;61:21;64:8;66:3, 11;67:1,10;71:24; 72:16;74:11;76:15; 77:5,5,12;78:14;81:19; 83:15;84:18;87:25; 88:6,10,12,13,13,15; 90:11,22;91:9;98:16; 99:3,6,9;102:10;104:5, 13,17,18,23;105:1; 107:10,10,25;108:1; 109:25;121:20;133:1; 158:2;159:4,4,12,14, 14;160:5,6,6;161:18; 162:9,23;168:24; 169:13;170:1;174:6; 175:14;191:10,11,16, 18;193:22,23,24;194:7, 19;195:15;201:6; 204:16,22;205:9,9,21; 207:4,16;208:11; 211:2;214:23,23; 217:10 areas (10) 12:22;16:8;64:21; 79:3;80:12,12;87:18; 90:20;103:23;182:15 arguable (1) 217:24 argue (4) 95:17;96:9;162:21; 180:4 argued (2) 73:24;74:6 argument (2) 89:22;186:25 arithmetically (1) 113:6 Arm (1) 42:7 around (19) 10:21;31:25;35:6; 81:2,2,2;84:13;88:19; 102:9;120:8;153:11; 160:7,8;168:2;169:15; 178:19;199:25;201:1; 205:12 arrive (1) 95:8 arsenic (5) 45:4,7,9;46:7,11</p>	<p>arterial (1) 141:4 article (1) 22:4 articles (1) 22:8 ascribe (1) 203:12 ash (2) 49:12,12 aside (2) 91:1;94:16 asides (1) 94:18 aspects (1) 69:1 aspersions (1) 143:16 assertion (5) 78:18;85:24;92:18; 156:20;168:16 assess (2) 168:6;194:25 assessment (9) 42:13;43:4;45:20; 48:6,8;49:17;84:24; 200:2,9 assessments (6) 42:11;47:18,21;48:3, 9;199:25 assistant (2) 17:10;23:7 associate (1) 17:11 associated (2) 210:17;215:13 Associates (3) 20:25;21:10;35:14 Association (1) 5:10 assume (6) 89:16;137:22; 141:25;159:23;163:15; 202:8 assumed (6) 6:4;90:9;111:8; 154:23;155:4;172:2 assumes (2) 90:14;109:24 assumption (10) 88:8;91:3,5;93:12, 20,23;110:1,4;153:17, 23 assumptions (15) 89:5;94:24;118:25, 25;119:7;158:9; 161:11;178:7;199:18; 201:25;203:9;210:24, 24;214:3,4 atmosphere (14) 15:2,5,6,9;20:19; 22:25;25:9,17;44:15; 49:15;77:16;102:18;</p>	<p>103:25;104:17 atmospheric (6) 16:11;22:21;23:24; 94:22;100:1;190:4 attempt (2) 71:21;176:19 attempted (2) 205:11,12 attempts (1) 44:16 attend (1) 27:11 attention (2) 12:23;185:22 Attorney (3) 35:22;50:8,15 audible (3) 6:6;11:24;219:1 audience (1) 6:5 auditorium (1) 11:9 August (34) 62:11;69:2,9;71:13, 25,25;112:12;115:18; 123:20;124:14,15,16; 125:1,3;144:16; 147:15,16;148:8,19; 152:6;154:4,15,17; 155:3;156:17;157:2, 10;165:19;166:9,13; 196:6,10,12;202:11 authored (1) 49:24 automobile (1) 4:7 automobiles (4) 24:2;99:4;103:21; 130:5 availability (1) 10:11 available (22) 7:3,8,9,13,16,17,21; 8:18;9:4,7,9;10:8;11:8; 27:3,5;72:15;85:11,22; 86:4,6;212:5;214:23 Avenue (1) 13:19 average (16) 113:3;118:11;123:2, 19,23,24;126:25; 127:1;132:17;137:20; 162:15;170:18,19; 177:25;178:1,11 averaged (1) 123:14 averages (1) 113:11 averaging (6) 82:1,2;91:15,21; 111:13;162:16 avoid (2) 27:6,9</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>award (2) 45:24,25</p> <p>aware (6) 64:15;72:3;92:2,6; 165:11;198:9</p> <p>away (9) 5:15;95:12;99:21; 105:13;153:4;169:14, 14;202:21;203:5</p> <p>axis (5) 177:19,19,21,24; 178:8</p>	<p>10:3;63:25;67:6; 74:1;88:8;89:4,14; 90:4;92:4,5;93:12,16; 105:7,7;110:5;118:23, 24;126:3,4,19;130:2,3; 140:24;153:5;154:25; 157:3,10;158:6,9; 161:23;162:11,15; 168:2;171:6;173:17; 212:6;217:25;218:2</p> <p>baseline (1) 206:4</p> <p>basic (5) 25:10;99:22;101:25; 102:15;172:24</p> <p>basically (4) 19:24;109:24; 159:20;193:11</p> <p>basis (6) 22:9;60:13;75:18; 82:11;83:10;170:4</p> <p>battery (2) 121:12,13</p> <p>bear (1) 106:12</p> <p>Beautiful (1) 98:4</p> <p>beautifully (1) 79:10</p> <p>became (3) 19:17,23;20:6</p> <p>become (5) 48:5;132:8;189:19; 197:17;198:12</p> <p>becomes (2) 122:5,5</p> <p>begin (4) 27:2;176:6;203:2; 210:23</p> <p>beginning (2) 147:3;174:23</p> <p>begun (1) 4:12</p> <p>behalf (2) 4:18;5:1</p> <p>behoove (1) 199:17</p> <p>belabor (1) 198:21</p> <p>bells (1) 110:15</p> <p>below (13) 71:23;74:17;75:20, 23;76:1;95:21;103:8; 123:25;178:20;190:17; 191:14;199:13;210:12</p> <p>benefits (3) 42:13,17,17</p> <p>best (20) 41:9,17,20;54:9; 78:20;80:15,15;86:24; 112:24;114:7,11; 120:20;137:4;156:3;</p>	<p>160:13;198:10,10; 206:9;212:4,5</p> <p>better (8) 10:2;27:13;31:4; 44:15;48:3;103:23; 109:9;143:21</p> <p>beyond (4) 42:12;66:23;181:5; 215:25</p> <p>big (5) 23:12;29:18;178:3; 183:3;198:16</p> <p>bigger (2) 189:7;209:8</p> <p>bill (1) 44:9</p> <p>bird's-eye (1) 99:1</p> <p>bit (11) 18:1;45:11;55:23; 69:17;70:5;71:3,22; 102:9;137:6;209:16; 213:6</p> <p>bits (1) 52:16</p> <p>black-and-white (1) 143:4</p> <p>blame (2) 173:12,14</p> <p>blood (1) 48:24</p> <p>blow (2) 69:17;102:7</p> <p>blowing (1) 107:25</p> <p>blowup (2) 157:19;159:5</p> <p>blue (1) 178:22</p> <p>blue-dashed (1) 137:5</p> <p>Board (17) 4:3,18,21;11:6; 26:21;63:7,21,24;64:5; 75:19;83:10;96:23; 105:10;203:16,21; 205:25;206:24</p> <p>Board's (1) 63:7</p> <p>bodies (1) 20:20</p> <p>body (1) 59:5</p> <p>booked (1) 10:24</p> <p>Boston (2) 46:16,19</p> <p>both (24) 7:16;10:22;14:16; 22:6;45:4,7;46:7; 77:24;81:4,5;83:20; 91:18,24;99:20; 112:14;113:5;125:9;</p>	<p>147:15;157:23;164:14; 166:16;182:18;200:11; 217:5</p> <p>bottleneck (7) 178:23,23;179:24; 180:10;185:16;186:2, 18</p> <p>bottlenecks (2) 178:25;183:21</p> <p>bottles (2) 43:4,4</p> <p>bottom (5) 121:25,25;122:1; 190:9;193:19</p> <p>boundary (3) 16:17;107:18,23</p> <p>box (1) 184:11</p> <p>boxes (1) 106:16</p> <p>Branch (6) 17:23,24;19:10; 23:15;29:12;54:19</p> <p>BRANN (5) 4:24,24,25;70:16,20</p> <p>break (13) 11:18;69:9;82:23; 119:16;120:10,17; 125:24;143:6,25; 144:1,11;187:10,17</p> <p>breakdown (2) 72:21,23</p> <p>breakout (2) 72:1,20</p> <p>breathe (2) 81:17,18</p> <p>breathed (1) 49:13</p> <p>breathing (2) 81:17,24</p> <p>breeze (1) 16:16</p> <p>Breyse (5) 7:8;8:18;9:9,12; 10:17</p> <p>bridge (1) 205:12</p> <p>brief (4) 83:4;97:23;144:25; 188:1</p> <p>briefing (1) 28:4</p> <p>briefly (1) 83:13</p> <p>bring (2) 48:2;83:21</p> <p>bringing (1) 45:5</p> <p>Bryson (2) 15:7,7</p> <p>bubble (3) 102:5,6,8</p> <p>bubbles (3)</p>	<p>102:9,11,12</p> <p>bucks (1) 98:6</p> <p>build (1) 107:12</p> <p>Building (5) 4:17;9:17;101:16,17; 202:19</p> <p>buildings (5) 64:16;101:14; 103:19,20;121:23</p> <p>builds (2) 107:13,18</p> <p>built (3) 12:8;207:6,12</p> <p>bulk (1) 190:11</p> <p>bull's-eye (1) 168:14</p> <p>burden (2) 74:8;75:6</p> <p>burning (1) 20:18</p> <p>bursting (1) 102:11</p> <p>button (2) 98:8;160:1</p> <p>buy (1) 90:15</p>
B				
<p>back (39) 5:13;11:11;14:10; 18:12;21:1;33:1;34:3; 36:20;57:11;59:9;70:4, 23;83:2;84:13;88:8; 90:19;101:22;106:2; 108:6;111:23;117:17; 120:7,14,15;123:4; 130:15;152:2;155:18; 165:1,7;166:22;169:9; 174:21;177:8;180:13; 187:21;189:3;192:14; 197:24</p> <p>back-and-forth (1) 7:2</p> <p>backed (2) 166:19,23</p> <p>background (32) 14:9,24;61:11,13; 90:14,23;95:11; 113:11,11,15,15; 117:17;118:10,21; 126:4,5,10,10;157:7; 161:13,13;162:19,24; 165:23;166:4;202:25; 204:17,21;205:7; 207:4,9;214:20</p> <p>backing (3) 181:10;202:21;203:5</p> <p>backup (2) 6:25;179:9</p> <p>backups (3) 180:2;183:19,22</p> <p>bad (3) 164:18;186:5;209:5</p> <p>Baking (1) 42:8</p> <p>balloons (1) 32:4</p> <p>bar (1) 198:7</p> <p>Barry (3) 47:24,24;48:1</p> <p>bars (1) 197:6</p> <p>base (3) 87:18;93:22;177:12</p> <p>Based (38)</p>	<p>25:10;99:22;101:25; 102:15;172:24</p> <p>19:24;109:24; 159:20;193:11</p> <p>22:9;60:13;75:18; 82:11;83:10;170:4</p> <p>121:12,13</p> <p>106:12</p> <p>98:4</p> <p>79:10</p> <p>19:17,23;20:6</p> <p>48:5;132:8;189:19; 197:17;198:12</p> <p>122:5,5</p> <p>27:2;176:6;203:2; 210:23</p> <p>147:3;174:23</p> <p>4:12</p> <p>4:18;5:1</p> <p>199:17</p> <p>198:21</p> <p>110:15</p> <p>71:23;74:17;75:20, 23;76:1;95:21;103:8; 123:25;178:20;190:17; 191:14;199:13;210:12</p> <p>42:13,17,17</p> <p>41:9,17,20;54:9; 78:20;80:15,15;86:24; 112:24;114:7,11; 120:20;137:4;156:3;</p>	<p>160:13;198:10,10; 206:9;212:4,5</p> <p>10:2;27:13;31:4; 44:15;48:3;103:23; 109:9;143:21</p> <p>42:12;66:23;181:5; 215:25</p> <p>23:12;29:18;178:3; 183:3;198:16</p> <p>189:7;209:8</p> <p>44:9</p> <p>99:1</p> <p>18:1;45:11;55:23; 69:17;70:5;71:3,22; 102:9;137:6;209:16; 213:6</p> <p>52:16</p> <p>143:4</p> <p>173:12,14</p> <p>48:24</p> <p>69:17;102:7</p> <p>107:25</p> <p>157:19;159:5</p> <p>178:22</p> <p>137:5</p> <p>4:3,18,21;11:6; 26:21;63:7,21,24;64:5; 75:19;83:10;96:23; 105:10;203:16,21; 205:25;206:24</p> <p>63:7</p> <p>20:20</p> <p>59:5</p> <p>10:24</p> <p>46:16,19</p> <p>7:16;10:22;14:16; 22:6;45:4,7;46:7; 77:24;81:4,5;83:20; 91:18,24;99:20; 112:14;113:5;125:9;</p>	<p>147:15;157:23;164:14; 166:16;182:18;200:11; 217:5</p> <p>178:23,23;179:24; 180:10;185:16;186:2, 18</p> <p>178:25;183:21</p> <p>43:4,4</p> <p>121:25,25;122:1; 190:9;193:19</p> <p>16:17;107:18,23</p> <p>184:11</p> <p>106:16</p> <p>17:23,24;19:10; 23:15;29:12;54:19</p> <p>4:24,24,25;70:16,20</p> <p>11:18;69:9;82:23; 119:16;120:10,17; 125:24;143:6,25; 144:1,11;187:10,17</p> <p>72:21,23</p> <p>72:1,20</p> <p>81:17,18</p> <p>49:13</p> <p>81:17,24</p> <p>16:16</p> <p>7:8;8:18;9:9,12; 10:17</p> <p>205:12</p> <p>83:4;97:23;144:25; 188:1</p> <p>28:4</p> <p>83:13</p> <p>48:2;83:21</p> <p>45:5</p> <p>15:7,7</p> <p>102:5,6,8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C-2 (1) 4:10</p> <p>c3 (1) 20:8</p> <p>c4 (1) 20:8</p> <p>c4s (1) 20:8</p> <p>cafeteria (1) 119:25</p> <p>calculate (3) 51:18;89:14;123:19</p> <p>calculating (1) 123:2</p> <p>calculation (3) 10:3;124:5;163:23</p> <p>calculations (5) 52:16;123:5,7; 195:12;197:3</p> <p>calendar (4) 8:25;9:22;27:17,22</p> <p>California (1) 44:8</p> <p>call (15) 10:12;13:21;17:6; 35:7;43:8;48:1;121:20; 163:2;177:3;185:22; 192:24;200:4;205:15; 211:17,19</p> <p>called (25) 18:6;20:12;28:19;</p>

29:8;33:4;45:4,24; 46:16;51:12;54:19; 59:4;83:17,18;108:8; 109:17;121:4;129:10; 145:22;148:11;160:12; 178:23;189:2;193:5; 197:8;207:23 calls (1) 167:6 came (9) 42:15;45:8;126:14; 150:18;152:5;162:16; 165:19,24;166:8 campus (1) 16:10 can (108) 6:24;7:17;8:7,16;9:1, 16,18,21,24;10:16,18, 21;11:1,3,15;12:17; 18:10,12;25:2;26:14; 27:23;36:19;37:22; 39:15;41:21;48:9; 49:13;51:18,22,24; 54:10;57:11;60:18; 62:22;69:15,16,17,25; 70:1,4,6;71:1,3,9,9; 72:14;75:3;77:3;81:6; 83:18;91:14;94:17; 95:13;96:1,4,7;98:2; 101:4;103:2,9;106:4,5, 6,23;107:4;108:9; 115:14,17,17;117:8; 120:22,23,25;133:22; 136:8;138:3;140:23; 145:7;154:6;155:19; 156:22;158:24;159:23; 161:4;167:4;169:2; 171:9,18;172:8,25; 173:10,14;174:25; 185:15;186:23;189:3; 193:10;196:16;201:8; 207:1;209:17;210:8; 216:5;218:1,3,3,8,13 Canada (3) 23:10;59:23;60:2 cancer (2) 48:22,24 capacity (9) 39:21;178:1,2,3,5,9, 20,20;184:20 Capital (1) 66:21 car (4) 26:12;90:16,16; 102:5 carbon (2) 173:23;189:13 carcinogens (2) 45:8;194:13 cards (1) 51:22 career (3) 31:22;61:7,14 careful (4) 29:7;136:6,7;200:18 cars (12) 84:19;88:2;162:21; 170:23;174:5;175:20, 21;176:14;181:10,23; 182:4,21 cart (1) 90:19 CASAC (1) 189:19 case (63) 4:22;7:4;10:1;16:14; 21:25;23:8,9;25:15; 26:10;29:11;35:21; 39:13;43:13;44:5; 48:21;53:2;54:1;58:22, 24;59:1;61:4,20;62:9, 12,21;63:1,8,21;64:1,3, 11,19;71:23;72:7; 83:22;87:5,6;89:15,16; 94:19;96:10,14,24,24; 97:15;101:16;103:5,5, 20;114:17;122:9; 128:4;131:11;161:1; 170:4;173:15;186:15; 197:12;199:3;201:18; 203:21;214:19;216:9 cases (17) 29:4;36:24;37:21; 38:6,7,13;49:5;51:21; 56:23;57:4;94:5;95:13; 100:8;101:19;114:6; 116:18,18 casting (1) 143:16 categories (1) 24:18 category (5) 24:22;153:12; 189:15;192:20,23 caught (1) 192:11 caution (2) 113:9;118:24 CCA (1) 45:4 CDC (1) 47:14 cells (1) 109:20 Center (1) 190:3 centers (2) 46:18;47:14 certain (24) 23:24;25:6;34:11; 53:16;68:20,25;69:6; 73:25;75:21;76:12; 84:5;85:7;104:11; 110:19,22,23;111:2,4, 6;118:24;162:11; 203:14;214:3,5 Certainly (12) 12:2;25:5;27:8; 61:13,17;82:25;83:19; 131:6;146:23;215:1; 217:13,24 certainty (1) 218:14 certificate (1) 46:2 certified (1) 60:18 cetera (4) 55:5;81:3;132:18; 182:25 chain (1) 20:21 chairs (1) 5:14 Challenge (1) 45:25 chance (2) 28:5;198:15 change (10) 14:23;15:8;105:8; 110:6,7,25;111:4; 121:25;173:7;178:18 changed (8) 39:3;51:16,21;52:8; 153:23;178:7;214:3,4 changes (10) 39:15;60:24;94:5; 96:18;97:11;109:21; 110:8;132:13,17; 158:10 changing (5) 105:22;110:19,22, 22;111:2 characteristic (3) 112:19;215:18,22 characteristics (11) 15:5;34:12;65:19; 77:15;110:9;188:7,8; 189:1;199:16;215:12, 14 characteristic's (1) 215:18 characterizations (1) 142:12 characterized (1) 80:13 characterizing (1) 78:12 charge (1) 30:14 chart (9) 136:16;150:20; 152:18;174:10;184:3; 185:10,13;192:6,25 charts (2) 183:17;192:3 check (8) 8:25;9:5,14,23;11:5; 86:2,2;126:3 Chemical (7) 44:19,23,24;164:13, 15;194:11;199:15 chemicals (1) 43:21 chemistry (3) 22:21,21;45:25 cherry (2) 176:3;191:20 chief (6) 18:14;19:18;23:16; 29:12,12;53:19 children (1) 45:6 choice (13) 96:2,5,5,7;110:16, 17;111:25;112:15; 116:12;127:13,15; 128:1;156:6 choices (5) 40:20;111:11,17; 116:14,18 choose (4) 75:24;109:25; 112:21;163:13 chose (1) 14:12 chosen (2) 197:19;198:23 Christmas (3) 27:7,8;28:6 chromium (5) 45:4,7,9;46:10,11 chronic (1) 5:13 Church (3) 42:3,4,6 circle (2) 11:10;79:13 circulating (1) 16:17 circulations (1) 22:5 circumstances (8) 31:14;33:11;36:15; 41:13;79:20,22;99:18; 185:15 citation (2) 131:12,14 cited (2) 177:13;197:16 citing (1) 174:4 citizens (1) 54:18 city (2) 22:18;101:13 Civic (1) 5:10 Claggett (5) 150:4,10;156:8; 173:18,19 claim (1) 48:8 claimants (1) 43:14 claimed (1) 43:14 clarification (1) 140:16 clarified (1) 44:25 clarify (2) 18:17;218:8 clarity (1) 212:24 class (1) 127:18 classes (1) 102:4 classified (2) 76:15,18 Clean (11) 20:7,7,12;33:20,21, 22,24;35:10;47:17,25; 189:18 cleaners (1) 43:9 clear (10) 27:17,22;36:10; 68:11;89:22;94:6; 146:1;165:17;208:8; 214:3 cleared (1) 141:24 clearly (3) 69:2;78:23;182:17 clients (1) 21:11 climate (2) 14:23;15:8 climatology (1) 17:13 close (15) 27:19;68:3;77:3; 83:25;127:6;137:25; 154:9;182:15;193:2; 197:14,16;198:13; 199:17;203:8;204:8 closer (1) 78:13 closest (1) 71:17 Club (3) 6:25;64:21;65:17 cluster (1) 48:22 coaching (1) 173:13 coal (4) 20:18;48:22;49:12, 12 coal-burning (1) 49:8 coalesce (1) 193:6

<p>Coalition (5) 5:22,24;6:2;51:1; 61:22</p> <p>coarse (1) 191:11</p> <p>coarser (2) 190:10;194:17</p> <p>coastal (3) 22:2,12;23:11</p> <p>Code (2) 36:4;215:11</p> <p>coefficients (23) 76:16,19,20;78:3; 82:15;83:14;87:6; 103:3,3,24;112:1,6,17, 22;114:10,11;115:11, 15;116:3;158:2;163:6; 210:18,21</p> <p>cogitating (1) 115:21</p> <p>cold (2) 16:18;100:4</p> <p>Cole (74) 6:3,17,21,24;13:12, 13,16,16,17,19,25; 14:6;17:17;20:25; 21:10,24;22:7,7;23:1; 24:8;28:10,11;35:14; 49:23;51:10;62:2,8; 69:21;70:13;71:3,8; 81:6;83:8;89:9;92:2; 94:1;96:13;97:15; 98:19;101:22;111:23; 113:23;120:17;123:2; 127:12;131:8;133:17; 140:16;142:17;143:5; 145:4,15,24,25;146:13; 147:6,20;148:13; 150:19;152:2;157:18; 160:24;165:17;169:23; 177:6;188:6;195:20; 202:5;207:3;213:16; 215:10;216:5,8;218:10</p> <p>Cole's (3) 50:21;73:18;120:2</p> <p>collect (5) 31:7,17;32:25;33:3; 53:1</p> <p>collected (7) 31:23;32:8,12,21; 33:6;52:20;57:1</p> <p>collecting (2) 31:2;32:5</p> <p>collection (2) 33:13,16</p> <p>collective (1) 193:24</p> <p>collectively (1) 46:3</p> <p>College (2) 14:11,13</p> <p>color (3) 105:15;143:11;149:3</p>	<p>column (2) 137:23;138:6</p> <p>combination (5) 59:7;96:22;113:25; 210:24,24</p> <p>comfortable (1) 121:7</p> <p>coming (8) 105:1;158:16;168:4; 176:2;182:21;183:8; 204:16,21</p> <p>comment (1) 63:15</p> <p>commercial (1) 4:11</p> <p>Commission (6) 56:7,16;57:8;59:6,8; 66:21</p> <p>commissioned (1) 54:12</p> <p>common (2) 45:9;184:18</p> <p>communication (2) 46:4,5</p> <p>community (4) 21:11;49:2,3;54:12</p> <p>company (6) 35:16;39:16;42:7; 43:7;46:16;58:16</p> <p>compare (2) 115:17,17</p> <p>compared (2) 158:3;161:21</p> <p>comparing (4) 43:3,4;136:25;165:1</p> <p>comparison (5) 103:13;104:23; 157:25;166:20;200:12</p> <p>comparisons (1) 115:19</p> <p>compatible (1) 51:24</p> <p>competing (1) 44:8</p> <p>complete (3) 7:4;72:4;165:13</p> <p>complex (8) 25:16;36:13,13; 40:22;48:21;49:10; 79:1;94:23</p> <p>complexity (1) 177:3</p> <p>compliance (1) 133:5</p> <p>complicated (4) 37:12;60:25;100:3; 122:23</p> <p>complicating (1) 104:2</p> <p>comply (1) 132:23</p> <p>composition (1) 189:11</p>	<p>compound (2) 119:8;197:9</p> <p>compounding (3) 177:4;183:7;186:22</p> <p>computation (1) 40:4</p> <p>computer (14) 29:8,16,17;30:25; 36:11;40:3;51:11,13, 16;52:5,7,10,15;100:24</p> <p>computers (1) 52:14</p> <p>computing (1) 39:21</p> <p>conceded (1) 140:8</p> <p>concentrated (6) 42:14,16,20;99:14; 171:21;190:10</p> <p>concentration (13) 88:24;89:15;90:14; 99:12;101:20;105:17, 24;108:20,21;117:4, 10;166:25;167:19</p> <p>concentrations (50) 67:7;69:6;71:16; 73:8;76:22;81:21,22; 83:20;84:3;90:22;92:4, 5,8,20;97:10;99:3,5,18, 20;100:10,11;102:15, 16,17;103:24;107:6, 15;108:24;110:2; 112:25;113:1,24; 115:13;148:13;157:4; 160:16,21;161:5,5; 165:2,2;166:25; 167:20;169:16;172:17; 195:24;196:2,3; 210:12;212:8</p> <p>concept (2) 117:13;200:24</p> <p>concepts (1) 93:4</p> <p>conceptual (4) 176:9;177:1,2; 191:22</p> <p>concern (4) 127:12;170:1; 173:23;214:7</p> <p>concerned (4) 45:14;95:10;201:2; 202:20</p> <p>concerning (1) 97:12</p> <p>concerns (2) 45:5;111:24</p> <p>conclude (3) 75:19;82:11;83:11</p> <p>conclusion (3) 76:9;83:14;163:1</p> <p>conclusions (6) 25:13;45:22;78:2; 87:18;185:23;213:19</p>	<p>condensation (1) 193:3</p> <p>condense (1) 194:9</p> <p>condenses (1) 194:11</p> <p>condensing (1) 193:4</p> <p>condition (1) 200:25</p> <p>conditions (10) 22:23;23:22;41:13; 141:3;142:13;200:24; 205:8;207:24;208:1; 209:10</p> <p>conduct (6) 28:15;29:6;37:4,6; 40:8;211:15</p> <p>conducted (4) 4:18;32:2;38:21; 60:15</p> <p>conference (1) 10:12</p> <p>confess (1) 191:19</p> <p>confirm (3) 9:1;10:17;126:3</p> <p>conflate (2) 92:22;93:4</p> <p>conflict (2) 5:12;9:21</p> <p>confused (2) 66:14;141:22</p> <p>confusion (4) 18:22;67:2;137:2; 141:21</p> <p>congestion (17) 87:22,25;88:2;95:23; 150:5,5;169:24; 172:15;177:11,14; 180:18;183:9;184:20; 185:24;186:3,4,4</p> <p>connect (1) 16:4</p> <p>connection (1) 34:1</p> <p>conservancy (1) 95:12</p> <p>conservation (1) 169:21</p> <p>conservatism (8) 94:24;96:10,11,20; 111:15;202:19,19,22</p> <p>conservative (18) 76:20;95:9,15,16,22, 23;112:16;114:16; 115:10,12,13;116:2,8; 153:23;165:7,9; 199:18;201:25</p> <p>conservatively (1) 155:7</p> <p>consider (8) 26:19;27:20;58:18; 133:10;154:10;174:17; 187:1;201:17</p> <p>considerable (1) 130:6</p> <p>considerably (1) 139:15</p> <p>consideration (2) 87:21;179:10</p> <p>considered (2) 31:13;190:17</p> <p>considering (5) 92:19;155:13;163:5; 179:7;201:5</p> <p>considers (1) 137:4</p> <p>consistent (1) 115:3</p> <p>constitute (1) 215:17</p> <p>construct (1) 4:6</p> <p>construction (3) 12:14;132:16;179:2</p> <p>consultant (1) 44:23</p> <p>consulted (1) 60:17</p> <p>consulting (3) 21:10;61:7,14</p> <p>contact (2) 27:21;45:7</p> <p>contain (2) 189:21;200:15</p> <p>contained (2) 45:4;46:7</p> <p>containing (1) 190:12</p> <p>contaminants (3) 73:4;100:12;194:9</p> <p>contaminated (1) 43:11</p> <p>contaminating (1) 43:10</p> <p>contamination (3) 20:17;34:1;50:4</p> <p>content (2) 44:11;45:11</p> <p>contention (3) 75:2;97:3;165:6</p> <p>continue (1) 82:23</p> <p>continuing (1) 203:25</p> <p>contracted (1) 67:11</p> <p>contrary (2) 96:25;160:22</p> <p>contribute (3) 193:19,20;197:11</p> <p>contributed (1) 191:25</p> <p>contributors (1) 71:20</p>
--	---	--	---

contribution (2) 71:15;72:7	143:4	crestfallen (1) 121:4	106:1	169:16
contributions (3) 71:10;214:14,15	correlating (1) 143:3	criteria (1) 121:21	data (32) 30:24,24;31:2,2,7,9, 17,17,23;32:5,8,12,21, 24;33:2,3,6,15;51:23; 52:20;53:2;84:15; 85:14;86:8,17,23; 111:12;114:6;130:4; 211:25;212:5;213:18	deemed (2) 60:20;172:14
contributor (1) 22:6	correlation (1) 140:19	critic (1) 47:16	database (1) 49:6	deep (2) 122:14;194:21
Control (1) 47:14	Costco (12) 4:3,24;5:2,5,22,24; 12:7;153:24;168:3; 170:3;211:15;217:6	critical (17) 23:9;24:24;25:9,12; 37:15,24;38:7,16;82:6; 94:11;128:3;130:12; 131:10;197:17;198:19; 199:11;214:6	databases (1) 40:21	deeply (4) 95:10;97:11;202:20; 203:13
controversial (1) 148:1	Costco's (2) 66:15;170:16	cross (2) 56:13;99:16	date (4) 7:9,13;10:5;28:6	default (4) 85:14,15,16;212:3
convective (1) 109:14	Council (8) 4:16;84:6;85:9,11, 23;86:3,18;189:18	cross-examination (3) 174:23,25;218:20	dated (1) 12:20	defaults (2) 211:25;212:1
convenient (2) 8:17;9:20	counsel (1) 173:13	cross-examine (3) 56:11;57:24;175:1	dates (17) 7:1,2,22,22;8:7;9:5, 10,20;10:3,14;11:3,5,6; 27:3,4,21;28:4	deficiencies (2) 94:2;96:21
conveniently (1) 16:24	country (2) 7:10;48:22	cross-examined (5) 55:4;56:11,11;60:1,1	dating (2) 7:23,24	defies (2) 169:19,20
conversion (5) 155:14;164:15,18; 165:12;202:25	counts (6) 6:20;170:8,13,14,16; 190:14	crude (1) 101:3	David (2) 23:8;38:9	defined (2) 65:24;66:9
convert (1) 40:21	county (2) 21:13;204:8	CSI (4) 44:19,20,22;46:1	day (9) 4:2;10:18;27:9;71:1; 132:10;143:19;160:17; 209:25;210:2	definitely (1) 35:1
converted (2) 24:3;153:19	couple (3) 27:9;94:3;170:23	cubic (9) 71:20;119:2,5; 126:10;127:5;161:21; 163:9;168:11;193:25	days (9) 8:4,5,6;28:1;29:7,18; 52:1;60:23;129:17	definition (9) 65:25;66:2,16,17,22; 67:15,18;68:2;81:9
coordinating (1) 8:25	coupled (1) 161:9	curiosity (1) 25:7	de (2) 67:8,14	definitions (2) 81:8;191:2
copies (4) 6:21;129:17;143:6; 144:14	course (6) 16:13;61:6;102:11; 146:5;162:20;202:5	current (6) 53:11;61:18,18; 70:20;87:22;133:11	deal (8) 17:2;94:23;95:25; 96:13;110:7,8,10; 198:16	DeGrace (1) 6:19
copper (6) 45:11,14,15,16,17; 46:7	courses (1) 17:13	currently (2) 53:10;190:8	deals (2) 155:3,3	delay (3) 177:21;180:10;186:2
copy (12) 11:15;12:5;69:23; 124:24;129:24;136:12; 143:4,11,15;144:2,4; 146:4	court (5) 54:17,19,24;59:19; 60:19	curriculum (2) 14:12,17	dealing (8) 25:16;48:17;72:7; 114:3;140:24;141:3; 199:10,19	Delays (3) 179:13,13,15
Cordry (3) 5:11;8:24;180:2	couscous (1) 191:21	curve (18) 178:22,23,23;180:8, 11;181:3;183:10,10,12, 13;184:17;185:16; 186:8,12,15,18;190:10; 191:9	dealt (1) 19:10	delivered (1) 43:23
co-recipient (1) 45:24	cover (3) 94:25;177:9;209:16	curves (5) 152:21;178:21,22, 25;179:25	dear (1) 121:14	delivery (1) 87:24
corner (1) 23:16	coverage (2) 43:14,25	curve's (1) 180:10	debate (1) 47:23	demonstrate (3) 61:20;127:2;166:20
Corporation (1) 4:3	covered (1) 187:24	cut (4) 37:25;40:17;41:4,7	decayed (1) 43:21	demonstration (1) 160:14
corporations (4) 21:12;41:24;46:9,12	covering (1) 208:6	cutoff (1) 191:1	December (5) 4:15;27:4,12,14,16	density (2) 109:18;167:3
corrected (5) 126:17;157:7,13; 161:4;203:1	covers (2) 189:4,16	cycle (1) 132:9	decided (2) 151:25;212:1	deny (1) 23:2
correcting (1) 163:3	covert (1) 155:6	cycles (1) 132:18	decision (3) 4:22;201:11;210:6	departing (1) 210:17
correction (14) 84:23;86:25;87:2,7; 95:11;113:12,13; 155:25;161:16,22; 162:11,22;165:10; 212:6	Create (2) 106:12;146:11	D		
corrections (2) 85:2,2	created (1) 215:14	daily (3) 178:1,2,11	decision-making (1) 195:16	depend (1) 178:19
correctly (7) 6:20;12:5;71:12,14; 105:14;116:10;163:17	creates (1) 183:9	darker (5) 99:9,14;105:4,19;	decisions (1) 46:25	depending (3) 81:12;170:25;203:9
correlate (1)	creating (2) 29:13;204:1		decrease (1)	depends (3) 100:4;164:2;174:22
	credible (1) 132:15			deposition (2) 20:20;194:8
	credit (3) 44:10;107:24;108:14			depth (2) 122:8,13
	Creek (1) 32:1			describe (2) 185:16,19
				described (5) 65:23;66:3,8,24; 78:25
				describes (1)

<p>183:18 describing (1) 78:14 description (4) 25:19;53:10;66:12; 129:9 descriptive (1) 6:14 designate (1) 56:16 designated (1) 60:11 detail (5) 88:6;97:25;103:11; 112:4;209:7 detailed (1) 114:5 details (1) 110:15 detergent (2) 42:14,15 detergents (1) 42:16 determination (2) 115:9;161:4 determine (4) 53:15;69:5;100:14; 115:5 determining (1) 76:13 develop (1) 30:24 developed (3) 22:11;28:19,21 developing (2) 30:24;31:1 deviations (1) 197:7 devil (1) 110:14 devil's (1) 163:11 diagram (10) 79:11;100:10;105:3, 10;117:5,6;177:12,20; 191:6;199:14 diagrams (2) 154:25;191:20 dialogue (1) 95:8 diameter (2) 193:15,23 dichotomy (1) 140:20 died (1) 49:6 diesel (1) 173:24 diesels (1) 167:3 differ (1) 115:16 difference (23)</p>	<p>83:13;103:15; 115:14;116:5,9;117:6; 124:21;125:20,22; 126:1;127:23;132:4; 138:12,17,21;139:16; 152:11;156:19;163:4, 17;167:7;191:13; 194:15 differences (5) 16:19;128:14; 137:15;143:9;152:22 different (27) 24:17;39:7;49:1; 51:19;55:23;61:4;79:6, 6;101:11;137:3; 142:22;144:3;155:2, 12;157:2;164:3; 170:14;182:21;185:15; 188:25;189:9,10; 191:2;199:15;202:23; 208:18;214:2 difficult (6) 77:12;137:6;186:3; 211:24;213:17,25 dig (1) 214:5 diligent (1) 80:17 dilution (1) 102:21 dim (1) 70:6 diminishing (1) 99:21 dioxide (1) 128:2 dire (10) 17:7;21:16,19,20,21; 27:2;28:8;47:1;51:1; 53:3 DIRECT (2) 14:4;78:4 direct- (1) 60:1 direction (4) 19:20;50:18;104:11; 122:12 directly (7) 16:3;17:8;20:4;73:8; 79:5;189:24;195:10 director (2) 20:7;47:23 disagree (8) 76:24;77:7;78:7; 81:4;84:9;85:10,20; 163:22 disagreeing (1) 166:24 disagreement (1) 202:17 discipline (1) 25:7 discontinuities (1)</p>	<p>109:24 discounting (1) 183:23 discrete (1) 73:14 discretion (1) 78:25 discuss (2) 202:6;209:6 discussed (2) 64:19;200:14 discussing (2) 94:12;140:20 discussion (3) 103:2;180:2;202:16 Disease (2) 47:14,16 disinfectant (1) 45:10 disperse (3) 100:13;104:25;105:5 disperses (2) 105:23;109:2 dispersion (35) 15:22;22:10;25:17; 76:16,18,18,19;77:18; 78:2;79:19;82:14;87:5; 97:9,24;100:1;101:19; 102:1;103:4,23; 107:16,23,24;109:6; 112:1,6,17;122:22; 138:11;140:21;142:4; 163:6;164:14;169:9; 196:14;210:18 dispersions (1) 143:17 dispute (3) 68:16;140:9;181:24 disputed (1) 140:13 disputes (1) 54:18 dissertation (1) 14:22 distance (3) 107:14,19;201:19 distinction (6) 65:1,7;117:9;154:14; 163:19;201:7 distinctions (1) 141:13 distinguish (1) 150:7 distinguished (2) 153:3;201:4 distributed (1) 11:14 distribution (4) 109:8;132:10;189:6, 25 disturbing (1) 203:13 Divide (2)</p>	<p>118:18;167:7 divided (1) 89:17 dividing (1) 178:2 division (5) 19:10;29:8;35:22; 51:12;53:19 doable (1) 212:3 dock (24) 79:4;158:7,8,12,15, 17,25;159:9,11,16,18, 21;166:18,20,21,23; 167:1,2;168:22;183:3, 4;215:21;217:5,16 docks (3) 153:24;183:8;216:10 doctor (2) 47:7;55:11 document (2) 72:14;149:17 documentation (1) 94:5 documented (1) 129:10 documents (2) 83:24;145:4 dog (1) 129:14 done (48) 29:8,15,21;33:9,17; 34:6;35:4,17;37:5,24, 24;38:12;39:6,8;40:13; 42:11;47:22;51:11,17, 25;52:10;54:11;61:14; 71:15;72:13,21,23; 76:4,16;88:25,25;89:3, 16;95:13;96:1;102:4; 117:14;118:4;157:11; 160:18;163:22;165:5, 10,14;208:5,5,6;215:1 Donna (1) 5:14 door (1) 144:20 Dop (2) 55:15,16 dosage (1) 92:23 dots (1) 16:5 doubt (2) 25:8;52:7 Dow (2) 44:23,23 down (12) 36:15;99:1;107:21; 137:7,9;144:13; 166:23;167:6;174:2; 199:18;212:22,23 downstairs (1) 11:9</p>	<p>downwind (5) 104:11,24;122:4,15; 169:16 Dr (85) 5:25;6:2,3,13,13,17, 18,21,24;7:8;8:18;9:9, 12,13;10:16;13:12,16; 14:6;17:17;21:24; 22:14;23:1;24:8;28:10, 11;47:24;49:23;50:21; 51:10;55:14,15,16; 62:2,8;69:21;70:13; 71:3,8;73:18;81:6; 83:8;89:9;92:2;94:1; 96:13;97:15;98:19; 100:19;101:22;111:23; 113:23;120:2,17; 123:2;127:12;131:8; 133:17;140:16;142:17; 143:5;145:4,15,24,25; 146:13;147:6,20; 148:13;150:19;152:2; 157:18;160:24;165:17; 169:23;173:18;177:6; 188:6;195:20;202:5; 207:3;213:16;215:10; 216:5,8;218:10 draw (3) 106:3,9,20 drilling (1) 14:14 driver's (1) 26:3 driving (7) 26:4,12,12;132:9,18; 140:4;142:12 Dropbox (1) 11:14 dry (2) 43:9;111:8 Duckett (1) 5:12 due (1) 178:25 during (12) 6:22;18:2;19:6; 22:23;30:12;51:10; 69:4;87:22,23;124:21; 126:14;202:5 dust (1) 49:12 Dwight (3) 42:3,5,6 dynamic (1) 14:25 dynamics (1) 109:16</p>
E				
<p>earlier (12) 5:15;41:23;84:12; 109:7;115:2;123:3,16;</p>				

<p>151:6;160:24;166:19; 196:19;212:12 earliest (1) 20:17 early (4) 11:12;34:9;39:8; 203:5 earned (1) 14:21 earth (4) 14:14;15:11;16:11; 17:12 easier (2) 51:20,25 easily (1) 120:4 east (2) 101:17,17 Eastman (1) 36:16 Eastman's (1) 35:24 Eastport (1) 23:11 easy (2) 28:25;213:17 edge (2) 104:13;214:11 educational (1) 61:11 effect (21) 15:20,21;16:15; 43:15;58:20;74:18; 83:19;99:7,7;102:14; 104:6,20;120:18; 155:12;159:8,10; 160:15,20;172:3; 183:7;217:16 effects (6) 38:11;64:9;177:4; 189:9;215:11,13 efficient (3) 10:15;175:21;176:15 eight-hour (1) 82:3 eighty-eight (2) 118:22;123:18 either (12) 7:15;11:18;15:10; 95:20;96:3;117:7; 135:18;143:10;151:13; 198:7;203:8;212:4 Eleanor (1) 5:12 electronic (2) 12:5;44:18 Electronics (2) 44:4,7 electroscope (1) 191:19 element (1) 128:3 elements (1)</p>	<p>103:7 elevated (1) 141:7 eliminate (1) 137:2 eliminated (3) 159:20;163:19; 168:22 else (13) 6:5;12:22;26:8; 56:20;99:25;109:5; 114:11;164:16;189:2; 190:20;198:25;218:21, 23 elsewhere (1) 64:10 e-mail (8) 6:12,14,16,18,21; 10:14,17;63:11 emission (15) 34:11;95:21;108:20; 128:21;130:5;137:20; 140:25;152:9;153:4; 155:4;172:16;174:8, 16;180:25;210:14 emissions (69) 22:20;38:11;43:6; 81:19;83:16,18;84:1,2, 3;87:21;88:3,5;89:18; 92:23;94:21;95:20,23; 97:8;99:4;108:21; 115:25;128:12;129:4, 11;130:7;132:11; 133:1,11,18;137:8; 138:11;140:25;142:7; 152:17;155:7,25; 156:5,7;158:6,8,12; 159:9,16;166:14,15,23; 167:2,5;170:5;172:4; 174:1;176:2,23; 180:20;183:4,14; 184:24;185:5,6,7; 188:7;189:21;195:4,4; 200:10;203:3;205:13; 212:9;217:16 emitted (1) 153:18 emitting (2) 174:13;175:15 emphasize (2) 45:19;110:14 employee (1) 88:21 end (4) 10:18;64:10;117:20; 202:8 ending (1) 202:10 energy (2) 15:1;59:7 engaged (1) 20:9 engine (1)</p>	<p>132:10 engines (1) 182:9 enlarge (1) 70:13 enormous (1) 130:4 enough (3) 9:17;10:21;28:7 enrolled (1) 14:11 ensure (1) 132:24 entering (3) 179:9;181:11;182:12 entire (2) 64:21;214:11 entirely (2) 61:4;185:14 entrance (1) 182:20 entrances (4) 168:9;182:14,24; 214:20 envelope (1) 88:9 environment (5) 12:19;15:15;45:15, 16;59:7 environmental (16) 16:11;17:13;20:25; 21:10;42:11,13;43:3; 44:5,6;45:13,20;46:5, 22;49:17;108:12; 121:13 EPA (82) 17:22;18:4;19:4,13; 22:6,6,9;23:1,8;28:12; 30:12;31:24;32:5,8,13, 18,18,22,24;33:20; 34:17;35:11,18,18; 38:21;39:8;40:10; 51:11;52:12;53:19; 61:3,5;74:1,7;75:20; 76:1,11,13,17,23,25; 77:1;78:8,11;79:7,8,9, 18;80:2,13;82:20; 83:12;88:24;89:24; 90:2;91:20;92:2;95:21; 96:25;108:12;115:3; 117:9;123:25;129:3,6, 10,20;130:5;132:22; 137:3;141:9;142:15; 163:2;188:9,16,19; 189:18;210:13;212:7, 9,18;215:19 EPA-funded (1) 33:18 EPA's (11) 18:14;45:25;75:3; 83:17;121:21;129:8; 133:11;156:3;210:17; 211:6;212:8</p>	<p>epidemiologist (1) 47:11 equation (1) 118:10 equations (1) 197:9 Erich (1) 4:24 erode (1) 107:13 err (4) 94:23;114:15;195:2; 199:19 error (9) 114:17;149:13; 157:7,12;196:21; 197:6;198:7,7;202:25 errors (7) 94:9,25;150:14; 186:23;197:8,9;210:23 especially (2) 87:22;186:12 essential (1) 169:8 essentially (7) 12:6;51:17;53:18; 168:15;172:18,21; 175:5 establish (1) 207:4 established (2) 64:10;202:14 estate (2) 46:16,18 estimate (4) 30:13;71:15;117:20; 120:2 estimated (1) 183:16 estimates (2) 156:6;170:16 estimating (3) 83:16;117:21;148:12 et (4) 55:5;81:3;132:18; 182:25 evaluate (1) 213:18 evaluated (2) 31:17;32:24 evaluating (2) 67:23;214:1 evaluator (1) 214:1 even (14) 9:21;16:12;78:11; 87:4;102:7;118:11; 139:6;163:8;188:7; 195:9;197:9;198:17; 199:13;201:5 event (5) 11:2;47:23;149:13; 153:14;201:7</p>	<p>everybody (4) 8:3;9:21,24;69:22 everyday (1) 26:17 everyone (3) 26:8;56:12;69:25 evidence (43) 4:20;25:12;43:17; 45:19,21;49:14;55:18; 64:1;83:22;91:2,12; 92:19;97:3,6;112:23; 128:4,13,13;133:22; 140:9;156:8;160:21; 170:18;171:1,5,6,7,14, 17,17,25;172:13; 175:22;176:12;186:13; 187:1,5;195:4;197:15; 212:6;214:17,17,22 evidences (1) 43:24 evidentiary (1) 93:22 exact (4) 29:5;104:23;153:7; 211:25 exactly (10) 30:3;79:8;93:6; 101:10;111:17;118:5; 127:8;170:24;185:9; 214:4 EXAMINATION (2) 14:4;25:12 examine (1) 31:9 examined (1) 17:7 Examiner (6) 4:20;14:8;24:19; 62:16;209:21;217:21 example (26) 16:16;23:24;48:6,10; 49:3;54:9;79:4;82:6; 84:18;88:20;110:18; 112:25;113:14;115:18; 132:15;141:4,6; 164:16;177:4;189:20; 191:15;194:9,10; 197:5;202:24;213:3 examples (6) 32:11,20;39:15,15; 53:24;132:16 exams (1) 14:23 exceed (2) 74:1,7 exceedance (6) 83:23;95:12;202:21, 21,25;211:3 exceedances (3) 97:11;201:19;203:2 exceeded (2) 97:4,5 exceeding (3)</p>
--	---	---	--	--

197:14;203:8;211:1 exceeds (1) 159:14 except (1) 66:10 exception (7) 4:5;50:7;72:16; 75:19;83:11;206:13; 215:16 exceptions (2) 216:23,24 excerpt (2) 149:15,17 exchange (2) 63:12,18 exchanges (1) 10:14 exciting (1) 12:21 Excuse (6) 17:18;34:23;150:1; 164:8;177:6;208:14 executive (2) 54:18;124:10 exercised (1) 80:10 exhibit (30) 6:10;12:4,15,19,24; 50:20;69:22;71:8; 98:20,24;114:18; 124:17,19;125:3; 129:14;134:1;135:20; 136:13,22;144:3,5; 145:13,17,25;146:11; 147:18,23;149:16,16; 173:20 exhibits (4) 6:9;13:5;62:17; 150:8 exist (1) 61:2 existence (1) 195:11 existing (5) 39:12;207:24;208:1, 11;209:10 exit (2) 182:14,17 exiting (1) 182:12 exits (4) 168:9;182:23,25; 214:21 expand (1) 58:16 expect (3) 120:4;148:13;214:14 expected (1) 209:19 expense (1) 207:15 experience (5) 26:8,17;196:20;	199:24;212:18 experiences (1) 15:14 experimental (1) 45:19 expert (32) 24:8;26:24,25;48:8; 53:22,25;54:3,21; 55:19;56:4,12,17,21; 57:4;59:15;60:7,11,19, 21;61:7,16,21;62:2,3; 81:16;86:15;153:11; 171:15;194:20;216:25; 217:6,15 expertise (12) 19:3;25:19;41:9,21; 47:4;55:6;60:9;216:1; 217:8,14,19,23 experts (4) 7:22;8:3;55:13; 199:12 explain (21) 14:8;18:1;81:7; 85:16;88:1;89:9;103:2; 104:7;108:9;112:4; 138:1;140:23;152:4; 156:22;172:11;177:20; 189:1;206:8;212:1,10; 215:16 explained (2) 51:10;79:11 explains (1) 160:4 explanation (4) 86:8;159:23;160:13; 173:11 exponential (3) 137:9;186:2,7 exposed (8) 88:9,11,12,13;89:17; 90:10,24;200:11 exposure (7) 89:5;91:6,19;92:4,5, 23;93:12 exposures (2) 91:16,17 extended (1) 66:22 extends (1) 162:10 extensive (2) 61:11,13 extra (3) 143:6;146:12;184:10	15:20;39:13;43:17; 45:19;72:11,15;80:4; 90:15,21;95:5;96:25; 97:10;113:2;118:10; 155:13;160:19;169:20; 174:2;180:17;195:10; 200:14;205:21;207:23; 214:18 facto (2) 67:8,14 factor (41) 23:12;82:6;84:24; 95:20;103:4;104:2; 113:12,13;127:16; 128:5;137:14,15,20,24; 138:18,18;139:7,9,10; 152:15,23,24;153:15; 155:6,24,25;156:7,10, 12,18;161:9,17,19,23; 162:12,18,23;167:4; 183:15;201:1;210:16 factors (10) 86:25;87:2,7;91:20; 110:3;132:9;195:11; 209:7;210:14;212:6 factual (1) 171:11 faculty (1) 15:16 fair (12) 28:7;32:7;34:13; 38:20,23;78:1,24; 112:14;181:13;187:19; 200:20,20 fairly (4) 99:4;167:14;169:2; 172:6 fall (5) 74:17;75:20,23;76:1; 77:18 falls (1) 192:23 familiar (11) 40:4;48:5;61:18; 62:20;63:3,6;64:2,13; 65:17;149:1;216:8 familiarized (1) 36:11 family (1) 63:14 far (11) 9:17;33:24,25;44:15; 141:3;143:14;153:4; 154:5;158:3;210:8; 211:2 fascinating (1) 43:12 fashion (1) 80:3 fast (4) 153:5;164:19;165:4; 170:23 faster (5)	102:1;105:23;109:2; 161:23;162:22 fat (1) 12:15 favor (2) 78:2;112:13 favorable (1) 202:18 feared (1) 204:1 feasible (1) 212:3 features (1) 215:15 February (7) 7:12;8:2;9:5;10:5; 11:4;54:2;56:24 federal (14) 21:12;74:1,7;82:20; 130:14;131:3,14,18; 134:24;173:18;177:13; 185:13,23;186:12 feel (8) 37:11;93:21;96:18, 19;97:2;143:19; 184:15;203:3 feeling (1) 146:7 feels (1) 112:20 feet (3) 65:15;169:14,14 felt (6) 49:16;54:13;77:18; 86:17;114:11;205:7 few (5) 6:8;7:2;47:3;49:24; 151:4 fewer (3) 141:3;158:9,9 field (8) 15:8;17:12;24:8,9; 35:8;47:25;55:13; 114:5 fields (1) 22:22 fight (1) 68:17 figure (51) 24:1;90:4;114:18,24; 123:16,20,23;124:10, 18,19;125:1,15;126:9; 133:23,24,25;134:1,9, 9,9,11,14;135:5,8,9,10, 12,16,17,18,20;136:1, 18,22;156:15,16;157:3, 6,19;158:5;159:5; 165:24;166:3,8;169:3, 17;173:17;187:1; 196:5,7,12 figures (11) 73:12,15;80:25; 98:22;101:23;113:10;	117:1;153:7;157:2; 208:21;210:25 figuring (1) 130:16 file (1) 33:5 files (1) 6:13 fill (1) 181:16 filling (1) 4:7 final (3) 49:21;83:25;210:10 finally (1) 53:21 financial (1) 18:18 find (15) 10:10;22:7;61:25; 64:6;86:3;88:7;103:10; 106:18;128:23;155:17; 160:18;180:7;181:11; 190:13;213:18 findings (5) 25:13;63:22;64:5; 67:6;81:2 finds (1) 155:19 fine (7) 8:14;11:18;82:25; 117:8;189:8;202:24; 218:22 finish (7) 8:7;9:25;38:4;42:22, 24;90:1;174:24 finished (2) 17:5;82:16 finishing (1) 40:25 firm (5) 21:11;37:11;38:9; 39:20;40:1 first (24) 11:8;13:9;42:16; 43:2;48:17;80:9;82:14; 85:19;86:20;87:13; 95:7;98:25;111:25; 114:2,8;124:5;130:15; 131:13;149:4;157:3; 176:22;186:1;204:13; 215:20 firsthand (1) 170:6 fish (1) 45:16 fit (4) 6:24;9:24;36:14; 178:5 fits-all (1) 153:17 five (12) 19:21,22;28:1;33:2;
	F			
	facet (1) 49:15 facility (4) 35:24,25;54:15; 132:25 fact (24)			

49:5,6;51:23;71:20; 88:23;118:22;123:18; 169:18 five-minute (2) 82:23;187:10 flat (2) 139:18,24 flawed (2) 54:15;206:10 Fleet (1) 137:20 flexible (1) 10:21 floor (2) 4:16;11:7 flow (1) 122:4 flowing (1) 104:12 fluid (1) 104:3 fluids (1) 104:7 fluorescent (2) 44:9,16 focus (4) 15:8;55:21;71:3; 132:21 folks (2) 10:12;181:10 follow (12) 76:12,23;78:8,16,17; 80:22;84:16;85:1;87:7; 211:5,5,22 followed (6) 49:19;78:15;79:11; 80:9,25;211:16 following (9) 8:5,6;32:1;76:17; 78:11;79:7;163:2; 216:12,14 follow-up (1) 51:7 food (3) 20:21;119:22,24 food-chain (1) 20:20 forensic (1) 43:8 forget (2) 153:7;159:13 forgetting (2) 46:15;56:22 forgot (1) 70:18 form (5) 40:22;51:16;84:12; 175:6;193:6 formation (1) 23:25 formed (1) 35:13 forming (2)	35:16;193:4 formula (2) 148:13;165:18 formulations (1) 137:1 forward (2) 98:19;144:1 found (4) 43:24;79:15;211:24; 213:25 founded (2) 21:9;25:7 four (2) 43:16;53:24 fourth (1) 88:7 fraction (1) 167:8 framework (3) 177:1,23;178:20 frankly (5) 93:17;160:21;203:4, 4;214:12 free-for-all (2) 56:14,15 freely (1) 175:22 freeway (1) 141:7 freeze (1) 19:24 frequency (1) 109:20 frequent (1) 122:12 Friday (2) 4:15;8:13 Friesland (1) 54:14 front (1) 124:23 fueled (1) 22:13 full (12) 11:10;13:14;14:24; 19:13;70:3;107:17,24; 143:11;147:24;163:14; 209:25;210:2 fuller (1) 176:19 fumes (3) 20:19;43:10,11 fumigation (1) 22:4 fun (2) 44:3,3 function (3) 23:19;100:7;109:18 Fund (8) 20:7,8,13;33:21,24; 47:17;48:1,25 funded (2) 31:24;47:13	funding (1) 18:11 further (10) 22:11;27:4;47:1; 59:17;60:4;92:20; 104:18;105:13;176:12; 185:20 future (1) 7:1 fuzzy (3) 198:1,3;213:7 G g/mile (1) 155:6 gap (1) 205:12 Gas (70) 5:22,24;64:2,6,12, 17;65:8;69:6,10,10; 71:10;73:8,13,16; 82:19;87:24;88:10,15, 17,20;89:21;90:7,10, 15;101:18;159:4,12, 19;160:7,8,15,19; 162:7,9;167:19,19; 168:4,8,8,13,15,24,25; 169:6,19;170:9,10; 179:8,24;180:1,5; 183:8;203:23;204:7, 11;205:4,23;206:1; 208:16,22,23;209:4; 214:10;215:20;216:2, 9,22,24;217:4,11 gases (1) 194:9 gathered (1) 29:23 Gaussian (2) 109:7,18 gave (4) 32:11;73:12;86:24; 194:19 general (20) 4:11;24:22;25:1; 30:7;34:10;35:22; 50:15;64:7;66:12,12; 74:10;78:12;94:3; 95:14;185:19;188:16; 200:21;213:16;216:3, 10 generally (10) 27:5,9;62:20;63:3,6; 64:2;66:10;71:23; 105:13;212:22 general's (1) 50:8 generated (1) 97:3 geology (1) 16:13 geometric (1)	194:2 germane (2) 21:25;26:10 gets (2) 94:6;119:22 given (11) 34:11;50:8;54:14; 57:1;116:14,18; 175:14;194:23;199:16; 203:7;210:19 gives (11) 15:12;112:15; 127:16;128:11;132:15; 137:11,12;156:9; 158:14;161:14;166:24 giving (4) 43:10;115:12; 137:24;169:7 Glad (5) 44:25;95:7;100:17; 141:24;209:22 Glass (2) 43:2,4 goal (1) 197:19 GOECKE (152) 5:4,4,6,8;11,14; 10:13;19:12,15;24:17; 28:9,11,15,18,21,23; 29:1,3,16,22,25;30:2,7, 12,23;31:4,7,11,16,19, 21;32:7,11,16,20,24; 33:14,19;34:3,6,13,16, 19,21,24;35:2,4,9,13, 16,20;36:7,9,18,21,24; 37:3,6,9,16,20;38:20; 39:3,6,16,23;40:1,5,8, 11,15,18,24;41:16,23; 42:1,4,6,9,21,23,25; 47:3,7,9,11;49:21,23; 50:6,10,12,17,22,24; 51:20;52:18;58:4; 59:18,19,23;60:4,9,15; 67:17;70:2,12,17; 92:25;120:9;124:17; 135:1,14,22;136:5; 142:22;144:2,18; 145:22;146:2,10,14,18, 22;147:9,11;148:3,6,9, 15,18,21,23,25;149:4, 8,11,21;150:15,17,24; 170:12,21,24;171:2,8, 10;209:24,25;210:4,6; 215:25;218:6;219:8 goes (8) 33:12;62:1;76:12; 137:7,9;174:2;190:24; 191:3 gold-standard (1) 108:15 Good (35) 5:1,4,21,23,25;6:1; 12:16;13:13;14:6,7;	29:5;46:25;71:4;82:22; 83:1;98:12,14;104:9; 106:8;110:10;114:9; 116:4;119:16;123:12; 146:14;172:5;174:9; 175:18;193:1;199:5,8; 218:25;219:5,7,8 Gorsuch (2) 19:23,24 governance (1) 54:19 government (2) 21:13;98:5 governmental (1) 18:10 governments (7) 21:13;84:6;85:9,11, 23;86:3,18 government's (1) 121:10 gradual (1) 122:19 grams (6) 138:8;155:6;174:10, 14;175:3,3 grand (1) 108:5 grant (1) 18:5 graph (4) 140:17,19;190:3,7 graphic (2) 120:18,20 graphs (2) 149:7;154:24 grass (1) 103:7 Gravestar (1) 46:16 great (11) 15:15;31:24;51:25; 52:18;59:11;67:21; 95:25;96:13;100:16; 152:22;212:10 greater (4) 169:18;180:25; 191:15;209:7 greatest (1) 190:14 greatly (2) 101:15;109:21 Green (2) 45:25;96:23 grid (5) 22:17;81:9,10,11,11 GROSSMAN (754) 4:2,19,25;5:3,6,9,16, 23,25;6:1,3,7;7:6,7,13, 19,23;8:1,9,12,15,23; 9:2,8,12,15;10:6,9,19, 23;11:1,11,17,19,22, 25;12:3,10,12,14;13:3, 5,8,11,14,18,23;14:2,
--	---	--	--	--

<p>19;15:23,25;16:2,6; 17:1,5,15;18:4,8,21; 20:1,4,12,15,22;21:1,4, 7,14,17,19,21;24:7,10, 14,20,25;25:3,5,18,24; 26:2,6,11,15,19,23; 27:1,8,23,25;28:7,10; 30:16,20;31:1,6;32:14, 17;33:12,15;36:3; 37:25;38:3,14,19,23; 39:1;40:17,19,25;41:3, 6,10,15;43:19;44:2,21; 46:8,12;47:1,48:12,15, 17;49:20,23;50:20,23, 25;51:3,5,6,8;52:22; 53:3,6;54:3,5,8,22; 55:1,3,6,10,17,19,24; 56:1,3,8,14,16,20,25; 57:3,7,10,12,15,18,20, 23;58:2,7,10,13,21,25; 59:3,5,8,12,14,17;60:3, 5,13;61:8,22,25;62:6, 18;63:10,18,24;65:1,4, 7,22;66:6,17,20;67:1,4, 10,13,19,22;68:1,6,8, 10,14,17;69:4,18,20; 70:1,24;71:6;72:18,24; 73:2,5,6,10,19,22; 74:25;75:5,8,10,15,22; 76:24;77:7,21,25;78:4, 7,10,21;79:2,14,17,21, 24;80:8,20;82:16,22; 83:2,5;84:4,9,17,22,25; 85:5,19,25;86:2,11,14, 21;87:9,15;88:12,17; 89:2,7,19;90:1,7,12; 91:4,8,11,23,25;92:7, 11,13;93:2,10,14,21; 94:13,17;95:15,18; 97:13;98:2,5,8,11,14; 99:9,12,15,24;100:14, 18,22;101:1,6;102:20, 23;104:7,14,20;105:3, 7,10,12,17,19,21; 106:4,6,9,14,17,22; 107:2,5,8,11;108:2,17, 22,25;109:3;110:22; 111:1,4,10,18,21; 112:7,9,11;113:5,8,17, 20;115:21;116:1,7,13, 16,21,24;117:11,13,16, 20,25;118:6,8,13,16, 19,22;119:1,4,9,12,14, 18,21;120:1,6,10,14, 22,23,25;121:2,4,6,9, 15;122:2,7,17,19,24; 123:10;124:4,8,12,15, 20;125:5,8,10,14,17, 19,23;126:7,11,12,16, 19,23;127:4,9;128:6, 10,16,25;129:12,13,15, 18,22;130:1,8,13,17, 21,23;131:4,7,12,16,</p>	<p>18,21,23,25;132:2,6; 133:7,13,25;134:2,4,6, 11,13,16,20;135:5,10, 12,19,25;136:4,7,9,13, 17,19,21;137:14,17,19, 22;138:2,5,9,14,16,19, 23,25;139:3,5,9,12,14, 18,21,25;140:3,5,8,12; 141:1,8,13,16,22,24; 142:5,8,23;143:2,8,13, 16,19,23,25;144:8,11, 15,19,22,24;145:1,2,5, 8,10,12,15,20,24; 146:4,7,10,17;147:1; 148:1,17;149:6,9,12, 18;150:2,9,12,14,16, 20,23,25;151:3,8,10, 14,16,19,22;152:23; 153:2,9,12,20,22; 154:2,4,8,19,21;155:1, 11,16,18;157:12,15; 158:18;159:25;160:3, 6,10;162:2,6,9,13; 163:10,24;164:4,7,9, 11,21;165:15;167:15, 22;168:17;170:20,22, 25;171:3,9,12,21; 172:8,11,18,21,25; 173:2,10,14;174:5,11, 13,19,22;175:5,8,11, 14,19,24;176:2,6,8,10, 13,17,20,24;178:10,14, 16;179:4,6,14,17,19, 21;180:10,15,19,21,23; 181:2,5,9,14,19,21,25; 182:2,6,8,13,17,22; 183:1,6,12,21;184:3,6, 9,12,15,21,25;185:6,9, 12,18,25;186:6,9,11, 15,18,21,24;187:3,6,9, 14,16,19,21,25;188:2, 15;190:16,19,23;191:3, 8,23;192:3,6,8,11,17, 20,23;193:8,11,15,17, 21;194:1,5,23;195:7,9, 14,18;197:21;198:20; 199:2,6,21;200:17; 201:9,14,21;202:1; 203:11,15,19,21;204:4, 9,23;205:10,17,20; 206:11,17,20,23; 207:14,21,25;208:3,7, 10,17,19,25;209:3,11, 15,20,24;210:2,5,7; 211:7,10,13,21;212:12, 15,23;213:2,4,8,10,14, 20,23;214:9;215:2,4,7; 216:2,13,17,20,22; 217:8,18,22;218:19,23, 25;219:2,5 Grossman's (1) 112:3 ground (4)</p>	<p>15:3;105:13;113:4; 187:24 ground-level (1) 169:13 grounds (1) 83:14 groundwater (3) 43:11,21;48:4 groundwork (1) 39:11 group (3) 38:9,10;190:5 groups (3) 44:6,6;46:4 grows (1) 104:17 growth (1) 186:2 grumpy (1) 119:23 guess (6) 27:18;52:2;67:10; 71:4;174:25;211:21 guidance (24) 23:17;76:13,17,23, 25;78:8,11,15,16,17, 18,24;79:7,18;80:10, 13;84:13;92:3;115:3; 142:16;163:2;199:23; 210:17;211:6 guide (2) 41:21;200:21 guideline (1) 23:15 guidelines (6) 17:24;77:1;80:3; 96:3,3;115:9 gusts (1) 100:7 H half (3) 8:2;209:18;215:7 hall (1) 144:13 Hammer (1) 42:8 Hampshire (2) 40:3,5 hand (6) 13:24;51:18;60:22; 114:13;158:24;200:23 handle (1) 57:12 handling (1) 109:5 Hank (1) 70:8 happen (2) 121:24;199:12 happened (3) 15:15,18;202:22</p>	<p>happening (4) 159:11;169:10; 185:19;207:16 happens (7) 15:2;26:9;101:13,14; 104:15;158:14;178:24 happy (1) 101:2 hard (5) 30:15,16;101:10; 129:17,24 harder (1) 27:11 harm (1) 200:6 harmed (1) 95:4 harms (1) 95:5 HARRIS (23) 5:1,1,3;6:15;7:15; 9:6,11;10:3,7,13;11:10, 14,18,21;12:2,9,11,13; 218:8,13,18,22;219:7 Hawkins (2) 23:8,13 hazardous (5) 20:10,10;29:11; 47:20;200:1 HDVD (1) 155:4 head (5) 29:24,25;30:1,2; 144:19 headroom (1) 100:12 health (22) 46:4;47:18,18,21; 48:8;64:7;74:10,18; 95:3,5,5;194:20; 195:17;197:14;199:11, 12,20,25;200:2,7,8,18 hear (7) 5:16,17;71:2;171:18; 186:19;195:25;199:12 heard (2) 46:19;61:1 hearing (21) 4:3,12,16,18,19; 11:25;14:8;24:19; 27:14,16;28:4,6;56:1; 58:5;59:22,25;62:16; 69:4;74:3;209:20; 219:9 hearings (2) 6:16;55:23 heating (2) 109:13,13 heavier (2) 99:9,12 heavily (1) 49:11 heavy (5)</p>	<p>167:3;189:12,12,21, 23 height (1) 34:12 Heights (1) 5:8 Heisenberg (2) 94:14,16 held (1) 121:11 helicopter (1) 31:25 hell (1) 192:11 help (6) 49:1;70:11;146:23; 187:23;191:18;207:1 helped (1) 5:14 helpful (1) 187:12 helps (1) 172:5 Henry (6) 13:12,16,16;20:25; 21:9;35:14 here's (5) 102:7;120:21; 121:22;122:10;163:25 high (7) 157:4;159:3;160:4; 164:17;165:3;167:2,3 higher (29) 71:22,24;76:20; 84:21;90:21,22;91:18, 20;100:10;102:17; 105:24,24,25;108:20, 23;115:13;127:18; 137:8,8;139:15; 140:10;155:23;156:10; 162:19;169:6;174:7, 16;185:6,7 highest (4) 54:17;99:6,18; 190:14 highlight (1) 129:25 highway (14) 132:16;134:24; 140:25;173:18;177:13; 179:24,25;183:19,22; 185:13,18,23;186:12; 212:7 hip (1) 5:13 hire (1) 41:17 hired (1) 211:15 hissed (1) 143:20 history (2) 92:14;101:12</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>hits (1) 101:13</p> <p>Hold (6) 17:4;130:17;131:16; 134:6;217:22,22</p> <p>holding (2) 7:22,22</p> <p>holiday (1) 28:2</p> <p>home (10) 26:12;65:15;68:20; 69:12;71:17,21;72:22; 73:14;169:11,18</p> <p>homes (5) 45:6;64:25;65:15; 71:16;81:3</p> <p>honor (1) 6:4</p> <p>honors (1) 146:9</p> <p>hope (4) 6:19;8:7;184:4,5</p> <p>hopefully (1) 123:9</p> <p>hoping (1) 8:20</p> <p>horizontal (3) 99:8;177:19,24</p> <p>hot (1) 100:4</p> <p>hot-spot (2) 132:8,15</p> <p>hour (18) 88:22;89:16,17; 90:13;102:12;106:23; 110:2,4,4;137:10; 139:16;155:6;177:22, 23;197:25;198:3; 209:18;211:9</p> <p>hourly (6) 89:15;178:1,2,3,8,9</p> <p>hours (6) 88:23,23,23;120:5; 164:20;177:22</p> <p>household (1) 45:10</p> <p>How's (1) 218:5</p> <p>huge (4) 79:24;88:7;192:1; 194:14</p> <p>human (1) 95:3</p> <p>hundred (4) 126:14;153:18; 154:23,25</p> <p>hundreds (1) 122:14</p> <p>hydrocarbons (1) 194:12</p> <p>hypotheses (1) 25:11</p> <p>hypothesis (1)</p>	<p>113:4</p> <p>hypothetical (9) 114:4;171:6,10,13, 13,14,15;211:18,19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>idea (2) 34:10;83:1</p> <p>ideal (2) 9:25;194:7</p> <p>identification (2) 12:25;145:18</p> <p>identifies (1) 25:19</p> <p>identify (4) 4:22;71:9;127:14; 218:14</p> <p>idle (2) 155:6;182:3</p> <p>idling (14) 84:19;127:17,20; 128:12;132:18;138:22; 152:14;156:9;158:10; 175:20;181:23;182:7, 7,8</p> <p>illustrate (1) 120:18</p> <p>image (1) 70:13</p> <p>imagine (1) 21:15</p> <p>immediate (4) 77:5;88:16;132:19; 207:4</p> <p>immediately (2) 200:25;215:21</p> <p>impact (22) 45:13;69:10,11; 71:22;72:9;81:18; 87:23;92:20;109:13, 15;121:13;132:11; 156:24,25;158:15; 169:5;180:4;184:23, 24;199:14;200:9;214:8</p> <p>impacts (6) 48:4,5;132:24;153:5; 183:21;195:11</p> <p>implicated (1) 127:15</p> <p>import (1) 198:19</p> <p>important (15) 25:15;35:21;45:20; 47:13;49:15;76:19; 97:8;103:15;108:5; 109:13;117:9;132:11; 133:10;198:12;214:25</p> <p>impossibility (1) 44:17</p> <p>improper (1) 86:16</p> <p>improved (1)</p>	<p>109:22</p> <p>improvements (1) 108:15</p> <p>inaccuracy (1) 96:19</p> <p>inadvertently (1) 199:19</p> <p>incineration (1) 20:18</p> <p>incinerator (1) 54:11</p> <p>incinerators (1) 20:11</p> <p>include (7) 4:7;64:18;68:3,19, 23;164:15;197:9</p> <p>included (7) 12:9,10;46:4;48:10; 66:23;151:6;170:6</p> <p>includes (7) 64:20;66:1,2;196:21, 25;214:11,20</p> <p>including (12) 8:3;15:6;26:9;38:6; 42:17;46:3;64:14; 66:13;108:18;152:7; 168:8;174:24</p> <p>inconsistent (2) 205:24;206:6</p> <p>incorporate (4) 58:19;80:18,22; 110:6</p> <p>incorporated (7) 23:22;41:14;44:19; 118:5;132:3,14;195:16</p> <p>incorporates (1) 164:14</p> <p>incorporating (1) 87:8</p> <p>incorporation (1) 101:8</p> <p>incorrect (3) 80:2;153:14;170:17</p> <p>increase (7) 73:15;102:12;137:9; 180:5;183:14,24; 184:19</p> <p>increases (2) 122:9;184:20</p> <p>incremental (10) 72:7,9;73:15;156:24, 25;160:15;169:12; 214:8,15,18</p> <p>increments (1) 169:2</p> <p>independent (2) 128:13;133:21</p> <p>indicated (2) 10:7;170:7</p> <p>indicating (1) 214:17</p> <p>individually (1) 96:22</p>	<p>induced (1) 122:3</p> <p>industrial (3) 35:23,24;36:4</p> <p>infamous (1) 170:9</p> <p>infinitely (1) 190:24</p> <p>influence (2) 16:16;172:16</p> <p>inform (1) 21:25</p> <p>information (19) 23:20;33:7;57:1; 58:19;72:1,15,18,19; 85:8,11,21;86:4,6; 130:4;133:22;156:5; 213:18;214:6;217:3</p> <p>informs (1) 26:17</p> <p>inherent (7) 215:22;216:4,4,18; 217:9,11;218:2</p> <p>initially (2) 104:16;124:5</p> <p>input (8) 19:17;23:14;24:4; 37:13;49:3;133:10; 138:10,11</p> <p>inputs (5) 22:20;29:10,13; 40:20;51:13</p> <p>insensitive (1) 140:2</p> <p>insights (1) 33:9</p> <p>inspected (1) 43:23</p> <p>instances (1) 97:8</p> <p>instead (10) 45:11;102:4;109:6, 18;111:7,8;151:25; 152:23;161:24,24</p> <p>Institute (1) 43:2</p> <p>institutes (1) 190:5</p> <p>institution (1) 18:12</p> <p>insurance (2) 41:12;43:7</p> <p>intelligible (1) 177:16</p> <p>intend (1) 67:14</p> <p>intention (2) 93:1,3</p> <p>intercepting (1) 110:11</p> <p>interchange (3) 132:16,19,20</p> <p>interest (3)</p>	<p>14:14;15:15;22:12</p> <p>interested (2) 15:13;16:15</p> <p>interesting (1) 77:17</p> <p>interests (1) 14:16</p> <p>interference (2) 167:1;179:1</p> <p>interferences (1) 214:21</p> <p>interferes (1) 179:3</p> <p>interfering (1) 70:24</p> <p>intergovernmental (2) 17:21;18:7</p> <p>intermediate (11) 77:20;80:15;87:6; 112:22;114:12;116:22; 161:2,9;163:5;189:8; 210:22</p> <p>international (1) 23:9</p> <p>interrupt (1) 63:10</p> <p>interrupted (1) 68:14</p> <p>Intersection (1) 170:9</p> <p>intersections (3) 81:11;141:11;181:11</p> <p>into (61) 16:21;20:19,20; 23:14,15,22;27:2; 30:25;33:9,10,10,25; 41:14;44:15;45:6,7; 48:12;49:3,15;51:23; 60:2;77:10;80:4,12,18; 81:22,24;83:18;87:8, 21;88:5;90:20;91:14; 94:13;97:18,24; 100:13;101:8;104:18; 107:4;119:19;129:8, 16,23;131:3,10; 132:15;143:7;153:15; 180:3,15;183:3,8; 192:9,23;199:9;200:7; 202:19;204:16,21; 208:22</p> <p>introduce (1) 143:7</p> <p>introduced (2) 129:16;131:2</p> <p>inverse (1) 108:24</p> <p>inversely (1) 102:16</p> <p>inversion (1) 100:8</p> <p>invested (1) 98:5</p> <p>investigated (1)</p>
--	---	---	--	--

189:18 investigation (1) 116:20 involved (15) 14:22;19:20;29:13; 34:21;35:11;40:13; 43:5;48:4;49:11;61:6, 15,17;127:13;197:5; 214:22 involves (1) 14:25 involving (5) 20:10,10;23:9;48:22; 200:8 irrespective (1) 64:9 ISC (1) 36:1 isolate (1) 71:21 isopleth (1) 154:25 isopleths (1) 80:25 issue (41) 36:13;43:9,12,12,13; 44:7;45:2;49:11,11; 58:14;61:7;63:14,16; 64:3;68:16;70:8;77:11; 89:23;91:1,14;94:23; 126:21;140:13;160:18; 163:25;166:11;168:13, 14;177:9;189:19; 197:13;200:8;201:21, 23;202:18;204:6; 205:6;206:8;214:13; 216:11;217:24 issued (2) 84:12,13 issues (19) 18:3;25:8,16;29:5; 35:24;36:17;43:5; 46:22;58:17;61:6;62:1; 63:13,14;72:6;199:9; 200:3,6;201:17;205:5 it's (1) 71:4 items (1) 6:21 iterations (1) 202:9	47:24;48:1,1 joint (3) 14:17;59:6,8 Joseph (1) 23:16 journal (1) 22:8 judge (1) 96:6 judgment (19) 74:22;75:17;77:11; 79:1;80:10,15,18; 86:25;94:6;97:2;101:9; 112:18,24;114:7,12; 158:13;161:1;172:16; 195:3 judgments (1) 210:18 juggle (1) 8:20 junctions (1) 202:23 June (2) 69:4,7 jurisdiction (1) 60:20 justified (1) 121:16	knock (1) 163:17 Knolls (2) 64:24;65:18 knowledge (3) 22:12;216:24;217:10 knowledgeable (1) 216:2 known (6) 4:10;44:19;100:3; 188:12;189:20;194:13 Kodak (4) 35:23;39:18,23; 50:10 Kodak's (1) 35:23	107:18,23;122:8,9 laying (1) 39:10 layman's (2) 26:11,20 leads (1) 101:19 learned (1) 15:19 least (10) 9:7;23:8;27:17;91:8; 97:20;143:20;150:3; 159:20;202:18;210:21 leave (3) 12:18;26:13;87:12 leaving (2) 38:21;182:24 left (7) 20:6;33:20;47:25; 83:8;146:7;169:4; 191:20 left-hand (1) 157:23 length (1) 182:4 lengths (1) 212:10 less (16) 34:14,21;42:20; 53:20;95:15;100:12; 103:6,17;105:1; 107:23;141:4;175:21; 176:14;204:25;209:18; 212:19 lesser (1) 158:10 less-intensive (1) 34:24 less-involved (1) 34:25 letter (2) 205:25;206:3 level (21) 30:6;71:20;87:22; 88:4,5,10;93:12;100:8; 105:23,24,25;132:7,25; 140:10;166:13;169:18, 19;191:14;193:2; 196:13;203:24 levels (17) 34:11;68:20,24; 71:23;73:25;74:7; 82:19;88:2;132:14; 133:18;164:17;172:16; 195:22,23;196:1; 208:11;213:1 Lewis (1) 6:19 liaison (1) 48:21 lib (4) 106:5,6,7,7 liberal (1)	96:10 liberty (1) 177:15 license (2) 26:3;54:13 lid (1) 100:9 lie (1) 78:19 life (2) 81:25;174:2 lift (1) 12:17 light (4) 44:9,11;96:23;184:5 lighter (3) 105:12,14;106:1 lights (4) 44:16;70:7,23,24 likely (2) 127:3;211:3 limit (1) 68:1 limitations (1) 132:8 limited (1) 130:3 Limiting (1) 28:20 line (7) 137:5;139:19;140:1; 149:9,10;199:18; 218:20 lined (1) 179:23 lines (6) 43:17;81:11,11; 100:15;141:14;177:15 link (1) 140:25 links (1) 137:3 list (1) 6:10 listed (1) 57:4 listen (1) 213:24 listing (1) 43:1 literature (2) 33:8;45:18 little (23) 18:1;45:11;55:23; 69:17;71:2,22;80:17; 102:9;103:8;137:6; 150:20;156:23;165:10; 173:13;178:6;184:10; 191:11;192:15;193:19, 21;197:25;209:16; 213:6 live (3) 15:15,18;200:11
J		L		
January (6) 7:3,4;9:6,13,24;11:3 Jison (4) 7:21;9:4,13;10:16 job (8) 15:16;19:16;22:21; 24:3;31:9;36:12;45:11; 49:1 Johnson (3)	Karen (1) 5:11 keep (2) 20:1;186:4 keeps (2) 100:9;209:21 Kenmont (1) 6:25 Kenosha (1) 15:18 Kensington (1) 5:7 key (3) 43:12,13;158:10 kid (2) 102:5,8 kids (2) 90:18;102:10 killers (1) 200:16 kind (13) 27:19;33:7;86:5; 89:4;104:4;109:9,10, 19,19;141:16;164:13, 24;197:2 kinds (11) 23:23;24:3;39:15; 49:7;97:9;110:20; 111:9;137:3,4;189:22; 200:13 knew (1) 8:21	land (7) 16:18,20;41:13; 54:17;200:24;217:6,25 landfills (2) 38:11,12 large (4) 21:12;157:5;192:1; 204:7 larger (3) 70:5;108:19;189:1 Larry (1) 5:21 laser (3) 98:2;106:4;121:10 last (9) 6:8;8:2;27:9;48:20; 49:6;60:16;164:7; 170:17;187:7 late (6) 15:7;27:12;39:8; 100:24;197:25;209:17 later (14) 9:4;18:14;19:17; 22:11;71:1;83:18;88:1; 94:16,19,19;106:24,25; 141:20;187:1 lateral (3) 99:1,2,21 latest (1) 11:12 law (2) 169:20;200:24 lawn (1) 103:7 lawn (1) 103:7 layer (4)	lag (2) 104:20;105:23 Lake (8) 15:19,20;16:15,15, 18;58:15,20;103:16 lake-breeze (1) 22:4 Lakes (1) 59:11 land (7) 16:18,20;41:13; 54:17;200:24;217:6,25 landfills (2) 38:11,12 large (4) 21:12;157:5;192:1; 204:7 larger (3) 70:5;108:19;189:1 Larry (1) 5:21 laser (3) 98:2;106:4;121:10 last (9) 6:8;8:2;27:9;48:20; 49:6;60:16;164:7; 170:17;187:7 late (6) 15:7;27:12;39:8; 100:24;197:25;209:17 later (14) 9:4;18:14;19:17; 22:11;71:1;83:18;88:1; 94:16,19,19;106:24,25; 141:20;187:1 lateral (3) 99:1,2,21 latest (1) 11:12 law (2) 169:20;200:24 lawn (1) 103:7 lawn (1) 103:7 layer (4)	

<p>lived (1) 15:20 load (1) 90:19 loading (27) 79:4;153:24;158:7,8, 12,15,16,25;159:9,11, 16,18,20;166:18,19,21, 23;167:1,2;168:22; 183:3,4,8;215:21; 216:10;217:5,16 loan (9) 17:21;18:4,7,17,18, 19,20,24;21:2 loaned (2) 18:17;19:2 loans (1) 19:1 local (1) 54:12 located (2) 4:8;217:4 location (11) 64:2,14;65:16,17; 69:12;81:23;162:2,4; 204:6;209:5;215:21 locations (2) 73:16;194:8 logic (1) 169:20 long (8) 14:10;90:4;167:14; 171:8,10;182:9; 200:12;218:19 longer (9) 68:16;105:5,25; 120:3;129:3;175:16; 190:19;210:3;212:11 long-wave (1) 15:10 look (50) 22:3;36:19,20;37:24; 43:22;45:21;49:4,7,25; 52:4;53:14;54:15;77:2; 80:16;82:5;91:14,19; 101:4,7;104:23;109:9; 112:15;116:22;129:18; 135:20;138:7;142:24; 146:22;152:21;157:2; 158:7;159:7;163:13; 169:9;173:25;174:24; 177:23;178:3,21; 189:4;190:1,9,13; 197:8;199:9;201:17, 19,20;210:23;214:22 looked (9) 79:12;80:11;96:17; 100:18;113:3;128:24; 164:5;166:20;175:3 looking (30) 7:20;12:5;33:8; 43:20;45:18;70:13; 71:8;89:13;99:1,2;</p>	<p>102:10;112:16;117:1; 141:20;144:3;145:4; 155:10;158:5;159:2,5; 162:4;169:4;179:10; 190:25;191:25;195:3; 197:13;198:10;200:3,3 looks (11) 10:5;77:10;101:3; 109:19;133:4;137:11; 139:14;146:21;149:1, 6;158:16 Los (1) 22:19 lost (1) 198:4 Lot (39) 4:9;15:4;22:16,18; 26:7;29:11;45:17; 47:19;48:3,10;55:14; 60:24,24,25,25;88:20, 22;90:20;96:19;97:15; 101:14;103:1;107:21; 109:8,10;111:14; 122:11;132:21;133:6, 9;141:11;182:20,21; 187:24;191:25;193:21; 200:2;203:1,6 lots (3) 133:1;170:11;201:22 Louis (1) 22:18 love (1) 7:3 low (8) 105:23;138:21; 156:8;169:2;185:3,3,4; 199:19 lower (17) 76:22;102:17;103:7, 24;105:17;108:24; 161:22;164:23;169:14; 172:2;180:17;185:4,5; 210:15;212:25;213:7; 214:15 lowered (1) 213:5 lowest (5) 44:11,14;104:16; 166:6,7 low-level (2) 99:3,4 lumps (1) 189:15 lunch (3) 106:23;119:17; 120:11 luncheon (1) 120:12 lungs (1) 194:22 Lyons (3) 16:24;22:7,7</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>m3 (1) 167:20 machine (2) 102:6,8 machines (1) 102:6 macroscientific (1) 100:3 Madam (1) 19:23 Madison (1) 14:21 main (3) 38:14,15;193:18 Maine (1) 23:11 maintain (1) 151:25 major (13) 15:6;22:5;40:16; 41:24,24;48:20; 127:12;170:1;186:3; 195:5,5;204:7,7 majority (3) 190:12;191:16; 193:20 majors (2) 14:18,18 makes (8) 27:11;42:7;51:24; 67:22,22;108:1; 120:21;165:3 making (8) 40:12;46:24,25; 52:16;158:13;186:25; 195:3;208:7 Mall (54) 4:10;15:3;64:19,21; 66:1,4,13,18,23,24; 67:7;68:2,24;69:1,3; 71:24;72:2,10,23; 73:16;77:4,5;79:5,25; 80:5,12,14;81:3;87:25; 90:22;158:1;159:18; 160:16;161:6;166:18; 168:2;170:5;172:1; 179:7,9;180:3,12; 181:11;182:20;183:18; 196:14;200:11;204:18, 18;205:9,13;214:12,16, 24 manner (1) 173:8 manufacturers (1) 44:9 many (28) 11:2;23:17,17;30:13, 13;37:11;40:20;42:17, 17;94:11,11,20,21; 95:9;96:2,4,17;101:11;</p>	<p>108:15;110:15,16; 111:11;127:2;153:19; 164:2;198:17;206:14; 214:2 March (2) 130:15;131:22 margin (4) 111:20;169:10; 196:21;198:7 margins (1) 214:16 Maria (1) 7:20 Mark (7) 6:2,19,24;70:4; 145:7;218:15,16 marked (3) 12:24;145:17;177:22 market (4) 42:15;45:3;46:20,21 Marlboro (1) 13:20 Martin (1) 4:19 marvelously (1) 102:10 Maryland (2) 4:9;13:20 Maryland-National (1) 66:21 mass (6) 169:21;190:10,12; 191:25;193:19,21 massage (1) 40:21 material (2) 42:19;141:16 materials (1) 179:22 mathematical (2) 157:12;177:2 Mattaponi (5) 13:19,20,21,22,23 M-A-T-T-A-P-O-N-I (1) 13:21 matter (10) 4:3;50:10;72:11; 152:8;164:19;173:25; 199:11;205:22;206:5, 12 matters (9) 6:8;11:13,23,23; 28:3,5;54:20;173:24; 176:23 max (3) 123:22;162:4,23 maximum (12) 91:17;92:20;113:2; 117:8;148:12;155:14; 159:13;162:4;165:25; 166:1;196:15;214:23 maximums (1) 91:20</p>	<p>may (33) 14:2;33:23;35:4; 46:14;51:6;61:5;63:11, 14;88:21,22;90:24,25; 100:8;104:19;110:4; 133:2;136:3;151:3,23; 153:13;154:20,22; 165:10;175:14;179:25; 182:2,8,9;190:11; 194:9;197:25;198:24; 206:1 maybe (21) 25:7;27:19;30:17; 36:22,23;69:17;72:14; 116:18;128:25;129:1; 142:25;145:7;162:21, 22;171:18;182:5; 184:7,7;207:1;213:21; 215:7 mean (40) 8:12;9:15,15;24:25; 29:12,18;31:1,2,3; 32:14;34:7;38:23; 41:10;51:21;74:25; 75:1,2,14;77:23;93:6; 102:7;104:7;130:23; 138:23;151:14;154:25; 161:13;168:13;169:15; 175:8;178:5;181:7; 188:15;190:21;194:2; 198:14;202:1;210:6; 212:24;217:24 meaning (7) 76:15;81:14;105:17; 109:7;110:2;140:1; 141:3 means (7) 4:20;26:4;81:7; 105:15;137:22;178:19; 213:21 meant (5) 93:2;139:7,9;152:20; 213:12 measure (3) 67:11;197:20;198:7 measured (1) 67:10 measurement (2) 139:1;205:7 measurements (3) 111:13;119:12; 208:13 measuring (4) 79:3;207:17,23; 208:11 Mechanical (2) 103:18;109:15 medical (3) 47:5,7;81:16 meet (7) 53:16;75:3,20,23; 82:20;83:11;89:14 meeting (2)</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>76:11;96:25 meets (1) 105:22 members (1) 170:14 memo (2) 72:12;160:16 memorized (1) 151:24 memory (4) 104:3,8,21;213:6 mention (2) 6:8;46:13 mentioned (5) 41:23;109:14; 154:15,17,22 mercury (6) 20:16,19;34:1;44:11, 15;50:4 mesoscale (1) 32:3 mess (2) 180:15;193:21 Meszáros (2) 6:24;218:16 met (5) 74:8;75:6;76:5; 121:20;202:6 metal (2) 189:11,12 metals (2) 189:21,23 meteorological (6) 31:14;32:3;33:3; 108:11;111:12;190:4 meteorologist (1) 16:23 meteorology (25) 14:15,18,21,24,25; 15:4,21;16:12,12,22; 17:10,13;22:3,12,20; 23:12;24:8,10;25:20; 33:10;55:8;60:7,10; 62:3;91:16 meter (10) 32:2;71:21;119:2,5; 126:10;127:5;161:21; 163:9;168:11;193:25 meters (1) 122:15 Method (4) 28:20,21,22;29:3 methodologies (3) 25:21;60:8;62:4 methodology (3) 60:12;61:3,12 methods (5) 23:25;24:1;94:25; 119:7;203:13 Michael (2) 150:4;173:18 Michele (5) 5:7;6:15;136:6,7;</p>	<p>146:23 Michigan (1) 15:19 micrograms (10) 71:20;119:2,5;126:4, 10;127:5;161:21; 163:8;168:7,10 microlevel (1) 132:25 micrometeorological (1) 32:2 micrometeorology (1) 15:2 micrometer (2) 191:6,6 micrometers (3) 190:25;191:1;193:13 micron (1) 191:19 microscale (2) 132:7,21 middle (6) 41:4;70:17;81:11; 113:4;191:10,21 might (12) 10:17;34:6;49:4; 64:9;90:15;100:20,22; 114:2;148:25;193:4; 201:4;217:11 Mike (2) 5:4;142:24 mile (4) 138:8;174:10,14; 175:4 miles (3) 102:12;137:10; 139:16 Mill (1) 4:8 million (1) 48:25 millions (1) 130:5 mind (4) 27:3;102:3;201:7; 209:3 mine (6) 135:14,16,17,18; 136:5;142:22 minor (1) 200:16 minus (1) 197:6 minuscule (1) 160:20 minute (4) 39:21;58:11;107:7; 169:5 minutes (8) 88:11,13;90:10,14, 24;120:7;177:24;210:3 miracle (1) 151:5</p>	<p>Misra (1) 55:14 misreading (1) 137:19 missed (1) 59:20 missing (2) 136:11;149:6 mission (1) 19:24 mistake (2) 92:21;126:9 mistaken (3) 6:10;169:12;214:7 misunderstanding (1) 138:2 mix-ups (1) 151:4 mobile (12) 84:3;113:14;129:1,2, 10;141:5;156:10; 161:23;162:16,17; 163:3,5 MOBILE2010 (1) 84:12 MOBILE6 (31) 83:17,19;84:20;85:2; 127:14,19,24;128:6,8, 14,22;129:6,20;130:2, 7,16;132:5;133:19; 137:1,11;139:18,23; 149:12;155:24;161:16; 162:12;163:18;166:12; 205:13;210:15;212:10 model (54) 19:18,20;22:5,10,10, 13,16,17,19,22;28:20; 29:3,6,9;34:10;36:2,4, 11;76:10;81:10,13,24; 83:17,17;84:5,12;85:7, 8,12;86:16;95:21; 102:15;108:12,15,16; 109:22,23;110:23,24; 113:24;129:4,11; 132:5;133:12;138:12; 155:11;156:4;177:1,2, 2;196:14;198:17; 212:9,11 modeled (8) 23:20;35:23;69:1; 110:2;113:14,19; 162:15;210:11 modeler (1) 116:15 modelers (2) 52:21;110:18 modelers' (1) 38:8 modeling (127) 16:21;17:22,24; 19:10,11;23:6,14,15, 17,22;24:9,11,13,14; 25:20;28:12,16;29:7,</p>	<p>14,20;30:9,10,13;31:8; 32:6,9;33:10,21;34:4,7, 16;35:7,11,17;36:1,25; 37:4,5,23;38:6,9,12,16, 21;39:3,6,7,17,18;40:6, 8,12,13;41:14,18,22; 43:6;49:25;50:5,6; 51:11,17,21;52:10; 53:2;54:10,16,16;55:9, 14;58:19;60:7,11,16, 19,23;61:12,15,19; 62:3;63:13;74:1;76:4; 77:2,23;80:18,23;81:9; 82:2,7;87:21,21;89:15; 92:23;94:4;95:10;96:1, 4;97:16,24;108:13; 114:4;115:25;127:15; 133:4,21;152:13; 154:23,24;156:1; 157:3,11;161:1; 164:14;165:11;168:2; 169:20;170:2,4; 190:21;196:20;197:1; 198:6;203:1;205:12; 211:16,22 models (16) 23:21;33:24;39:12, 14;40:4;52:13;53:14; 101:9;108:16,18,19; 109:7;110:19,22; 111:2;197:3 modify (2) 8:16;77:3 moisture (1) 109:11 mold (1) 100:19 molecular (1) 193:2 moment (7) 46:1;101:23;131:5; 134:9;174:17;177:10; 188:6 momentarily (1) 144:24 money (3) 41:17,19;121:10 monitor (1) 208:20 monitoring (17) 81:10;203:17,22,25; 204:10,13,15;205:2,21; 206:4,12,14,18;207:3, 11,15;208:2 monitors (6) 81:10;133:3;204:17, 17,21;207:23 monoxide (1) 173:23 month (1) 9:4 moot (1) 129:2</p>	<p>more (101) 6:14;8:6;9:20;10:15; 13:2;18:1;19:21;23:19; 25:22,24;26:5,11,12, 20;31:9;33:12,24,25; 46:23;52:13;53:20; 60:25,25;67:23;72:8; 76:20;77:13;78:14; 79:3;94:12;95:18; 96:22;97:24;99:14; 100:11;101:20;102:1, 13,21;103:25,25; 104:13,20;109:1,5; 112:4,16;114:16; 115:10,12,13;116:2,7, 8,9,13;117:21;120:2; 122:5,5;126:5;133:8; 140:6;155:13;163:19; 165:13;172:1,15; 174:5,6,8,13,14; 175:11,12,15,18; 177:15;178:10;180:18; 183:15,16;184:20; 185:5;188:7;189:20; 197:10;198:12;200:2, 9,12;202:2;204:25; 209:13,15,18;212:2,19, 25;213:6;215:5 morning (13) 5:1,4,21,23,25;6:1; 8:16;13:13;14:6,7; 209:17;218:5;219:6 most (25) 33:17;35:21;37:23; 52:21;67:5,24;79:15; 99:17;100:2;111:24; 112:20;113:23;114:6; 119:25;127:15;132:12; 142:12;153:22;156:4; 159:8;161:1,11;163:7; 194:16;202:11 mostly (2) 79:18;80:14 mother (1) 5:15 motives (1) 203:12 motor (9) 83:16;128:21; 132:12;133:1,11; 141:11;166:15;180:25; 195:6 mountain (1) 110:11 mounting (1) 45:5 move (7) 8:8;16:2;24:7;33:19; 90:16;98:19;119:19 moved (1) 15:16 movement (1) 15:1</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>MOVES (53) 84:5,20;85:3,7,12,18, 21;86:16;104:17; 113:13;118:4;122:4; 127:14,16,18,24;128:4, 6,10,11,14,19,21; 129:7;130:3;132:5; 137:1,7,12,23;140:9, 17,18;149:13;152:19; 155:23;156:9,11; 161:16,16,23;162:17; 163:3,5,18;166:11; 174:1,4;180:24; 211:23,24;212:3,4</p> <p>MOVES10 (1) 210:16</p> <p>MOVES2010 (5) 83:18;85:17;133:12; 156:4;162:12</p> <p>MOVES2010b (1) 129:10</p> <p>moving (12) 88:17,19;90:25; 102:13;103:19;104:3, 11,11;107:9,22; 120:18;175:22</p> <p>Mrs (1) 6:25</p> <p>mu (2) 167:23,25</p> <p>much (23) 24:1,5;35:7;39:3; 51:20;58:22;60:22; 67:22;71:4,24;103:11, 11;109:12;114:14; 120:2,3;160:21; 162:19;165:13;169:12, 13;174:22;210:15</p> <p>multiple (4) 20:9;183:9;189:4; 200:15</p> <p>multiplied (1) 162:17</p> <p>multiply (3) 156:6,12;162:24</p> <p>multiplying (1) 113:12</p> <p>municipal (1) 54:11</p> <p>mu's (1) 191:1</p> <p>must (2) 50:16;64:5</p> <p>muster (2) 30:5,8</p> <p>myself (2) 27:14;30:19</p>	<p>4:19;6:20;13:14; 192:25;193:8</p> <p>named (1) 16:23</p> <p>names (1) 6:14</p> <p>nation (1) 190:5</p> <p>National (14) 33:4;51:22;74:1,17; 75:3,20;76:1;83:12; 90:2;190:3;197:22; 198:23;212:20;215:19</p> <p>nature (1) 186:7</p> <p>nauseous (1) 32:1</p> <p>near (13) 15:2;44:17;99:5,18; 101:17,18;103:20; 107:14,15,20,24; 153:24;202:21</p> <p>nearest (3) 65:15;169:10,18</p> <p>near-field (1) 205:16</p> <p>nearing (1) 202:8</p> <p>necessarily (3) 81:4;133:5;215:12</p> <p>necessary (4) 85:8,21,21;86:17</p> <p>need (19) 8:16;10:5,13;48:2; 74:5;79:19;106:9; 113:10,13;132:13,14; 163:21;186:12;192:13; 194:1,4,6;208:15; 218:20</p> <p>needed (1) 85:12</p> <p>needs (4) 66:11;132:3;164:23; 195:16</p> <p>negative (2) 149:13;173:5</p> <p>neglected (1) 49:16</p> <p>neglects (1) 90:15</p> <p>neighborhood (17) 65:5,12,13,14,23,25; 66:2,8,9,12,18,22;67:9, 15;68:2;72:9;214:11</p> <p>neighborhoods (1) 204:19</p> <p>neighboring (1) 15:18</p> <p>neither (1) 45:9</p> <p>Netherlands (4) 54:11;55:15;57:5; 58:7</p>	<p>network (2) 142:13,14</p> <p>nevertheless (3) 49:19;205:3;206:5</p> <p>new (20) 16:10;35:23;106:12; 132:4;145:10,12; 146:11,20,21,22,24; 147:8,9,10;148:9,10, 23,25;149:24;150:18</p> <p>newer (1) 126:20</p> <p>next (13) 4:14;11:12;30:6; 36:16;80:1,4;87:20; 123:23;151:9;169:19; 188:17;189:10;191:18</p> <p>nice (3) 9:19;79:11;119:24</p> <p>night (5) 100:24;218:25; 219:5,7,8</p> <p>nine (1) 146:16</p> <p>nitrogen (3) 24:2;128:2;214:19</p> <p>NO2 (48) 23:24;24:3;72:8,25; 73:1;82:6;83:20,22; 84:23;90:23;92:4,7,12; 93:9;95:11;97:4;117:4, 10;119:10;124:1; 128:2;148:12;153:3,6, 9,13,19;154:10,14; 155:7;156:20;157:4,4; 160:20;161:5;163:16; 164:18;166:16;167:20; 168:1,3;202:24;203:7, 23;211:2,7;213:6; 214:19</p> <p>none (2) 11:25;94:10</p> <p>non-inherent (8) 209:7;215:11,17,22; 216:4,18;217:9;218:2</p> <p>nor (1) 45:9</p> <p>norm (2) 94:8;197:12</p> <p>normal (6) 33:5;42:14;89:13; 109:8;179:24;198:8</p> <p>Normally (1) 39:25</p> <p>north (1) 101:16</p> <p>northeast (1) 48:22</p> <p>note (2) 5:11;16:14</p> <p>noted (1) 160:24</p> <p>notes (1)</p>	<p>70:25</p> <p>nother (1) 66:11</p> <p>notice (1) 184:13</p> <p>noticed (2) 4:14,15</p> <p>November (16) 6:14;62:9;77:10,17; 80:24;81:1;112:19; 115:1;124:12;147:14, 17;155:5;157:3,11; 158:1;160:25</p> <p>NOx (24) 72:8,25;128:12; 133:18;152:17,19,20; 153:3,6,9,12,18; 154:15;155:4,25; 156:2,20,25;161:5; 163:14,16;166:14,17; 173:23</p> <p>nuclear (1) 58:14</p> <p>nuclei (2) 193:4,5</p> <p>number (53) 8:7;19:19;23:13; 37:21;43:22;46:17,21; 47:17;48:20,25;50:20; 52:18;56:23;63:22; 64:13;65:13,24;76:10, 13,25;77:14;84:13; 88:2;95:13;97:7; 124:18,19;131:20,21; 132:10;136:22;145:13; 155:1;158:9;161:15; 164:24;166:6,7,8; 173:17;178:5;179:12; 182:4;184:16,18,22,23; 185:1;190:13;192:1,1; 194:18;209:6</p> <p>numbers (13) 29:23;51:18;76:20, 21;99:13;118:24; 143:3,5;161:3,4; 165:19;178:3;190:14</p> <p>numerator (1) 178:3</p> <p>numerous (2) 22:1;94:4</p>	<p>148:15;150:24;171:22; 215:25;216:13,15</p> <p>objects (1) 103:19</p> <p>obligation (1) 76:12</p> <p>obligations (2) 8:15;10:25</p> <p>oblivion (1) 192:9</p> <p>observations (1) 213:17</p> <p>obsolete (1) 83:17</p> <p>obtain (2) 85:22,23</p> <p>obtained (1) 86:23</p> <p>obvious (1) 194:2</p> <p>Occam's (1) 160:12</p> <p>occupation (1) 38:15</p> <p>occupied (1) 11:6</p> <p>occur (3) 142:13;186:23; 203:14</p> <p>occurred (1) 43:17</p> <p>occurring (2) 155:15;193:3</p> <p>occurs (1) 121:24</p> <p>odds (1) 198:9</p> <p>odors (1) 38:12</p> <p>off (13) 15:12;26:13,15; 37:25;40:17;41:4,7; 43:10;83:8;100:11; 163:17;182:9;185:1</p> <p>offenders (1) 200:16</p> <p>offered (2) 17:21;18:13</p> <p>Office (5) 4:16;18:14;19:4; 50:8;144:20</p> <p>official (1) 200:18</p> <p>off-the-record (1) 94:18</p> <p>often (2) 13:5;142:2</p> <p>old (1) 12:15</p> <p>older (2) 108:16;126:3</p> <p>once (10) 17:3,5;38:21;87:3,</p>
N			O	
<p>NAAQS (1) 212:19</p> <p>name (5)</p>			<p>Oak (1) 32:1</p> <p>oath (2) 54:23;125:25</p> <p>object (3) 60:10;80:5;170:12</p> <p>objected (1) 57:20</p> <p>objection (10) 60:6,14;61:25;92:25;</p>	

<p>10;97:11;121:24; 143:20;167:10;186:4 one (120) 6:11;8:17,18,24; 10:5;16:14;19:1;22:2, 18;23:8;25:11,22,24; 26:1;29:11;30:16; 36:16;42:16;45:10; 46:15,23;47:12;48:9; 49:21;54:1;56:23;57:4, 7;58:12;60:22;65:24; 66:14;67:2;68:15; 71:19;72:6;75:24; 76:10,13;81:8;84:11, 13;85:14;86:12;89:17; 90:17;91:21;94:3,23; 96:5,15;100:2;101:17; 103:1;104:3;106:3; 107:7;110:14;111:14, 25;112:9;113:3; 114:10,20;117:7; 118:22;123:18;125:12; 126:19;127:16;130:10; 131:9;134:9;137:4; 140:16;142:18,19,21; 146:24;148:21;149:4; 150:14;151:9,14,16,19, 21,21;153:16;154:1; 155:12;157:1;158:10; 162:21;174:3;175:24; 181:5;186:1;187:4; 189:10,17;190:4; 191:25;192:14;194:10; 197:10;202:11,17; 205:5;206:8;209:8,15; 210:10;211:8,9;215:5, 10;217:22,22;218:9 one-half (1) 177:23 one-hour (23) 82:3,7;88:24;89:5; 92:9,10,12,14,15;97:4; 117:4,10;119:10; 123:25;128:3;148:12; 155:4;157:4;169:4; 203:7;211:10,12,13 one-quarter (1) 177:22 ones (1) 57:18 one-tenth (1) 198:15 only (23) 7:21;38:21;44:5; 61:11,15;66:1;88:11, 13;113:14;116:23; 121:23;142:21;152:7, 25;153:6,9;167:20; 169:4,6;179:19,21; 210:2;214:13 onset (1) 186:2 Ontario (3)</p>	<p>55:14;58:15,20 on-the-road (1) 26:7 onto (2) 181:17;198:25 Oops (1) 136:6 open (3) 8:3;17:6;54:24 operate (2) 4:6;203:24 operated (1) 46:18 operation (1) 203:23 operational (1) 215:12 opinion (19) 53:15;76:1;92:19; 97:1,9;113:23;115:10; 142:11;152:13;163:7; 166:12;200:10;202:13; 204:6;205:14;210:11; 215:17,22;217:15 opportunity (4) 31:25;57:24;158:14; 175:1 opposed (10) 7:23,24;32:14;42:14; 84:20;166:5;168:4; 189:2;205:22;206:5 opposite (1) 153:8 opposition (1) 170:15 order (3) 164:12;200:10; 203:22 Ordinance (1) 4:5 organization (2) 5:18;20:9 organizations (2) 21:12;46:5 original (5) 146:16;149:1;167:5; 169:15;177:25 OSHA (3) 89:24;90:2;91:1 others (11) 5:17;13:21;22:11; 27:15;33:6;37:5,23; 41:11;79:2;146:20; 194:20 ought (2) 27:20;210:20 ours (1) 151:22 out (57) 7:10,25;9:23;10:10, 14;11:5;19:24;20:1; 21:16;24:1;29:4;38:10; 42:16;69:9;71:2;79:10;</p>	<p>81:10;86:3;88:9;90:16; 97:6;99:7;102:13; 106:12,19;109:21; 113:10,13,19;114:5; 117:16;118:9,11,12,15; 121:17;124:21;130:16; 144:10,22;146:7; 153:1;158:11;161:8; 164:24;166:19,22; 168:12;169:17;176:2; 180:7;181:12,17; 187:1;190:9;199:13; 200:19 outbreak (1) 48:23 outcome (2) 110:17;173:7 outfit (1) 50:16 output (1) 30:4 over (30) 39:14;45:10;60:1; 80:14;92:20;94:19; 95:4;100:8;101:12,13; 104:12;106:23;107:13; 108:15;120:17;128:24; 133:2;157:5;159:13, 14;165:8,8;178:1,9,12, 19;200:12;201:22; 202:2;212:18 overall (6) 77:2;78:12;132:23; 162:23;167:20;194:14 overlying (1) 107:15 overnight (1) 218:4 overpredict (1) 97:9 own (4) 28:16;90:21;199:24; 210:25 owned (2) 44:23;46:17 oxidants (1) 165:5 oxides (2) 24:1;214:19 OZAH (1) 4:4 Ozone (5) 28:20;164:17;165:1, 3,3</p>	<p>98:20;114:22;124:19; 125:2,5,12,14,15; 130:20,22,23;135:1,6, 10,11,12,25;136:18,22; 142:17;143:9;146:21, 22;147:3,5,6,17; 148:18,20;155:1,17,19; 158:7;165:24;166:9; 167:4,21;168:17,19; 177:21;184:3,9;192:6, 17;196:9,10 Pages (4) 131:24;146:16,24; 147:3 panel (1) 98:25 paper (3) 23:25,25;151:4 paradigm (3) 74:12,23;75:1 paragraph (2) 77:17;131:10 parameter (1) 110:5 parameters (6) 84:6;109:25;110:23; 111:5,6;114:6 Parcel (11) 4:9;64:19,21;66:1; 68:24;72:2;101:12; 161:6;170:5;172:1; 196:14 parcels (1) 68:21 Pardon (1) 125:8 Park (1) 66:21 parking (7) 88:19;90:16,20; 101:14;170:11;182:15, 20 Parkside (1) 16:10 part (15) 29:23;42:10;45:20; 50:22;59:20;72:9,12; 79:2;80:17;93:5; 104:16;110:16;176:17, 18,22 partially (1) 176:13 participate (1) 36:25 particle (5) 189:10;190:15,17; 192:2;193:23 particles (24) 15:6;49:13;189:5,5, 6,7,8;190:6,10,12,13, 20,23;191:7,11;192:1, 21;193:6,20;194:7,10, 12,19,21</p>	<p>particle-size (1) 189:25 particular (26) 12:23;22:13;25:15; 26:10;46:23;64:11; 71:10;77:18;81:21; 87:25;96:24;126:21; 131:11;132:25;137:1; 159:15,22;168:14; 169:1;174:6;184:3; 190:22;191:5;200:9; 214:4;215:13 particularly (9) 14:14;22:23;25:15; 34:1;128:1;174:3; 188:8;203:7;212:9 particulate (1) 173:24 particulates (15) 15:9;84:19;152:10; 188:9,13,24,25;189:22; 191:20;194:17;195:5; 199:14;200:15;205:16; 210:15 parties (5) 4:22;7:3;11:3;27:4, 12 partner (1) 41:11 partnered (4) 16:23;39:20;40:1,2 partnership (1) 38:9 parts (2) 86:20;103:17 pass (1) 30:8 passed (3) 5:15;30:5,5 passing (1) 89:20 past (1) 39:4 Pat (2) 5:1;6:15 pattern (3) 100:14,19;169:9 patterns (1) 166:25 paying (1) 12:23 peak (1) 87:23 peaks (1) 178:7 peer-reviewed (1) 50:13 penetrate (1) 194:21 Pennsylvania (1) 48:23 people (28) 10:7;13:21;19:19;</p>
		P		
		<p>Packaging (1) 43:2 pads (1) 106:3 page (50) 68:7,8;69:8;71:8;</p>		

27:10;29:14;30:24; 33:3,9;49:6;53:14; 81:15,15,18;88:9,17, 19,20;89:20,25;90:24; 91:8;179:23;181:15, 21;183:8;200:5,10,20 per (22) 62:2;71:20;102:21; 119:2,5;126:10;127:5; 132:10;137:10;138:8; 155:6;161:21;163:9; 168:10;174:10,14,16, 16;175:3,3,15;177:22 percent (26) 126:14;137:17,24; 153:6,9,16,18;154:23, 25;158:11;159:10,16, 20;164:1,2,2,23,25,25; 165:12;167:4,8; 168:13,22;190:11; 198:15 percentage (6) 69:5;73:7,13;139:7; 163:15;164:1 percentages (1) 138:13 perchloroethylene (2) 43:9,23 perfect (1) 14:13 perform (1) 28:16 perhaps (6) 8:4;136:16;137:6; 141:4;157:5;201:1 period (13) 19:13;32:12,21; 39:22;43:25;91:15,17, 21;174:16;203:17,22, 25;206:4 periods (3) 87:23;92:20;200:12 peripherally (1) 61:5 permission (1) 174:18 permit (2) 23:2;54:14 person (9) 18:12;19:3;36:11; 40:3;47:25;81:22;90:5; 93:12;116:19 personally (3) 8:12;32:14,16 pertain (1) 17:8 pesky (1) 209:20 petition (1) 4:4 petitioner (1) 4:6 Phase (3)	11:15;12:4,19 phaseout (1) 46:6 PhD (4) 14:21,23;16:9;17:10 Philips (3) 44:4,7,18 phone (2) 48:1;60:2 phoned (1) 59:25 photochemical (3) 22:15,17;165:4 photochemistry (1) 22:24 photography (1) 170:7 phrase (1) 173:5 physical (16) 11:15;15:4,5;18:20; 33:13,16;52:20;53:2; 103:17;121:10;188:7, 8,25;194:18;199:15; 215:12 physically (2) 129:12;179:2 physics (1) 190:23 pick (3) 13:22;164:24;200:19 picked (2) 88:9;165:24 picks (1) 18:11 Picture (3) 102:3;106:3,9 piece (1) 209:8 pieces (2) 187:4;214:5 place (11) 14:13,15;43:24; 45:10;58:18;59:25; 103:10;124:5;128:24; 133:9;182:19 places (8) 15:3;46:21;90:25; 96:4,18,19;133:5; 141:11 placing (1) 87:23 planned (1) 28:3 Planning (9) 18:15;19:5;47:4; 63:6,7;66:21;203:16; 205:25;206:23 plans (2) 6:22;132:22 plant (5) 29:10,11;36:15,16; 58:15	plants (3) 24:2;32:1;49:9 plastic (1) 43:4 play (3) 16:21;41:20,21 played (1) 35:6 playgrounds (1) 45:6 Plaza (1) 4:9 pleasant (2) 65:14;66:24 please (18) 4:23;13:15,18,24; 14:8,9;18:1;27:13; 53:21;74:4;96:15; 123:19,21;150:7; 177:9;196:17;215:16; 218:8 pleasure (1) 209:24 plume (7) 34:12;99:2,8;100:9; 104:25;110:11;158:16 plumes (1) 32:1 plus (2) 126:10;197:6 pm (1) 219:9 PM10 (2) 132:11;191:15 PM2.5 (35) 83:20,24;97:5; 127:16;132:11;133:18; 138:25;139:2,23,24; 140:10;152:8,14,21; 166:14,16;173:24,24; 188:7,10,11,12;189:4, 14;190:8;195:22; 196:1,13;203:8,23; 210:10,11;211:1,12; 213:5 point (62) 7:15;26:12;33:6; 61:23;66:14;67:2; 73:10;81:23;98:9,12; 101:8;110:14;112:4; 118:22;120:21;121:23; 122:15;123:18;126:24; 129:25;130:9;131:7; 137:11;140:16;144:10; 152:25;154:9;156:20; 163:13;169:8;170:17; 171:22;175:9;185:12, 19;186:24;191:16,22; 192:3;193:18;194:14; 195:7;198:20;199:8, 21;203:2,10;204:10,12, 13,23;205:1,4,7,20; 206:12,16,17,22,25;	208:7;209:11 pointed (3) 76:25;124:21;199:13 pointer (7) 98:3;106:4;120:25; 121:11;158:20;159:25; 184:14 points (10) 94:1,3;96:2,8; 110:16,17;111:23; 183:9;202:17,17 policy (1) 43:16 politics (1) 20:1 pollutancy (1) 183:25 pollutant (3) 127:25;195:23;196:3 pollutants (17) 16:17;25:17;68:20; 71:10;73:13;75:21; 83:21;104:1;127:15; 139:23;152:10;166:16; 173:17,23,25;203:7; 205:15 pollution (33) 15:13,22;16:12,15, 22;22:2,3,23;23:10; 33:10,25;37:14;42:12, 17;43:5;48:4;49:10; 54:14,55:8;68:24;69:6, 10;73:7;74:7;81:20; 82:13,19;88:10;91:16; 103:4;109:2;190:21; 200:1 pollutions (1) 73:25 polyaromatic (1) 194:12 polycythemia (1) 49:5 pond (1) 29:11 pool (6) 68:21;69:11;71:17, 18;72:22;73:14 popped (1) 27:2 populations (1) 200:4 portion (4) 65:23;66:8;162:16; 168:3 pose (1) 171:5 posed (1) 171:15 position (7) 16:10;17:21;18:13; 74:16;86:7;165:9; 206:6 positive (1)	173:5 possibility (1) 13:24 possible (4) 7:25;44:11;98:1; 137:2 possibly (1) 218:16 post (1) 20:22 potential (3) 94:25;170:9;211:1 potentially (3) 91:5;97:5;116:8 powdered (1) 191:23 power (9) 24:2;29:10,11;32:1; 36:15,16;49:8;58:15, 16 PowerPoint (2) 69:19;156:16 practical (1) 159:8 practice (1) 53:11 practices (2) 25:6;43:24 pre-building (1) 12:6 precise (1) 34:14 precursor (2) 36:5,6 predict (1) 166:13 predicted (4) 73:25;76:21;83:20; 97:10 predicting (4) 84:3;94:21,22; 196:13 prediction (1) 197:8 predictions (1) 197:3 predicts (1) 137:8 preeminent (1) 55:13 preface (1) 198:22 prefer (3) 8:12;70:25;209:25 preferable (1) 9:3 preference (1) 8:9 preferred (1) 108:13 preliminary (4) 6:8;11:13,22,23 premiere (1)
--	--	--	--	--

<p>190:4 premise (4) 25:10;185:2;189:17; 201:10 premised (2) 171:13,16 preparation (1) 14:12 preparation-for-research (1) 14:17 prepare (1) 120:17 prepared (1) 115:3 preparing (2) 167:15,16 present (4) 21:9;25:14;101:14; 112:17 presentation (1) 56:10 presentations (1) 214:2 presented (7) 77:24;81:1,3;112:14; 170:6;197:15;201:18 presents (2) 87:8;112:13 preservatives (1) 46:6 president (1) 19:23 Presidential (1) 45:25 pressing (1) 160:1 pressure-treated (1) 45:3 prestigious (1) 45:24 pretend (1) 102:5 pretty (3) 24:4;50:15;193:2 prevailing (1) 31:13 Prevention (1) 47:15 previous (3) 39:14;43:24;180:22 previously (3) 168:21;183:16; 210:14 primarily (1) 77:23 primitive (1) 101:9 principle (3) 94:14;112:24;160:11 principles (1) 95:9 print (2) 138:3,5</p>	<p>prior (5) 12:7,12;101:22,24; 203:23 probability (1) 109:17 probable (1) 197:8 probably (8) 9:25;13:7;27:15; 34:21;63:14;120:1,4; 142:25 problem (18) 9:18;57:15;63:18; 75:22;87:4;88:7; 116:23;122:5;139:22; 146:12;159:18,19,19; 166:18,18,21;190:7; 204:1 problematic (1) 194:25 problems (8) 5:13;20:18;39:12; 84:2;96:21;130:11,16; 132:5 procedure (2) 79:10;198:9 proceed (3) 13:9;14:2;151:3 proceeding (3) 56:4;58:8;146:12 proceedings (3) 53:22;55:20;63:4 process (12) 25:12;26:18;33:10; 34:22,25;40:13;56:12, 23;202:5,9,16;203:6 produce (1) 72:14 produced (1) 91:2 producing (1) 22:22 product (4) 45:3,8,12,13 products (3) 42:8,19;43:21 professional (6) 61:13;75:17;77:11; 78:25;161:1;166:12 professor (3) 15:7;17:11,11 proffered (2) 217:19,24 profound (4) 15:20,21;33:9;104:6 program (1) 18:6 programs (1) 34:9 progress (1) 10:1 prohibited (1) 194:25</p>	<p>project (4) 22:13;39:23;44:3; 48:20 projected (4) 68:20,23;172:4; 196:13 projections (4) 170:3,8;203:2; 208:16 projects (7) 19:19;30:13;47:13; 48:20;60:17;61:17; 132:12 prominent (1) 122:6 pronouncing (1) 6:19 proof (2) 74:8;75:7 propagate (1) 197:10 proper (2) 40:22;108:16 properly (4) 23:22;25:13;72:8; 210:11 properties (3) 64:15;66:23;79:25 property (2) 66:18;79:5 proportional (1) 102:16 proportionality (1) 108:21 proposed (8) 64:6,12;65:8,16; 66:17;74:9;168:3; 205:23 proposition (1) 77:1 protect (1) 200:10 protecting (1) 195:17 protection (4) 95:3;108:12;114:17; 197:13 protocol (6) 95:8;202:6,15,16; 211:16,22 protocols (10) 24:12,15;25:21;60:8, 12,20;61:12,16,19;62:4 prototype (1) 22:10 proud (2) 45:23;46:1 prove (1) 43:17 provide (10) 9:18;11:15;19:17; 23:13;63:24;75:18; 82:11;83:10;160:14;</p>	<p>187:5 provided (17) 19:9;23:7,14;61:19; 64:1;69:21;129:17; 144:4;147:4,24;148:5; 149:16;170:14,16; 173:19;202:10;214:6 provides (1) 72:1 providing (1) 102:21 Province (1) 54:13 provision (1) 44:13 provisions (1) 77:1 proximate (1) 217:4 proximity (2) 68:3;216:9 public (12) 4:2;27:11;56:6;57:7; 95:4;195:17;197:14; 199:11,20,25;200:7,8 publication (1) 50:9 publications (5) 21:24;22:1;36:20; 49:24;50:1 pulling (1) 183:3 pulls (1) 95:12 pumps (1) 4:7 punch (1) 51:22 purported (1) 47:4 purposes (2) 153:23;159:8 pursuant (1) 4:5 pushed (1) 28:4 put (22) 7:25;19:22;27:24; 29:10;30:25;31:4; 51:12,23;69:15;70:6; 81:9,10;99:13;107:4; 112:18;144:7;156:18; 175:23;176:25;204:6, 16,17 putting (3) 23:17;91:1;207:22 puzzles (1) 100:3</p>	<p>25:25;26:15;48:18; 53:7;57:13;62:1 qualified (8) 53:22,25;54:20; 56:17;59:14;60:6;62:2; 79:16 qualify (2) 56:4;61:21 qualifying (1) 79:25 qualities (1) 217:11 Quality (34) 18:14;19:5,11;24:9, 10;25:20;35:25;36:17; 47:4;48:3;54:14;60:7, 10;61:18;62:3;63:14; 74:2,7,17;75:4,20;76:2, 7;83:12;90:3;97:24; 132:23;164:18;197:20, 22;198:23;212:20; 215:19,20 quality-checked (1) 30:25 quantification (1) 172:4 Quantify (1) 89:10 quasi-judicial (3) 55:23;56:1;59:21 queue (8) 71:20,22;89:21;90:5, 10,24;168:8;179:8 queues (13) 69:10;87:24;88:10; 161:18;170:9;179:22, 22,23,24;180:1;181:15, 20,23 quick (1) 12:20 quickly (1) 186:5 quite (8) 15:8;68:15;122:12, 22;143:3,12;178:11,14 quote (6) 64:6,10;147:17; 149:15;167:14;215:10 quoted (1) 168:18</p>
R				
<p>Racine (1) 15:16 radiation (3) 15:10,11,11 radiosondes (2) 32:4,4 radius (1) 78:13 raise (1) 13:24</p>				
Q				
<p>qualifications (11) 17:2,6,9;20:5;21:22;</p>				

<p>raised (1) 111:24</p> <p>ramp (3) 141:2,6,12</p> <p>ran (2) 136:24;155:11</p> <p>random (2) 101:1,2</p> <p>range (2) 190:15;193:5</p> <p>ranged (1) 21:11</p> <p>rapidly (1) 169:16</p> <p>rare (1) 48:23</p> <p>raring (1) 145:1</p> <p>rate (6) 108:20;152:9;155:4; 174:8,16;180:25</p> <p>rather (10) 8:13;10:14;38:16; 106:22;149:12;162:23; 163:16;174:15;175:3; 189:16</p> <p>ratio (3) 177:25;178:11; 184:19</p> <p>rationale (1) 86:9</p> <p>ratios (1) 43:20</p> <p>razor (1) 160:12</p> <p>re (1) 6:17</p> <p>reach (1) 10:16</p> <p>reaching (1) 76:9</p> <p>reaction (2) 164:19;165:4</p> <p>read (9) 48:7;71:1;96:3; 125:10;129:8,23; 130:11;131:9;167:25</p> <p>readily (1) 212:2</p> <p>reading (3) 72:10;130:13,14</p> <p>readings (2) 119:12;178:8</p> <p>ready (2) 13:9;144:20</p> <p>Reagan (1) 19:23</p> <p>real (4) 46:16,18;81:24; 97:18</p> <p>really (19) 17:2;22:8;23:16; 58:21;62:1;87:10,10;</p>	<p>98:16;103:13;113:12, 19;121:5;166:18; 175:17;183:17,19; 185:20;198:18;214:5</p> <p>realm (2) 114:4;195:2</p> <p>reason (7) 46:2;85:6;86:9;95:1; 152:7;157:24;186:3</p> <p>reasonable (7) 75:18;83:10;113:3; 116:12,13,19;161:11</p> <p>reasonably (1) 114:3</p> <p>reasons (9) 76:8;82:8;83:9; 111:14;127:2,7; 194:19;206:1;209:6</p> <p>recall (12) 29:5;89:19;90:4; 124:20;126:21;128:16; 151:19,23;153:6; 154:11;163:16;203:15</p> <p>recalled (1) 151:23</p> <p>receive (1) 63:15</p> <p>received (2) 26:3;160:16</p> <p>recent (1) 38:7</p> <p>recently (3) 72:12;202:11;213:5</p> <p>Receptor (5) 17:23;18:3;81:7,15, 21</p> <p>receptors (8) 69:11;72:22;81:2,6, 13,17;200:5;204:8</p> <p>recess (5) 83:4;120:12;144:24, 25;188:1</p> <p>recitation (1) 147:5</p> <p>recognize (1) 188:19</p> <p>recognized (2) 188:16;201:3</p> <p>recollection (5) 85:9;126:2,6;154:8, 14</p> <p>recommend (2) 204:9;209:4</p> <p>recommendation (5) 4:21;201:15;205:21; 206:23;207:3</p> <p>recommendations (3) 49:18;63:7,25</p> <p>recommended (5) 66:22;67:16;108:13; 129:3;156:4</p> <p>recommending (1) 205:2</p>	<p>recommends (1) 91:21</p> <p>record (40) 4:23;5:11;13:15; 25:23;62:14;72:12; 117:2;119:1,10;120:2, 14,15;126:13;128:20; 129:8,12,16,23,23; 130:18;131:3,5,10; 135:21;143:7,22; 149:17;150:22;154:12; 171:14,17,17,25; 172:14;173:19,20; 177:17;212:24;216:11; 217:25</p> <p>records (1) 43:22</p> <p>recross (1) 58:2</p> <p>recycle (1) 44:16</p> <p>recycling (2) 44:9,12</p> <p>redesigning (1) 46:22</p> <p>reduce (3) 91:19;97:10;102:14</p> <p>reduced (6) 89:18;158:8;159:9; 167:3;212:25;213:11</p> <p>reducing (1) 83:20</p> <p>reduction (13) 42:18;44:10,14,14; 89:4,9;92:3;93:8,11; 158:12;163:15;167:8,8</p> <p>reductions (1) 203:3</p> <p>refer (2) 169:2;196:5</p> <p>reference (4) 6:22;69:7;147:7; 179:22</p> <p>referenced (2) 22:7;205:17</p> <p>references (1) 108:8</p> <p>referring (5) 133:23;136:15; 153:25;154:7;161:7</p> <p>refers (1) 85:3</p> <p>refined (3) 167:6,6;189:20</p> <p>refinements (1) 162:11</p> <p>refinery (1) 23:11</p> <p>reflect (5) 15:10;112:5;174:20, 25;212:8</p> <p>reflected (1) 204:21</p>	<p>reflective (2) 109:11,12</p> <p>reflects (4) 117:2;130:6;133:11; 142:12</p> <p>refresh (1) 154:13</p> <p>regarding (10) 6:15,19,20;21:22; 127:13;164:4;171:3, 18;216:9;217:25</p> <p>regardless (1) 177:19</p> <p>region (3) 36:17;132:23;205:12</p> <p>regional (3) 130:10;133:2,3</p> <p>regionally (1) 133:3</p> <p>Register (4) 130:14;131:3,14,18</p> <p>Registry (1) 47:16</p> <p>regulate (1) 188:11</p> <p>regulated (3) 188:21,22;195:10</p> <p>regulates (1) 188:10</p> <p>regulations (3) 44:12;58:17;92:3</p> <p>regulator (1) 23:2</p> <p>regulators (1) 24:4</p> <p>regulatory (4) 19:25;108:12; 201:12;212:9</p> <p>rehab (2) 12:17,18</p> <p>Reid (2) 15:7,7</p> <p>re-institutionalized (1) 21:5</p> <p>related (1) 190:7</p> <p>relating (2) 49:24;61:17</p> <p>relationship (5) 64:14;88:2;179:12; 193:23;215:19</p> <p>relative (1) 16:18</p> <p>relatively (6) 8:3;27:17;103:16; 107:10,16,25</p> <p>released (1) 49:14</p> <p>releases (3) 20:18;45:17;129:10</p> <p>relevance (2) 181:2;183:23</p> <p>relevant (2) 32:5;185:14</p>	<p>relied (3) 80:24;127:24;170:3</p> <p>relying (1) 77:23</p> <p>remain (1) 105:24</p> <p>remember (11) 12:4;56:18;76:10; 114:3;147:20;151:11; 155:8,11;162:10; 182:11;207:22</p> <p>remind (1) 196:16</p> <p>remove (1) 158:14</p> <p>removed (2) 44:12;159:8</p> <p>repeat (2) 62:22;87:14</p> <p>repeatedly (1) 83:22</p> <p>Rephrase (5) 32:19;38:5;74:13; 171:23;172:12</p> <p>replaced (4) 44:12;129:6,20; 212:11</p> <p>report (86) 4:21;50:7;54:10,16, 17,22;62:9,11;63:7,25; 68:19,23;69:2,9;71:13; 72:1,5;77:10,17;79:12; 80:23;81:1;82:10; 83:25;87:19;93:1;97:6; 108:8;112:5,7,8,19; 114:25;115:1,19; 123:4,5,21;124:7,7,12, 13,15,16,23;125:1,3; 127:13;129:9;144:17; 146:20;147:3,14,15,16, 17;148:8,20;150:4,5, 10;151:12;152:6; 154:5,15,18;155:3,5; 156:8,17;157:2,10; 160:25;161:3;165:19, 24;166:9,13;167:5; 170:16;177:25;195:22; 196:2,6,12;198:6</p> <p>reports (19) 20:16,17;28:12;50:4; 61:15,19;73:11,12; 94:10;96:17;122:11; 146:25;154:1;197:1,6; 202:10;214:17;215:1; 217:15</p> <p>representation (1) 112:21</p> <p>representative (5) 31:13,14;111:12; 204:14;205:8</p> <p>represented (1) 5:18</p>
---	--	--	---	---

<p>requested (2) 72:11;158:2</p> <p>require (1) 164:13</p> <p>required (2) 36:25;84:7</p> <p>requires (1) 63:21</p> <p>requiring (1) 206:12</p> <p>research (10) 14:12;23:25;25:10; 31:24;33:18,25;40:3,5; 190:4,5</p> <p>residences (1) 68:4</p> <p>residential (3) 64:15;67:1,9</p> <p>residents (4) 54:18;64:7;74:10,18</p> <p>resistance (1) 103:18</p> <p>resolve (1) 216:14</p> <p>resources (1) 37:12</p> <p>respect (7) 87:19;97:20;152:14; 156:20;170:2;215:18; 216:22</p> <p>respected (1) 47:24</p> <p>respiratory (1) 194:22</p> <p>respond (2) 77:9;201:8</p> <p>response (8) 6:6;11:24;61:9,10; 78:23,24;163:12;219:1</p> <p>responses (1) 84:11</p> <p>responsibilities (1) 30:3</p> <p>responsibility (1) 19:19</p> <p>responsible (1) 30:23</p> <p>rest (6) 21:15;27:24;90:13; 131:19;161:25,25</p> <p>restricted (5) 66:18;140:18,18; 141:5,12</p> <p>restriction (1) 141:4</p> <p>result (7) 15:14;69:6;73:8; 103:18;132:13;152:14; 159:15</p> <p>resulted (1) 46:6</p> <p>results (29) 69:2;72:10;78:1;</p>	<p>80:25;81:4;82:7;87:8; 90:21;96:6;97:11; 110:20;112:15,16; 115:16,18;130:6; 154:23,24;156:5; 158:1;165:10;177:18; 201:17,20;205:3,22; 206:5,13;207:17</p> <p>resume (2) 4:14;209:17</p> <p>résumé (2) 49:25;50:21</p> <p>retained (2) 47:14;194:21</p> <p>retreat (1) 96:20</p> <p>reverse (1) 95:6</p> <p>reversed (1) 105:4</p> <p>review (14) 12:20;23:2,5;37:5,6, 15,22;38:7,17;41:22; 53:15;54:16;61:15; 97:23</p> <p>reviewed (10) 28:12;47:17;50:14; 55:13;62:8,11,20,23; 202:9;217:14</p> <p>reviewing (2) 23:20,20</p> <p>reviews (1) 45:18</p> <p>revised (3) 145:15,22,24</p> <p>Revision (3) 129:11;158:6;166:24</p> <p>revisions (2) 94:4;214:2</p> <p>rewarded (1) 184:15</p> <p>rid (2) 106:16,20</p> <p>riddled (1) 200:13</p> <p>ride (1) 31:25</p> <p>right (253) 6:3,7,23;9:2;10:6,19, 23;11:11,12,19;12:15, 16,18;13:8,11,24;14:2; 15:20;18:23;19:3;21:7, 14;23:21;24:16,25; 25:18;27:2;28:7;29:22; 30:6,18;31:18,20;33:3, 16;34:5;35:15;38:18; 44:22,22;46:8;48:16; 49:20;50:25;51:5;53:6, 8,12;54:9;55:10;56:20, 25;59:17;60:5;61:8; 62:6;63:19;68:9,11,15, 17;70:15,18;71:6; 72:24;73:1,5;74:20;</p>	<p>75:5;77:21,25;78:9,21; 79:4,14,17;80:1,4,20; 82:9,12;83:2;84:22,25; 86:14;88:4,5;89:7,19; 90:11,12;91:4;93:10; 98:9,23;99:14;100:23; 102:20,23;103:16; 104:10,14;105:16; 106:2,11,19,20;107:8, 11;108:22,25;111:3,10, 18;113:8,17;114:24; 115:8;116:16;117:11, 15,23,25;118:4,8,12, 15,16,19;119:13;120:6, 10;122:2,24;123:6,10; 130:17,22;131:4,12; 134:15;136:21;138:9, 16,23;139:8,17,22,25; 140:3;141:1,18,23; 142:18,19,21;144:8; 147:25;148:3,18; 149:14;150:12,23; 151:3;152:20;153:20; 154:8;155:16,18; 157:15,16;158:6; 159:4;160:2,6,10; 162:7,9;163:24; 165:22;166:2;168:12, 24;169:19,23;171:2; 172:13,17;173:4,10,22, 25;174:11;175:5,10, 13;176:8,10,13,20,24; 178:22;179:11,16; 180:13,19,23;181:2,4, 8,24,25;182:6,7,13; 183:4,6;184:21,25; 185:7;186:6,10; 187:14,21,25;188:2; 191:21;192:14,18; 193:8,9,14,16,17,22; 194:1,3;199:1;201:13; 204:23;205:10;206:19; 207:19;208:3,5;210:7; 211:23;212:15;213:3, 8;215:3;218:23;219:2</p> <p>rigorous (1) 200:9</p> <p>ring (5) 170:11;179:17; 181:17,22;205:14</p> <p>risk (2) 48:6,8</p> <p>river (1) 36:15</p> <p>RME (1) 38:10</p> <p>Road (7) 4:8;13:19;170:11; 179:17;181:17,22; 205:14</p> <p>roadway (2) 142:11,13</p> <p>roadways (2)</p>	<p>141:5;205:13</p> <p>role (8) 19:5;23:1,19;30:2; 41:20,20;46:24;53:18</p> <p>Roman (3) 124:18,19;125:16</p> <p>room (7) 4:16;9:19,19;11:5,7; 26:9;27:15</p> <p>rooms (1) 9:16</p> <p>ROSENFELD (249) 5:7,7,9,10,20;6:15, 17,21;7:6,8,18,20,24; 8:2,20,24;9:3,9,14; 10:9,16,20,24;13:10; 14:3,5;17:16;18:16,23, 25;21:23;24:7,12,16, 23;27:23;28:1;42:22; 51:6,9;52:25;53:5,8,9; 55:25;58:1;61:8,10; 62:7,14,16,19;63:17, 20;65:10;66:7;68:12, 13,15,18;69:18,21; 70:11,15,22;71:7; 72:20;73:6,11,17,20, 23;75:9,11,13,16,25; 80:20,21;82:18,25; 83:5,6,7;87:16,17; 89:8;92:1,10,12,16; 93:8,11,18,25;96:12; 97:14;98:18;101:21; 102:25;108:7;111:22; 112:8,10,12;113:22; 116:1,25;119:15,19; 120:4,15,16,22,24; 123:1,13;125:2; 127:11,21;128:18; 129:5,13,16;130:19,25; 131:2;133:14;134:1,5, 7,12,14,22;135:3,7,9, 11,15,17,23;136:3,8, 10;140:15;141:19; 142:1,10;143:2,10,14, 18,21,24;144:6,13,21, 23;145:2,6,9,11,14,19, 21;146:3,5,8,15;147:1, 2,10,13,19;148:4,7,10, 12,19,22,24;149:15,19, 23;150:6,10,13,18,22; 151:1;152:1;155:20, 21;157:17;158:19,22; 160:23;165:16;167:16, 17,24;168:19;169:22; 171:20,23,24;172:19; 173:6,20;177:5; 185:21;187:9,12,20,23; 188:2,4,5,17,18;189:7; 192:12;195:19;198:2; 202:4;207:1,2;209:14, 15,22;210:9;211:14; 212:17;213:15;215:2, 3,6,8,9;216:5,7,19,21;</p>	<p>217:2,13;218:7,16,24; 219:3</p> <p>Rosenfeld's (3) 180:14;181:3;187:7</p> <p>rough (3) 100:5;107:10;110:13</p> <p>rougher (5) 16:20;108:1;121:22; 122:1,14</p> <p>roughness (9) 16:20;103:6,8,9; 109:14;110:5,9;111:7, 7</p> <p>rule (2) 78:12;97:6</p> <p>run (4) 51:13;53:14;143:6; 144:13</p> <p>running (2) 56:4;175:21</p> <p>runs (1) 52:10</p> <p>rural (59) 71:23;76:15,16,18, 19;77:13,19,24;78:20; 79:16,19;80:12,13,25; 83:13;103:2,3,5,16; 104:12;105:1;107:23; 111:25;112:14,17,22; 113:25;114:10;115:5, 11,15,25;116:2,8; 117:8;118:9;120:19; 121:19,20,21;122:16, 22;123:3,14;126:25; 140:18,19,20;141:3; 143:17;157:24,24; 158:3,4;161:3;162:15, 16;166:8;210:20</p> <p>Rutgers (1) 14:10</p>
S				
			<p>S-2863 (1) 4:4</p> <p>sadly (1) 49:18</p> <p>safety (3) 95:2;111:19;114:15</p> <p>same (26) 16:13;53:18;68:5,7, 8;97:20,20;99:17; 110:3,24;114:4; 115:24;125:2;127:18; 148:4;152:9,18,18; 169:3;177:21;182:23, 24,24;189:16,16; 199:14</p> <p>samples (2) 52:20;53:2</p> <p>sanity (1) 151:25</p> <p>satisfy (1)</p>	

74:17 Savage (1) 5:14 saw (4) 63:11,16;119:24; 179:21 saying (36) 26:16;37:18,18; 38:14;73:11;79:7;87:9; 93:4;95:24,24;102:19; 107:3,13;108:3; 109:18;116:7;118:6; 124:22;126:19;127:4; 139:6;151:24;159:17; 161:8;176:14;185:10, 13;186:19;189:14; 195:9;200:17;206:3; 208:20;209:8,9;215:4 scale (1) 22:17 scale-up (1) 155:6 scaling (1) 91:20 scenario (2) 204:24;205:1 schedule (4) 8:4,21;9:18;27:12 scheduled (1) 6:23 schedules (2) 10:22;28:4 scheme (1) 108:5 school (10) 64:22,24;65:18; 68:21;69:11;71:17,18; 72:22;73:14;169:3 science (13) 14:14,18;17:14;20:6; 21:10;24:9;25:6,14; 35:22;41:12;50:15; 94:8;160:11 sciences (3) 16:11,12;17:12 scientific (30) 19:17;23:14;24:4,12, 14;25:10,20,21;26:17; 41:9,21;46:24;53:14; 60:8,8,11,12;61:12; 62:4,4;100:3;164:22; 196:19,20;197:1,6; 198:5;203:4;206:8; 217:15 scientifically (1) 205:6 scientist (8) 18:13;19:9;24:22; 37:19;47:20;97:12; 203:13;214:1 scope (3) 42:12;68:19;215:25 screen (4)	34:9;70:3;101:10; 150:3 SCREEN3 (2) 34:9;37:10 screened (1) 33:23 screening (3) 33:23;34:7,24 se (2) 62:2;174:16 search (1) 90:16 seat (1) 6:4 second (15) 4:16;22:15;25:7; 27:18;83:15;110:3; 125:24;127:12;156:6; 163:11;175:3,15; 217:22,23;218:13 secondary (1) 159:3 secondly (5) 83:24;84:14;86:24; 87:23;204:14 seconds (2) 164:19,20 Section (12) 4:5;17:23;18:14; 19:18,18;22:18;29:9,9, 12,21;99:17;155:2 sector (1) 110:5 seeing (1) 105:14 seems (10) 7:2;8:2;49:25; 112:18;178:10;183:12; 205:23;206:6;216:24; 217:2 sell (1) 102:6 semi-rural (1) 121:19 Senator (1) 48:24 sending (1) 206:3 senior (3) 18:13;19:7,9 sense (9) 33:5;67:23;108:1; 171:15;178:10,17; 184:18;190:23;204:15 sensitive (3) 200:4,4,5 sensitivity (2) 110:18;136:25 sent (1) 205:25 sentence (2) 38:4;41:4 separate (3)	93:23;188:19,23 September (4) 155:22;156:13; 167:18;168:19 sequentially (1) 8:8 serial (1) 200:16 series (2) 20:16;204:17 serious (2) 114:17;160:18 served (1) 53:19 Service (5) 33:4;51:23;56:7; 57:8;88:21 session (2) 4:14;6:8 sessions (1) 4:13 set (7) 145:10;185:15; 194:24;199:22;200:19, 21;208:4 sets (1) 16:19 seven (1) 45:2 seventh (1) 11:7 several (11) 7:10;22:1;44:8;51:7; 60:17;131:3;145:3; 155:11;202:23;204:14; 215:15 shall (2) 120:6,7 sharp (1) 50:15 sheds (1) 184:5 shift (1) 203:14 shifted (1) 178:7 Shifting (1) 152:17 shop (1) 90:17 shopping (2) 46:18;90:19 shops (2) 90:17;182:19 shoreline (6) 22:4,5,9,10;55:14; 58:15 shorelines (1) 104:6 shorter (1) 91:15 shot (2) 198:10,11	show (27) 34:11;69:16;70:2,12; 71:9;72:11;75:3;76:5; 90:21;91:2;106:24; 115:14;128:5,12; 133:22;140:9;145:16, 24,25;152:7;154:6; 155:12;158:23;171:25; 179:12;183:17;191:18 showed (14) 44:13;76:14;81:4,5; 97:11;166:3;169:15; 172:15;180:22,24; 184:17;202:24;203:2; 214:16 showing (4) 74:9;105:25;152:11; 214:18 shown (6) 71:17;123:20;125:9; 158:16;162:5;193:19 shows (20) 69:2;76:17;81:13; 95:11;105:12;123:4,7; 133:4;137:7;150:4; 157:4;169:2;173:22; 174:1;177:2;183:13; 184:17;190:7;192:20; 202:20 side (7) 17:1;57:21;94:24; 114:15;143:15;157:23; 199:19 sides (2) 64:16;113:5 signaling (1) 20:17 significant (2) 111:24;132:9 Silver (1) 4:8 SILVERMAN (19) 5:21,22;13:1,4,6; 44:25;51:2;59:11;83:1; 119:22,24;121:3,17; 128:8;149:22;153:8, 10;218:9,11 similar (3) 72:1,22;152:21 Similarly (1) 104:25 simple (2) 28:20;172:6 simpler (2) 60:22;178:6 simplest (1) 160:12 simplicity (1) 51:25 simply (1) 147:5 simulate (1) 86:8	simulated (1) 86:23 simulates (1) 109:19 Simulator (1) 128:21 single (2) 60:15;96:6 sins (2) 189:5;200:15 site (37) 4:8;12:10,20;23:21; 31:15;37:1;39:18; 43:23;49:7;64:8,11,12, 13,15,18;65:4,8,16,16, 19,20;72:16;74:11,21, 24;75:1;76:17,18; 77:18;161:2;168:2; 172:4;200:24,25; 201:1;209:7;215:14 sites (10) 20:10;30:10,11;39:7; 47:19,20;49:8;73:14; 200:1;205:8 site-specific (1) 58:18 situation (12) 79:1;87:3;96:8; 109:10,19,23;120:21; 171:1;183:18;186:16; 189:17;201:24 situations (3) 153:17;177:3;183:11 six (2) 49:8,8 size (8) 52:7;64:2;70:8; 109:20;176:3;189:6; 190:16;204:8 skip (1) 17:1 slash (2) 108:11;140:20 slid (1) 192:8 Slide (64) 69:19;70:2,12,20; 101:24;102:2;106:19; 117:24,25;123:4,8,10, 23;124:22,25;130:23, 24;142:17,23;143:5; 144:3;145:16,24,25; 147:7,10,13,14,14,15, 16,21,22,23;148:4,4,7, 10,20;150:3;151:6,9, 19;152:2,4,20;156:15; 157:22;159:6;161:8; 165:18;167:9;169:16; 172:7;175:23;176:3; 177:9;180:22;183:17; 184:4;190:2;191:12, 18;192:8 slides (14)
--	--	--	--	--

<p>101:4;114:19,20; 134:3,4,11;135:13; 136:12;143:5;145:3; 146:11,12;148:8,8 slightly (3) 153:14;155:2;162:22 slime (1) 100:19 slow (6) 127:17,20;128:12; 139:15;170:23;175:21 slower (4) 137:23;172:15; 180:25;183:14 slower-speed (1) 183:24 slowly (7) 100:11;174:6,8,15; 175:12;176:14;183:16 slow-moving (1) 161:18 small (12) 49:13;103:7;124:18, 19;125:15;138:3,5; 141:14;156:19;191:7; 192:1;193:4 smaller (4) 15:3;91:16,17;103:7 smallest (1) 190:16 smog (1) 22:15 smokestack (1) 102:5 smooth (6) 16:20;103:16,17; 107:10,16,25 smoother (1) 100:5 smoothness (1) 107:13 snapshot (1) 166:25 snow (2) 15:23,25 snowbank (1) 179:2 SO2 (1) 32:2 so-called (2) 22:9;47:18 Society (1) 108:11 Soda (1) 42:8 software (1) 52:15 soil (2) 14:15,18 soils (1) 14:14 solar (1) 15:10</p>	<p>solution (3) 87:5;156:3;204:2 somebody (2) 51:18;218:21 somehow (1) 80:4 someone (5) 18:9;49:3;88:21; 90:15;96:1 sometimes (3) 26:17;54:19;160:12 somewhat (2) 100:18;161:23 somewhere (4) 77:19;117:22; 124:24;169:11 son (2) 26:25;192:13 soon (1) 15:19 sophisticated (3) 60:25;109:16;110:12 sophistication (1) 110:16 sorry (35) 5:16,17;18:24;32:19; 37:16;38:2;40:18,22; 41:16;42:23,23;46:10; 50:1;52:24;59:19; 68:11;89:2;103:11; 105:9;110:7;118:3; 125:5;130:21;133:17; 134:12;135:1,7; 145:22;164:8;168:5; 178:1;179:20;195:25; 211:10;215:3 sort (18) 16:8;30:7;31:15; 34:12;36:5;40:10; 45:12;48:5;79:4;88:25; 89:3;98:25;102:9; 109:6;186:18;196:21, 24;198:6 sorting (1) 52:16 sounded (1) 9:6 sounds (2) 29:22;83:1 Source (29) 17:23;36:4;41:14; 44:10,13;84:3;99:3,6, 10,19,21;104:24; 107:14,20,25;121:21; 122:4,10;129:10; 153:4;154:9;163:14; 169:13,17;177:13; 189:11;195:5;204:7; 214:20 sources (13) 33:25;34:11;69:11; 71:15;98:16;111:12; 113:15;140:25;152:14;</p>	<p>168:4;200:1;205:15; 212:7 south (6) 64:17;65:16;66:3,23; 122:10,11 southwest (1) 66:24 space (1) 90:16 spades (1) 33:7 speak (1) 177:10 Speaking (1) 63:10 special (9) 4:5;33:11;72:16; 75:19;83:11;206:13; 215:16;216:23,24 specialization (3) 37:14,14,16 specialized (2) 216:23;217:10 Specialties (1) 44:19 specialty (2) 38:3,15 specific (6) 71:15;76:8;79:3,9; 82:5;132:24 specifically (3) 47:15;73:6;110:6 specifics (1) 37:22 Specter (1) 48:24 speculation (1) 207:7 speed (24) 102:1,12,14,16,17; 103:10;132:9;137:7,9, 23;139:21;140:4; 152:8;170:10,18,19; 171:3,18;172:2;174:2; 176:23;177:10;180:25; 184:23 speeds (19) 88:3;108:24;127:17, 18,20;128:12;132:18; 138:22;139:15;140:12; 156:9;161:23;169:24; 172:15;175:21;180:17; 183:14;185:4,5 spell (1) 13:20 spelled (1) 79:9 spend (3) 140:5;174:5;175:12 spent (3) 96:13;97:15;209:18 spill (5) 43:9,13,14,15,17</p>	<p>spills (1) 46:22 Spitzer (1) 50:19 split (1) 116:9 splitting (1) 116:5 spoken (1) 196:19 spread (6) 99:2,19,20,21; 103:25;104:1 spreads (1) 99:8 Spring (1) 4:9 square (1) 192:14 squeeze (1) 11:2 squiggles (4) 100:25;101:1,2,10 squiggly (1) 100:15 St (1) 22:18 stab (4) 36:23;109:7;114:9; 116:4 staff (8) 29:14;63:7,12,15; 66:1,10,20;67:16 staffer (1) 63:13 stand (5) 54:23;128:19,22; 134:6,8 standard (63) 45:3;76:5;79:6;82:2; 83:23,25;89:5,6,14; 92:12,14,15;94:8; 95:21;97:4,5;108:14; 117:10;119:6;124:1,2; 127:1,6;128:3;133:2,4; 159:15,21;161:22; 162:20;163:9;188:23, 23;189:4,14,16;190:8, 11;191:14;194:15,16, 17,24;196:16,18;197:4, 7,7,19;198:13,15; 199:17;201:2,3,5,6,13; 203:8,9;211:7,11,13; 213:6 Standards (43) 18:15;19:5;35:25; 53:16;61:18;74:8,17; 75:4,20;76:2,7,11;82:3, 3,4,4,20;83:12;88:24; 89:24;90:2,3;96:25; 132:23;196:20;197:14, 15,19,20,23;198:23; 199:7,13,23;200:3,13,</p>	<p>19,21;201:19;210:13; 212:19,20;215:20 standing (1) 81:23 standpoint (2) 127:6;164:22 stands (2) 108:10;128:24 Star (2) 46:20,20 start (12) 42:2,2;133:23;147:2; 167:14;172:6,8,24,25; 188:9,9;215:8 started (7) 7:5;15:13;20:24; 32:8;38:3;95:8;198:21 starting (1) 199:8 starts (5) 107:12;132:10; 161:8;186:5;215:10 state (10) 13:14;18:9;25:15; 35:22;44:8;56:7;94:9; 110:1;138:8;154:20 stated (5) 133:17;155:7,24; 160:25;212:2 state-implementation (1) 132:22 statement (4) 77:8;78:24;85:20; 198:22 statements (2) 161:12;203:5 States (7) 17:22;23:10;59:23, 24;77:17;112:24; 215:11 stating (1) 160:17 station (60) 4:7;64:3,6,12,17; 65:9;69:7,10;71:10; 73:9,13,16;74:9;82:19; 87:24;88:10,15,18,20; 90:10;101:18;159:4, 12,19;160:7,8,15,19; 162:8,9;167:19;168:4, 8,8,13,15,24,25;169:6, 19;170:10;179:9; 180:5;183:8;203:24; 204:7,11;205:4,23; 206:1;207:12,17; 208:16,22,23;209:4; 214:10;216:22,24; 217:4 stations (3) 216:3,10;217:11 station's (1) 215:20 statistical (4)</p>
--	---	--	---	--

171:1,5;196:22,24 stay (4) 96:9;187:17,18,18 staying (1) 35:7 steady (1) 110:1 steepest (1) 178:21 step (3) 33:1;181:5;189:3 Stephen (2) 64:24;65:17 stick (2) 17:8;144:19 still (12) 10:5;95:16;107:23; 125:25;127:5;135:22, 23;159:21;163:7; 168:23;205:22;207:14 stipulate (2) 60:9;67:17 Stop (4) 5:22,24;68:1;107:6 stopped (1) 41:3 streets (2) 65:14;141:10 stretched (1) 102:13 stretching (1) 102:18 stringent (3) 212:19,19;213:1 strong (3) 83:22;88:1;214:17 studied (2) 104:5;146:18 studies (9) 20:9;33:8;47:18,21; 48:25;49:1,2,3;174:3 study (15) 12:7,19,21,22;14:25; 15:1;43:8;81:21;114:5; 134:25;177:14;178:24; 185:23;189:16;214:1 stuff (5) 29:12;45:5;49:14; 51:22;151:25 subcategory (3) 188:12,15,20 subject (15) 4:8;64:8,11,12,18; 65:4,8,19,20;67:5; 72:16;74:11;119:20; 169:24;209:16 subjects (2) 22:2;92:15 submission (1) 150:19 submissions (2) 62:21,24 submit (2)	143:11;145:6 submittal (1) 151:7 submitted (5) 54:17;151:13;156:8; 171:6;206:10 subpart (1) 153:13 subpoena (1) 11:1 subsequent (1) 95:10 subset (1) 24:17 substance (2) 48:13;97:18 Substances (1) 47:15 substantial (4) 168:23,24;170:5; 214:18 subtract (3) 113:10,19;118:9 suburban (2) 77:13;121:19 suburbs (1) 101:12 successful (1) 143:19 successive (1) 202:10 suddenly (4) 104:10,13;122:15; 203:1 sufficient (5) 76:4;93:22;97:6; 155:14;206:10 sugar (2) 191:22,23 suggest (4) 10:12;24:21;26:8; 195:1 suggested (4) 65:25;66:2;201:4; 203:17 suggesting (2) 199:22;207:11 suggestion (2) 7:25;217:20 suggestions (1) 87:5 suggests (1) 211:1 Sullivan (66) 39:13;40:14,19;41:6; 53:1;69:5,8;71:14; 73:11,12;77:10;83:16; 84:4,16;89:16;95:9,12; 112:7,8;114:9;116:4; 122:12;125:23,25; 126:2,11,13;127:24; 128:15;138:21;140:8; 144:17;146:21,23;	153:3,17;154:13,17; 155:8,10,17,19,23; 156:11;157:6;158:8, 15;159:17;160:14,25; 161:12,17;163:4,6,12; 166:4,17,22;167:18; 170:2;172:3;202:6,10; 205:11;210:21;212:1 Sullivan's (40) 6:18;62:8,21,23; 67:6;68:19;69:9;75:18; 76:14;82:10;83:9,24; 84:24;90:21;92:22; 93:1;94:10;108:8,14; 114:25;115:18;123:4, 20;124:7,21,23; 127:13;146:19;147:3, 13;148:7;152:6; 156:16,17;165:19; 170:2;195:22;196:2,6; 213:18 summarize (1) 166:11 summary (7) 83:9;94:2;110:13; 124:10;125:10;134:17; 147:6 summer (1) 22:23 summertime (1) 16:18 Superfund (4) 47:19,20;49:7,8 supervised (1) 40:9 supervisor (1) 23:18 supplementing (1) 57:18 supply (1) 131:6 support (3) 29:9;92:3;133:22 supported (1) 25:13 supporting (2) 55:18;92:18 supports (1) 97:3 supposed (5) 121:22;179:8; 181:16;182:3;194:25 Supreme (1) 54:19 sure (52) 5:18;6:10;27:22; 30:4,22;31:12;35:5,6; 36:12,14;40:12,14; 42:25,25,25;46:24; 48:2,9;49:7;51:8; 63:16;68:10;82:25; 93:3,5;96:16;97:19; 105:16;106:6;108:2;	116:20;117:6;119:18, 21,25;120:9;126:15; 134:8;141:20;142:21; 143:3,8,8,10,12; 158:24;172:13;178:11; 196:1;201:9;213:11,20 surface (28) 16:20;99:5;100:4,5; 103:6,9,21;104:12; 105:22;106:21;107:15, 22;109:10,11,14; 110:8;111:8;121:22; 122:1;191:10,11,16,18; 193:22,23,24;194:7,19 surfaces (1) 194:10 surrounded (1) 64:16 surrounding (4) 67:7,9;142:13;160:9 surroundings (1) 15:4 suspect (1) 209:17 sustainable (1) 46:23 sweat (1) 151:5 Swim (3) 6:25;64:21;65:17 sworn (1) 14:1 system (1) 194:22 <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> table (3) 71:12;144:16;169:1 tables (1) 154:24 tailpipe (1) 176:3 talk (8) 23:13;81:6,20;95:13; 98:15;119:6;191:17; 209:7 talked (7) 39:18,23;82:14; 83:12;96:18;143:15; 179:23 talking (46) 39:22;50:4;53:6; 72:24;73:1,7;74:12; 77:4;79:25;83:8;84:17; 86:6;88:14;89:10,12; 92:8,9;93:6;97:16; 98:17;99:3;119:1,10; 121:18;127:23;132:1, 4,20,24;146:1;157:19, 19;158:23;168:14; 180:6;181:21;183:4,5, 19;190:19,20;191:17;	193:11,12,24;211:8 talks (1) 155:5 tank (1) 181:16 tankers (1) 183:8 taught (1) 16:11 teaching (3) 17:12,17,19 team (11) 29:23,24,25;30:1,3,5, 8,9;32:15;35:18,23 teasing (1) 187:17 technical (9) 63:12,12,15;66:1,9, 20;67:16;103:6,11 technique (1) 77:2 techniques (2) 37:15;48:7 telling (3) 20:3;105:22;217:9 telltale (1) 43:24 tend (4) 78:2;99:6,19;193:6 tends (1) 97:7 tenet (2) 99:22;102:15 tenfold (2) 127:23;152:10 term (3) 103:6;108:8;132:21 terminology (1) 97:20 terms (28) 27:3;45:13,18,18; 47:3;49:16;66:10; 67:23;80:10;82:4,5; 89:20;93:2;94:2;114:8; 139:7,10;140:18; 142:2;153:3;168:1; 174:23;176:23;185:4; 189:6;190:20;201:2; 204:25 terrain (1) 36:13 territory (1) 202:2 test (1) 130:5 testified (42) 28:12;40:15;49:24; 54:3,5,24;55:4,15,16, 22;56:6;57:4;58:12,23, 25;59:16,19;61:2,16; 76:25;78:10;84:4;85:6; 87:1;93:21;115:2; 147:4,7,11;154:3,11,
--	--	--	---	--

<p>16;156:13,18;159:17; 160:19;163:7;164:4; 166:17;167:18;168:21; 183:25 testify (7) 6:5;54:23;55:19; 60:6;148:14;194:20; 218:1 testifying (1) 148:16 testimonial (1) 171:7 testimony (41) 6:18,22;47:5;48:15; 55:10;56:21;61:1;63:3, 25;73:18,21;85:10,10, 14;89:20;93:5,24; 97:19,21;120:3; 124:21;125:24;126:14; 147:8;152:18;155:22; 163:17;167:25;170:6, 12,22;181:7,9;183:15; 199:12;212:12;216:9, 11;217:5,6,25 testing (3) 32:3;130:3,4 tethered (1) 32:3 Texas (1) 38:10 Thanksgiving (1) 28:2 that's (1) 71:4 that'll (1) 12:3 theoretical (1) 30:9 theoretically (1) 181:16 theories (1) 25:11 therefore (1) 105:25 thermodynamics (1) 15:1 thinking (4) 8:4;107:6;158:24; 204:25 third (5) 27:19;43:7;88:6; 170:1;191:9 Thirdly (1) 109:1 though (7) 34:4;78:11;100:1; 129:3;139:6;158:2; 195:9 thought (14) 77:16;82:10;83:9; 100:18;111:1;116:4; 118:4;139:7;153:10, 11;159:18;202:18;</p>	<p>204:15;208:25 three (9) 16:13;43:16;53:24; 90:17;120:5;202:2; 204:20;205:2;208:21 three-kilometer (2) 78:13;79:13 three-minute (1) 143:6 three-year (2) 204:24;205:1 Thursday (2) 8:13,16 Tickvart (1) 23:16 times (13) 23:13;37:11;64:13; 65:13;84:21;127:17; 131:3;140:10;158:10; 161:20;178:4;201:22; 202:3 timing (1) 43:13 tiny (3) 190:24;194:10,19 tire (2) 182:19,19 today (16) 4:14;5:11,13,15;6:5, 16,23;10:17;12:18; 39:6;51:17,20,22; 52:10;61:1;174:24 together (5) 23:17;29:10;51:12; 118:17;177:1 told (4) 39:20;41:11;208:17; 214:25 tomatoes (2) 176:3;191:21 tomorrow (6) 4:15;6:16;13:7; 175:1;218:14;219:5 took (4) 43:15;54:22;113:1; 162:14 tools (2) 43:22;119:7 top (7) 29:20;70:17;71:19; 98:9;105:4,13;106:1 topography (5) 41:13;104:4;110:6,8, 10 total (1) 71:19 totally (4) 140:1;197:18,21; 198:24 touch (1) 35:8 toured (1) 65:13</p>	<p>toward (1) 70:17 towards (2) 105:13;207:17 town (1) 54:13 toxic (7) 44:14;45:16;47:15; 49:13;189:12;194:18; 200:1 toxicity (2) 189:15,22 toxicologist (1) 47:9 toxicology (1) 200:7 traffic (28) 26:8;88:4;133:6,9,9; 137:3;141:3;150:5; 160:20;161:18;169:24; 170:3,4,8,8,13,14,25; 177:14,25;178:1,8,12; 179:10;180:5;183:16, 24;185:18 trail (1) 100:11 train (1) 204:15 training (3) 14:25;26:20;61:1 trajectories (1) 80:11 transboundary (1) 23:10 transcript (4) 69:7;126:15;167:21; 168:20 transfer (1) 42:19 transformations (1) 23:24 transition (6) 77:13;104:4,5,18; 121:23;122:13 transitional (1) 114:14 transitions (1) 121:18 translate (1) 81:22 translated (1) 81:24 transmitting (1) 6:13 transportation (2) 132:12;179:25 travel (1) 172:2 traveled (3) 138:8;174:10,14 traveling (2) 162:22;181:22 tree-lined (1)</p>	<p>65:14 tremendous (3) 16:16;39:14;194:7 trial (2) 54:1;56:24 tried (2) 100:10;176:25 trip (1) 135:25 trips (1) 7:10 trouble (3) 74:3;203:6;208:10 trucks (5) 87:24;103:21;158:9; 183:3,3 true (8) 73:3;99:17;107:20; 133:5;139:23;169:1; 200:23;214:9 truly (1) 186:16 truth (2) 77:3;78:14 try (16) 9:22;10:14;11:2,2, 11;27:5,9;29:4;44:16; 45:21;80:3,3;86:3; 92:22;184:8;206:11 trying (14) 7:21;16:4;80:1; 91:24;168:1;173:12; 179:11;180:7,12; 181:11,15;195:1; 205:19;206:7 turbulence (30) 77:15;94:22;99:7; 100:2,2,7;101:8,15; 102:10;103:9,17,18; 104:1,6,16,25;107:7, 12,17,21;109:1,13,14, 15,17,20;110:9;114:5; 122:3,5 turbulent (3) 105:2;107:18;109:20 turn (7) 70:22;142:17; 156:15;167:9,10; 169:23;188:6 turned (1) 158:11 turns (2) 153:1;190:9 twice (2) 95:21;128:11 two (63) 8:4,5,5;10:22;14:18; 17:22,24;18:2,13;19:8; 24:17;46:15;47:25; 55:13;57:4;64:16;80:6, 7;81:8;83:21;84:11,24; 86:19;88:23;90:17; 93:4;102:12;112:23;</p>	<p>113:3;114:2,12; 116:19;118:17,18; 120:5;127:1;128:5,14; 137:10;150:8,15; 152:23;155:24;156:7, 10,12,18;157:2;161:10, 17,19,20,24;162:18,24; 164:7;178:25;197:7; 203:7;205:5;206:7; 208:18;218:8 two-thirds (2) 89:18;93:8 type (2) 35:10,17 types (1) 39:7 typical (1) 198:5 typically (1) 196:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ug (1) 167:20 ultrafine (18) 188:8,13,24,25; 189:2,8;190:6,15,17; 192:21;193:6,12; 194:7,11,21;195:5,23; 196:2 ultrafines (2) 188:19;191:5 unable (2) 84:5;85:22 unavailable (1) 7:11 uncertainties (17) 94:9,11,12,20,21; 96:22;97:7;165:8; 195:2;197:5,17; 198:17,18;200:14; 206:9;208:6;210:20 uncertainty (20) 25:8;94:7,14;95:1, 25;96:8,9,20;101:15; 110:21;114:14;195:11, 16;197:11;199:10; 201:17,21,23;206:2; 210:17 under (14) 14:17;19:19;50:18; 54:23;80:13;92:8; 99:17;119:6;125:25; 178:20;194:16;196:12, 13;215:19 underestimated (1) 152:15 Underneath (1) 140:17 underpredict (2) 84:1;97:8 underpredicted (1)</p>
--	---	--	---	--

127:3 underpredicts (3) 128:4,6,7 understandings (2) 109:16;202:14 understated (7) 133:19;156:1;170:8, 13;195:23;196:1,3 understates (2) 127:7;152:19 understating (1) 91:5 understood (5) 39:11,11;116:3; 185:20;187:9 underway (1) 49:1 undoubtedly (1) 9:18 unfortunately (3) 7:2;77:22;175:23 uniformly (1) 152:19 unique (3) 65:20;217:4,17 unit (2) 100:6;102:22 United (4) 17:21;23:10;59:23, 24 units (3) 67:7;138:8,15 University (10) 14:11,20;15:17; 16:24;17:11;18:10; 19:4;21:1;31:23;33:17 unless (7) 6:10;57:20;79:19,19; 143:20;160:13;216:20 unprecedentedly (1) 204:7 unrestricted (4) 137:5;141:9,10; 142:15 unusual (2) 215:14;217:7 up (40) 9:25;16:19;17:6; 18:11;26:21;27:17,17; 30:5;44:6;45:8;69:17; 70:12;80:22;83:21; 87:4;98:1;106:2; 107:18;117:20;121:25; 123:16;126:14;141:6; 146:8;150:12;162:16; 163:8,8;164:12; 171:16;174:2;179:23; 181:10,16;186:4; 188:2;191:3;194:24; 197:24;218:21 updated (2) 126:5;161:4 upon (2)	81:12;203:9 upped (1) 45:11 Upper (2) 13:20;98:25 up-to-date (1) 6:11 upward (2) 104:25;212:8 Urban (65) 22:16,17;71:18,19; 76:21;77:5,14,19,24; 78:2,19;79:24;81:3; 83:13;103:2,3,19,23, 24;107:17,24;111:25; 112:14,19,21;113:1,25; 114:10;115:5,15,23,23, 24;117:2,7;118:14; 120:19;121:19;122:5, 9,16,16,21;123:3,5,7, 14;126:25;137:5; 140:17,18,19;141:5,10; 142:15;158:2;161:2, 12,13;165:23;169:5,5; 195:5;196:14;198:17 urbanized (2) 104:13,18 urban-styled (1) 80:5 use (69) 28:25;31:14;33:6; 41:9,13,17,21;44:14; 58:17;64:9;79:19; 80:14;84:5;85:2,6,15, 16,18;86:16;91:21; 94:24;98:2;103:24; 106:4;110:24;111:7, 13;115:11;120:25; 121:5,6;122:20; 123:22;137:5;155:25; 156:3,11;158:20; 161:2,10;163:14; 164:1;169:5,5;174:1; 177:19;178:18;185:15; 199:16,18;200:24; 201:12,24;203:9; 207:16;208:12,12,14; 209:25;211:23,24,25; 212:1,2,6,16;215:13; 217:6,25 used (43) 22:19;23:21;31:8,10; 33:23;36:1;37:10; 39:13;43:16,20,22,25; 45:9,10;61:3;80:24; 83:16;85:15;91:3;95:9; 100:24;108:14,14,16; 112:6;114:1;119:7; 124:5;138:10;161:12, 22,24;165:9,11;166:6, 7;174:4;182:21; 199:23;205:8;210:15; 212:4,13	useful (1) 190:6 uses (3) 77:11;109:16,17 using (35) 32:2,3;42:14;51:21; 65:24;66:10,12;76:11, 15,18;97:19;109:7; 114:6;115:15;116:2, 11,12;121:12;123:19; 133:3,19;142:1;152:8; 157:24;161:3;180:24; 184:13;198:17;205:13; 208:6;210:20,21,25; 212:3,5 usually (1) 9:16	185:4,5;189:21;195:3, 4 vehicles (20) 132:12,18;133:11; 141:12;153:19;170:10; 172:1;174:7,15;178:6; 179:12;181:1;184:16, 18,19,22,23;185:2; 195:6;214:21 vehicular (2) 166:13;172:2 Veirs (1) 4:8 venturing (1) 200:7 vera (1) 49:5 verbal (1) 117:2 verified (1) 174:3 versa (1) 120:19 versus (13) 8:10;16:20;43:4; 45:12;83:13;103:2; 111:25;113:14;115:5; 127:14;137:1;162:15; 166:12 vertical (10) 99:16,19,20;100:12; 104:23;109:6,8; 137:23;138:6;177:21 vice (1) 120:19 vicinity (3) 65:20;132:19;182:15 videography (1) 170:7 Videos (1) 170:21 view (9) 65:21;72:4;99:1; 110:20;111:20;114:13; 133:18;172:3;199:24 viewpoint (1) 201:24 views (2) 21:25;183:9 violating (1) 35:25 virtually (1) 139:15 visitors (3) 64:8;74:10,19 VOC (1) 173:23 voir (10) 17:7;21:16,19,20,21; 27:2;28:8;47:1;51:1; 53:3 Volume (6) 131:15,16,18;	178:25;183:24;184:19 <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> waggles (1) 100:6 wait (7) 11:19;39:21;58:11; 134:5,5,5,5 waiting (1) 181:15 wall (1) 64:17 Walter (1) 16:23 wants (1) 164:23 warehouse (6) 12:6,7,15;155:4; 168:13;182:18 warm (1) 22:23 warranted (1) 111:15 wary (1) 82:1 Washington (1) 23:12 waste (8) 20:10,10;29:11; 47:20;54:11;121:9; 200:1;209:13 watch (1) 121:17 watched (1) 7:1 water (15) 16:20;20:7,7,12,20; 33:20,21,22,24;35:10; 42:20;43:10;47:17,25; 74:5 way (41) 12:17;19:22;27:1; 31:4;36:12,14;39:10; 43:16,18;51:17;71:18; 86:23;89:13;90:18,20, 22;93:5;94:23;97:20; 102:18;106:12,19; 107:13;113:24;117:21; 130:15;143:21;153:11; 157:7;169:15,17,21; 185:3;188:9;190:8; 195:20;201:4;208:6; 211:21;216:12,14 ways (10) 84:14;85:13,17;86:7; 91:18,24;113:9;114:2; 155:12;157:1 Weather (2) 33:4;51:23 Wednesdays (1) 11:6 week (8)
--	---	--	---	---

<p>5:15;8:4,5,6;11:12; 27:18,19;164:7 weeks (2) 27:10;47:25 Weeks' (1) 38:10 weight (4) 42:18,18;62:1; 112:18 weighted (1) 194:17 welcome (2) 62:6;209:22 welfare (2) 64:7;74:10 well-known (4) 15:8;91:15;189:21; 194:11 weren't (2) 21:4;70:24 west (1) 66:3 Westfield (1) 4:10 wet (1) 111:8 whatever's (1) 169:10 whatnot (10) 22:20;27:10;40:21; 45:6;46:5;88:20;99:5; 115:25;165:2;200:2 what's (34) 16:3;50:20;52:3; 60:13;89:22;90:10; 101:11;113:19;131:7; 12,19;142:24;148:11; 159:11;168:4;178:23; 185:19;190:16;193:25; 200:25;201:6;204:10, 16,16,23;205:1,4; 206:17;207:15,23; 208:15;209:24;216:4, 18 Wheaton (2) 4:9,10 whenever (1) 25:16 whereas (2) 130:3;137:12 Where's (4) 106:12;125:10; 192:13,14 Whereupon (5) 83:4;120:12;144:25; 188:1;219:9 wherever (4) 46:20;60:2;90:17,17 wherewithal (1) 39:17 Whichever (2) 143:18,21 whistles (1)</p>	<p>110:15 White (2) 42:4;191:13 whole (9) 66:11;79:10;88:22; 89:17;109:25;145:10; 165:1;206:15;208:4 Wholesale (1) 4:3 whoops (4) 138:18;173:23; 184:4;192:8 who's (3) 8:24;88:21;96:1 whose (1) 19:24 wiggles (1) 100:6 wind (19) 99:7;100:6;102:1,8, 12,14,16,17;103:10,19; 107:25;108:24;109:21; 110:5;111:13;122:4,9, 10,12 windblown (1) 49:12 Windows (2) 26:21;192:11 wires (1) 135:25 Wisconsin (6) 14:21;15:16;33:17; 56:7;57:8;58:4 Wisconsin-Milwaukee (1) 16:25 Wisconsin-Parkside (2) 15:17;17:12 wish (1) 106:2 wished (1) 13:2 within (10) 68:24;69:2;72:9,23; 161:6;170:10,11; 217:14,18,23 without (8) 92:18,19;152:17; 158:13;159:10,16; 166:24;167:1 witness (607) 13:9;14:1,20;15:24; 16:1,4,7;17:4,10,18,6, 9,24;19:13,16;20:3,6, 14,16,24;21:3,6,9,15, 18,20;24:19,21,24; 25:2,4,6,22;26:1,3,7, 14,16,22,24;27:7; 28:14,17,19,22,25; 29:2,4,17,24;30:1,4,11, 15,18,21;31:9,12,18, 20,22;32:10,18,23; 33:1,16,23;34:5,8,15, 18,20,23;35:1,3,6,12,</p>	<p>15,19,21;36:4,8,10,19, 22;37:2,4,8,10,18,21; 38:2,5,18,22,25;39:5, 10,20,25;40:2,7,9,12, 17,20;41:2,5,8,11,19, 25;42:2,5,7,10,24;43:1, 20;44:3,22;45:1;46:10, 14;47:6,8,10,12;48:14, 16,19;49:22;50:3,7,11, 14,18;52:24;54:4,7,9, 24;55:2,4,8,12,18,21; 56:2,6,9,12,15,18,22; 57:2,6,9,11,14,17,19, 22;58:6,9,11,14,23; 59:2,4,6,9,13,16,21,24; 60:6;62:5,15;65:3,6,8; 66:5,14,19,25;67:2,5, 12,21,25;68:5,7,9; 69:25;70:6,10,18,21; 71:5;72:21;73:1,3,21; 75:2,6,12,14;77:6,9,22; 78:1,6,9,17,22;79:9,15, 18,23;80:6,9;84:8,11, 18,23;85:1,13,24;86:1, 5,12,19,22;87:13; 88:15,19;89:4,25;90:6, 9,13;91:7,10,13,24; 92:14;93:16;94:15,19; 95:17,19;98:4,7,10,12, 15;99:11,13,16,25; 100:16,21,23;101:2,7; 102:21,24;104:9,15,22; 105:6,9,11,16,18,20; 106:2,5,8,10,15,18; 107:1,3,6,9,12;108:6, 18,23;109:1,4;110:24; 111:3,6,11,19;112:13; 113:7,9,18,21;115:23; 116:6,11,14,17,22; 117:12,15,19,22;118:3, 7,9,14,17,20,23;119:3, 5,11,13;121:1,5,12,18, 122:3,8,18,20,25; 124:6,9,14,16,18,25; 125:4,7,9,12,15,18,21; 126:8,17,22,24;127:8, 10,20;128:9,11,17; 129:2,20,25;130:2,9, 14;131:9,14,17,20,22, 24;132:1,3,7;133:8; 134:3,15,17,21;135:4, 8;136:2,11,15,18,20, 24;137:16,18,21;138:1, 3,7,10,15,17,20,24; 139:2,4,8,11,13,17,20, 22;140:1,4,7,11,14; 141:2,9,15,18,23; 142:3,6,9,25;144:10, 16;150:1,3,7;151:6,9, 12,15,18,21;152:25; 153:16,21,25;154:3,6, 20,22;157:14,16;160:2, 4,8,11;162:3,7,10,14;</p>	<p>163:21,25;164:6,8,10, 12,22;168:21;172:10, 12,23;173:1,4,12,16, 22;174:9,12,17,20; 175:2,7,10,13,17,20; 176:1,5,7,9,11,16,18, 21,25;178:13,15,17; 179:5,11,16,18,20; 180:9,13,17,20,22,24; 181:4,8,13,18,20,23; 182:1,4,7,11,14,18,23; 183:2,7,20;184:2,4,7, 10,13,16,22;185:1,7, 11,17,22;186:1,7,10, 14,17,19,22;187:2,4,7, 15,18;190:18,22,25; 191:5,9,24;192:5,7,10, 13,18,22;193:1,10,14, 16,18,22;194:3,6; 195:1,8,13,15;197:24; 199:1,4,8,24;201:8,10, 16,23;203:12,18,20, 204:3,5,12;205:5,11, 19;206:7,14,19,22,25; 207:19,22;208:1,4,9, 14,18,24;209:2,5; 211:9,12,23;212:14,16, 25;213:3,5,9,13,22,25; 214:10;216:16;217:20; 219:4 witnesses (10) 6:16,23;8:18;10:11, 20;94:18;170:3,6,23; 218:14 witness's (2) 21:22;93:24 wonderful (1) 11:8 wondering (1) 181:14 wood (2) 45:3,17 word (6) 10:1;81:14;86:5; 114:1;116:11,12 words (11) 15:11;21:5;40:9; 44:11;77:19;104:10; 107:4,16;163:18; 164:17;204:20 work (33) 5:12;8:21,22;10:14, 21;22:8,16;28:3;31:23, 24;37:13,13;38:8; 40:22;42:1,11;44:5; 45:17,23,23;46:3,3; 47:13,19;48:24;49:16; 55:12;61:14;71:3; 72:13;118:11;160:18; 169:21 workable (1) 204:2 worked (16)</p>	<p>28:11;29:5;32:10,12, 21;33:21;36:25;38:8; 39:8;40:15;41:24; 42:21;45:2;46:17; 48:19;165:18 workers (4) 64:8;74:11,21;89:23 working (5) 18:2;29:14;32:8; 44:7;63:13 works (2) 168:12;190:6 world (3) 100:4;120:20;212:10 worry (1) 176:6 wow (1) 136:2 write (2) 4:20;54:16 writes (1) 17:24 written (5) 21:24;60:16;78:23; 88:24;190:8 wrong (5) 88:3;95:3;134:9; 198:10,16 wrote (5) 22:1,17;54:10;77:16; 203:16</p>
Y				
<p>year (5) 36:9,18;49:6;58:4; 59:12 years (23) 17:17,19,22,25;18:2, 13;19:8,22;23:17;26:4, 5;33:2;35:9;39:4;45:2; 46:17;48:20;51:23; 60:16;204:14,20; 205:2;208:21 yellow (3) 115:24;191:12,13 Yep (4) 34:20;62:13;119:11; 192:22 yesterday (1) 160:17 York (1) 35:23</p>				
Z				
<p>zero (2) 103:10;139:16 zone (10) 64:10;77:13;95:2; 104:4,19;114:15; 121:23;122:13,14,25 zoned (1)</p>				

4:10 zones (1) 104:5 Zoning (2) 4:5;215:11	11.2 (4) 196:15;197:16; 198:16;210:25 11160 (1) 4:8 11229 (1) 13:19 12 (10) 98:6;137:12,17; 138:18;147:17,21,23; 196:18;197:16;213:6 12:00 (1) 83:3 12:46 (1) 120:12 12498 (2) 131:24,25 12499 (2) 131:24;132:2 125 (2) 65:15;169:14 127 (1) 118:12 13 (11) 27:14,16;120:7; 130:20,22,23,24; 134:17;147:16;148:4; 196:10 13-12 (1) 4:4 13th (4) 7:11;8:5;71:25; 147:15 14 (19) 134:9,10,11,14,20, 21,23,24;135:2,3,4,5,6, 8,10,11,12;136:1;148:4 14th (2) 7:11;8:5 15 (9) 137:24,25;142:17, 17,23;148:7;152:2; 178:4;213:6 15a (1) 62:17 16 (7) 4:7;142:25,25;148:8; 155:3;156:15;170:9 1-6 (1) 144:16 160 (10) 117:6,8;118:14; 124:4,11;125:13; 126:4;161:14;165:23, 25 160.2 (1) 125:17 168 (8) 117:5,7;123:20,22; 124:22;125:1;126:3; 166:3 16th (6) 69:9;125:3;144:17;	148:8;152:6;154:18 17 (1) 148:8 178 (1) 69:8 17th (2) 69:4,7 18 (10) 118:2;146:21,22; 148:9,10,18;158:7; 161:8;165:18;167:4 188 (1) 123:17 188.5 (3) 118:23;126:25;127:5 19 (5) 148:19;167:9;196:5, 7,12 190 (4) 117:10;124:2; 161:22;162:20 192.5 (3) 123:24;127:1,5 195 (2) 162:25;163:8 1961 (1) 26:4 1965 (1) 14:22 1969 (3) 14:22;15:14;17:20 197 (4) 118:18;161:20,20; 162:18 1976 (1) 50:1 1977 (4) 17:20,20;19:13;58:6 1979 (3) 19:12;50:2;60:17 1981 (1) 19:12 1983 (4) 19:14,21;20:22,24 1993 (4) 20:24;21:8,9;35:13	36:23;39:18,24; 130:15;131:22 2007 (3) 36:23;39:19,24 2010 (4) 59:13;84:13;134:25; 173:19 2011 (1) 58:9 2012 (11) 62:9;77:10;80:23,24; 114:25;147:14,17; 155:5;157:3;158:1; 160:25 2013 (25) 4:12,15;62:11;69:2; 71:13;72:1;112:10,12; 123:5,21;148:20; 154:18;155:3,22; 156:17,17;157:2,6; 161:3;165:19;166:9, 13;196:6,12;202:11 20772 (1) 13:20 20-minute (2) 90:4;91:5 20th (3) 156:13;167:18; 168:20 21 (4) 4:13;148:20,25; 149:4 217 (5) 117:8,9;118:7; 123:24;166:8 22 (5) 148:22;149:5,6; 184:4,9 22nd (1) 4:2 23 (2) 149:14,15 24 (8) 125:2,7;149:19; 166:9;169:3;177:9; 183:17;184:3 24-hour (3) 82:3;92:8;211:8 25 (8) 6:15;149:19;150:3; 153:6,9;164:1,25; 172:7 255 (1) 124:19 255a (3) 62:17;124:17;125:3 26 (2) 4:12;149:20 26th (1) 7:5 27 (5) 149:23,24,25; 150:13,14	277 (1) 168:7 27th (2) 9:6;10:4 28 (3) 149:24,25;150:13 287 (2) 161:21;162:19 29 (13) 149:24;150:16,18; 151:6,20,22,23,23; 190:2;192:6,8,17; 196:10 29th (2) 9:6;10:4
0				3
0.01 (1) 192:21 0.1 (1) 192:21 001 (1) 192:24 007 (1) 167:6 008 (1) 168:12 01 (5) 191:1,3,6;192:24; 193:12 024 (3) 167:20;168:6,10 098 (1) 167:5				3 (2) 114:18;147:4 30 (7) 39:4;60:16;150:18; 151:10,10,23;176:3 300 (1) 157:5 388 (1) 157:5 3rd (1) 10:8
1				4
1 (9) 69:19;71:8;125:16; 137:12;147:3;157:20; 159:6;191:6;193:12 1.0 (2) 178:19,20 1.2 (1) 138:18 1.5 (3) 161:24;162:23;163:8 1/15/2010 (1) 12:20 1:00 (1) 120:7 1:30 (1) 120:8 10 (23) 4:10;35:9;48:25; 84:21;88:23;95:20; 98:5;117:1;127:17; 129:17;135:12;136:1; 138:18;140:9;147:15; 152:16;166:9;177:24; 187:22;190:11;191:15; 210:2,16 100 (1) 165:12 105 (1) 162:24 10th (14) 7:9,13,16,17,17,19; 8:10,17,19;9:3,13; 10:4;130:15;131:22 11 (4) 136:15,18,22;147:16				4 (1) 147:5 4.1.1 (1) 155:2 4.1.2 (1) 155:3 4:00 (1) 187:22 4:45 (2) 12:18;210:8 4:48 (1) 219:9 40 (1) 90:13 400 (2) 6:9,12 401 (1) 6:14 402 (1) 6:16 403 (2) 6:9,18 404 (2) 6:11,20 404a (13) 69:22;71:8;123:10; 134:1,13,14;135:22,23; 136:14,23;145:23,25; 146:16 404a1 (1) 145:9
		2		
		2 (5) 33:6;80:17;98:20; 137:12;147:4 2.5 (6) 137:10,24;155:5; 191:4,14,14 20 (12) 83:3;88:11,13;90:10, 24;148:20;155:22; 157:22;159:6;160:25; 169:14;178:4 200 (3) 159:4,13,14 2006 (5)		

<p>404b (5) 98:20;149:16,17,21, 23</p> <p>404c (2) 150:11;173:21</p> <p>404d (4) 129:14,18;147:18,24</p> <p>405 (3) 12:4,19,24</p> <p>406 (3) 145:15,17;146:11</p> <p>46 (2) 167:21;168:19</p> <p>47 (3) 131:15,20,21</p> <p>4th (1) 10:8</p>	<p>8 (5) 26:21;123:8,11; 147:14;192:11</p> <p>80s (1) 39:9</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9</p>			
<p>5 (7) 124:19;125:12,14, 15;147:6,10;165:24</p> <p>5.3 (1) 169:6</p> <p>50 (6) 26:4,5;30:21;164:1, 25;198:15</p> <p>501c3 (1) 20:8</p> <p>59-G-2.06 (1) 4:6</p>	<p>9 (6) 117:1;123:20,23; 125:1;126:9;147:15</p> <p>9:30 (1) 4:17</p> <p>90 (8) 118:12,15;126:5,10; 161:13,20;162:25; 166:5</p> <p>93 (8) 158:11;159:10,16, 20;167:4,7,8;168:22</p> <p>97 (1) 167:7</p> <p>98 (2) 126:4;166:4</p> <p>98.5 (4) 118:18;161:15,20; 162:17</p> <p>9th (5) 7:15,17,21;8:9,22</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">6</p>				
<p>6 (7) 4:15;114:22;133:23, 24,25;134:1;147:13</p> <p>60 (1) 139:16</p> <p>631 (1) 4:9</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">7</p>				
<p>7 (1) 147:14</p> <p>70 (4) 30:21;118:15; 161:14;162:24</p> <p>70s (1) 39:8</p> <p>71 (3) 131:15,16,18</p> <p>75 (1) 164:2</p> <p>76h (3) 50:22,22,23</p> <p>79 (1) 118:18</p>				
<p style="text-align: center;">8</p>				