OFFICE OF ZONING AND ADMIN	IISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FOR MONTGOMERY	COUNTY
	x : :
PETITION OF COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION	: Case No. S-2863 : OZAH No. 13-12
	: x

A hearing in the above-entitled matter was held on June 17, 2013, commencing at 9:39 a.m., at the Office of Zoning and Administrative Hearings, 100 Maryland Avenue, Rita Davidson Memorial Hearing Room, Rockville, Maryland 20850 before:

Martin L. Grossman

Hearing Examiner

	Page 2		Page 4
	APPEARANCES	1	PROCEEDINGS
		2	MR. GROSSMAN: This is the sixth day of a public
		3	hearing in the matter of Costco Wholesale Corporation, Board
For the Applicant:			of Appeals No. S-2863, OZAH No. 13-12, petition for a
101 010 1.pp11001101		5	special exception pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section
Patricia Harris, Ea	sq.		59-G-2.06 to allow petitioner to construct and operate an
		7	automobile filling station which would include 16 pumps.
Mike Goecke, Esq.		8	The subject site is located at 11160 Veirs Mill Road, Silver
Lerch, Early & Brew	ver. Chartered	9	Spring, Maryland. That's Lot N, 631 Wheaton Plaza, Parcel
Deren, Larry a Dre		10	10, also known as the Westfield Wheaton Mall, and it's zoned
3 Bethesda Metro Co	enter, Suite 460	11	C-2, general commercial. The hearing was begun on April
			26th, 2013, resumed on May 1, May 6, and May 23 and June 4,
Bethesda, Maryland	20814		2013. It was noticed to resume again today. The next
			session will be has been noticed for Wednesday, June 19.
			That will take place in the seventh floor council hearing
For Kensington Heig	ghts Civic Association:	16	room in this building, COB, at 9:30 a.m.
		17	
Michele Rosenfeld,	Esq.	18	of Appeals. My name is Martin Grossman, Hearing Examiner,
The Law Office of 1	Michele Rosenfeld, LLC		which means I will take evidence and write a report and
THE Haw OTTICE OF I	Alchere Rosenteid, Inc		recommendation to the Board of Appeals which will make the
11913 Ambleside Dr:	ive		decision in this case. Will the parties identify
			themselves, please, for the record?
Potomac, Maryland	20854	23	-
		24	
		25	MS. HARRIS: with Lerch, Early, & Brewer on
	Page 3		Page 5
	CONTENTS		
	CONTENTS		behalf of the applicant, Costco.
Witnesses:	Direct Cross Redirect Recross	2	
Stephen Gang		3	
By Ms. Rosenthal:	11 141	_	behalf of Costco.
By Dr. Adelman	100	5	
By Ms. Duckett: By Ms. Harris:	109 132		Heights Civic Association.
By Mr. Silverman	144	7	
		8	
David A. Sullivan		9	
By Mr. Goecke:	153	10	
		11	
		12	5
		13	5
	ЕХНІВІТЅ		Rockville Stop Costco Gas Coalition.
Exhibit No.	Marked/Received	15	MS. DUCKETT: Eleanor Duckett, Kensington View

Exhibit No.		Marked,	/Received
169	CD of highlighted sector pla	in	8
170	June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld to Renee K	lamen	9
170(a)	Memorandum supporting June 1 Rosenfeld letter	.7	81
171	Aerial photo from Case S-279	4	142

17

19

20

16 Civic Association.

18 who wish to be heard today?

(No audible response.)

MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Are there also others here

MR. GROSSMAN: I see no, no other hands; so we

21 will proceed with the usual cast of characters. All right.
22 Let's first deal with a few preliminary matters before we
23 resume with Mr. Gang's cross-examination. I wanted to
24 mention on June 11 I sent an e-mail, which is now in the
25 record as Exhibit 166, requesting a supplemental needs

	Page 6		Page 8
1	analysis, requesting it to Ms. Harris, not mandating it, but	1	MS. HARRIS: Michele, did we receive a copy of
2	requesting it based on the possibility that I will not	2	that?
3	accept the applicant's concept of what the term general	3	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, you did.
4	neighborhood means in the particular section on needs	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. I understand
5	analysis. I haven't made any final decisions in that	5	from Ms. Harris's e-mail that the witnesses scheduled for
	regard, but I did want to have her have notice that that was	6	today will be Mr. Gang for his cross-examination and David
	a possibility so if she wished to provide a supplemental	7	Sullivan. Okay. Are there any other preliminary matters?
	needs analysis at least 10 days in advance of her expert's	8	
	testimony so that all sides would have an opportunity to	9	,
	review it and provide rebuttal should they wish to. That's	10	
	in the record, as I say, and I did send it to all of the		transmitted electronically.
	participants in the hearing as we've announced today.	12	,, G
13	The second thing is that Renee Kamen of the		Thank you very much. We'll mark that as Exhibit 169, CD of
	technical staff sent an e-mail to me with some preliminary		highlighted sector plan. I did receive a copy, an
	concerns about the proposed plan changes which I've		electronic copy of the highlighted portion of design, of the
	forwarded to the parties and made part of the public record, it's Exhibit 167 and Lipvited even/body whole a	16 17	design portion
	it's Exhibit 167, and I invited everybody who's a participant to contact Ms. Kamen, should they wish to do so,	17	
	to share any concerns or observations they may have for		highlighted portion wouldn't go through.
	inclusion in her analysis and also asked her to determine	20	
	whether or not the Planning Board wished to have further		two things. There is a plasticized version of Blue Lagoon's
	commentary on the case.		card. Is there a particular reason for that, sir?
23	I also received various additional exhibits since	23	-
	our last session. We received Kensington Heights Civic	24	
	Association's response to my 20 questions, that's Exhibit	25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 7		Page 9
	165 in the record; applicant's notice letter to technical	1	5
	staff regarding proposed plan changes, Exhibit 163; received	2	0,
	an opposition letter from a Karen Richardson, Exhibit 164.	3	like a dog tag.
	And, also, I see that Ms. Harris's plan with wall detail has	4	
	now been made Exhibit 168, and I believe there was some	5	5 , 5
	additional e-mail changes on Sunday and maybe this morning		letter to Renee Kamen from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of
	which have not yet gotten into the exhibit list. And I		Kensington Heights Civic Association. I presume this is the
	understand from Ms. Harris's e-mail that the parties		hard copy of what you e-mailed to, or the e-mail that I saw
9 10	MS. ROSENFELD: Excuse me. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm sorry. Did I hear, Ms	9 10	this morning? MS. ROSENFELD: I had sent an electronic copy, and
11	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, if you were about to go		a hard copy is being mailed today. Somebody
	through those e-mails from this morning, then I'll, I'll	12	
		13	•
1.5	stop, but if		
14	stop, but if MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I	14	
14	stop, but if MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed	14	
14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I	14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll
14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed	14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding
14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you.	14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception
14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's	14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary?
14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not	14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked for identification.)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: we won't be discussing that today. Kensington Heights won't be discussing the letter today.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked for identification.) MS. ROSENFELD: That is. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Harris, any other
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: we won't be discussing that today. Kensington Heights won't be discussing the letter today. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. That hasn't yet been	14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked for identification.) MS. ROSENFELD: That is. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Harris, any other preliminary matters by you?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: we won't be discussing that today. Kensington Heights won't be discussing the letter today. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. That hasn't yet been exhibitized; so I received some critique from my coining	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked for identification.) MS. ROSENFELD: That is. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Harris, any other preliminary matters by you? MS. HARRIS: No. Thank you.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: Not yet. I'll let you I understand you sent a letter. I haven't really reviewed them thoroughly yet, but I saw something, a letter from you. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, to Ms. Kamen, but that's not MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: we won't be discussing that today. Kensington Heights won't be discussing the letter today. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. That hasn't yet been	14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. All right. So we'll call this Exhibit 170, and it's June 17, 2013, letter from Michele Rosenfeld on behalf of KHCA to Renee Kamen regarding plans or proposals to change applicant's special exception plan. Is that a fair summary? (Exhibit No. 170 was marked for identification.) MS. ROSENFELD: That is. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Ms. Harris, any other preliminary matters by you? MS. HARRIS: No. Thank you.

	Page 10		Page 12
1	Kanaington Heighte Any proliminary metters?	-	question. The question was in your opinion is it
	Kensington Heights. Any preliminary matters?	1	question. The question was, in your opinion, is it immaterial to your testimony whether or not there is a
2	MS. ROSENFELD: No preliminary matters. MR. GROSSMAN: The Stop Costco Gas Coalition, any	2	pedestrian path along the southern ring road?
	preliminary matters?	4	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
5	DR. ADELMAN: No, no preliminary matters.	5	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.
6	MR. SILVERMAN: No, sir.	6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And how about Kensington	7	Q And the proposed changes also include a 46-foot
8	View Civic Association?	8	extension in the perimeter wall. Does that extension or
9	MS. DUCKETT: No. Thank you.	9	lack of extension affect your conclusions with respect to
10	MR. GROSSMAN: None, Ms. Duckett? Okay. Okay.	10	conformance with the sector plan?
	Then we will proceed. I see we have a movie screen up here.	11	A No, it does not.
	Are we who's going to be showing us films today?	12	Q So is it your testimony, or is it your conclusion
13	MS. HARRIS: Mr. Sullivan's	13	that the wall as originally proposed conforms to the
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	14	recommendations for the sector plan?
15	MS. HARRIS: presentation lends itself to	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Let me stop, hop in here for a
-	PowerPoint, which was distributed previously, and so we put	16	second. Hold on, Mr. Gang.
	the screen up in advance.	17	THE WITNESS: Right.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right then, I guess our	18	MR. GROSSMAN: When you say as originally
	next order of business is resuming the cross-examination of	19	proposed, let's make sure we understand what we're talking
	Mr. Gang?	20	about. This is before the extension of the wall?
21	MS. HARRIS: Yes.	21	MS. ROSENFELD: Before the extension of the wall.
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you all agree with that?	22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So do you understand the
23	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.	23	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't know how to answer
24	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And I think where we		it, quite frankly
25	left off, we were in the middle of Ms. Rosenfeld.	25	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
	Dana 44		
	Page 11		Page 13
1	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington	1	Page 13 THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is
	-	1 2	-
	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington		THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct.	2	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're	2 3	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang.	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.)	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions,	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: What's the objection?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. SILVERMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. SILVERMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or absence of a pedestrian path is immaterial to sector plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually a fair
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or absence of a pedestrian path is immaterial to sector plan conformance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually a fair THE WITNESS: Correct, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or absence of a pedestrian path is immaterial to sector plan conformance? A The sector plan does not show a pathway around the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually a fair THE WITNESS: Correct, but MR. GROSSMAN: a fair point. You're talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or absence of a pedestrian path is immaterial to sector plan conformance? A The sector plan does not show a pathway around the perimeter of the ring road.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually a fair THE WITNESS: Correct, but MR. GROSSMAN: a fair point. You're talking about an assumption you're making about that conversation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Cross-examination with Kensington Heights, that's correct. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You may resume. You're still under oath, Mr. Gang. MR. GANG: Yes, I am. (Witness was previously sworn.) CROSS-EXAMINATION (Resumed) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, for purposes of the remaining questions, could you identify for the record which site plan layout your testimony goes to? There has been an amended, a proposed amended plan submitted in the record, and is your testimony addressing that site plan layout or is it the previous layout that had been A My testimony deals with master plan or sector plan conformance, does not deal with specific site plan issues. Q So your testimony does not address issues related to the pedestrian path? A That is correct. Q As far as you're concerned, the existence or absence of a pedestrian path is immaterial to sector plan conformance? A The sector plan does not show a pathway around the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: and the reason I say that is there is no recommendation in the sector plan about any wall in that location BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q So let me ask A and this was I'm sorry. Q Let me ask the question A Sure. Q a different way then. In your view, the wall feature of the special exception application is immaterial to your sector plan findings? A I still don't. Honestly, I don't, I mean, and the reason the wall was there the wall is proposed because of an agreement between Westfield and the citizens when they walked the site on a specific day. I was not there. I don't know what was agreed upon. MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: What's the objection? MR. SILVERMAN: He's talking about things he didn't even hear or witness. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually a fair THE WITNESS: Correct, but MR. GROSSMAN: a fair point. You're talking

	Page 14		Page 16
1	THE WITNESS: Right.	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
1	MR. GROSSMAN: so we'll strike that portion of	1	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3	your answer, but let's	3	Q I believe in your report you concluded or you
4	THE WITNESS: Right, and that's why I don't know	4	stated that the overall square footage of the special
5	how to answer that.	5	exception area is 37,754 square feet, is that correct?
6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that the	6	A Yes, it is.
7	question goes to why the wall was there, or proposed to be	7	Q And that is less than but close to an acre in
8	there, I should say. It goes to your evaluation of the	8	size, is that correct?
9	wall's existence, if it is put there, in connection with	9	A It's less than an acre in size, yes.
10	sector plan compliance. So that's really the question.	10	Q All right. I'd like to bring your attention back
11	Does the, if the wall let's put it this way	11	to the photographs which are Hearing Examiner's Exhibit No.
12	THE WITNESS: Right.	12	160 that were introduced when you testified the last time.
13	MR. GROSSMAN: if the wall is erected in the	13	Do you have a copy of those?
14	way it was originally proposed, without the extension, the	14	A Yes, I do.
15	40-some-odd-feet extension to it, would that be consistent	15	Q Okay. Would you look at Site No. 28, Montgomery
16	with the sector plan or not?	16	Blair High School? Do you have that?
17	THE WITNESS: And the reason I don't know how to	17	A I have it in front of me.
18	answer that, because there is no discussion about any	18	Q Okay. Do you know if a 37,754 square-foot gas
19	additional wall. There's an existing forested buffer within	19	station would fit at that location on, on the property
20	that area. If the wall assists in the purpose of the	20	that's shown with an existing gas station?
21	buffer, forested buffer, then the answer would be yes, but	21	A Can you rephrase the question, please?
22	there is no discussion about additional buffer requirements	22	Q Do you know if the property that's shown as Site
23	between existing Kensington Heights and the mall.	23	28 is more or less than an acre in size?
24	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And does that same	24	A Do I know by fact, by record plat? The answer is
25	answer apply to the wall if it is extended for the is	25	l do not know.
	Page 15		Page 17
1		1	
1	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out.	1	Page 17 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit
			Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit
2	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six.	2	Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas
2 3	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed	2 3	Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you?
2 3 4 5	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply?	2 3 4	Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know.
2 3 4 5	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the	2 3 4 5	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in
2 3 4 5 6	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes.	2 3 4 5 6	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself?
2 3 4 5 6 7	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help,	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, Ms. Rosenfeld?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, Ms. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. Rosenfeld? MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any way? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any way? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any way? A No, it does not. MR. GROSSMAN: So is it fair to say that none of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site? A Yeah, I do think a wall can be accommodated on that site. Q And the same question for Site 30, and I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any way? A No, it does not. MR. GROSSMAN: So is it fair to say that none of the proposed changes would affect your sector plan analysis? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site? A Yeah, I do think a wall can be accommodated on that site. Q And the same question for Site 30, and I believe there you show two gas stations side by side.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that 46 feet, 43 feet? I haven't figured it out. MR. GOECKE: Forty-six. MR. GROSSMAN: Forty-six feet that is now proposed in the plan, would the same answer apply? THE WITNESS: Well, again, in reference to the sector plan, the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Does that help, MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And with respect to the other changes that you have proposed, one includes moving the fueling location for the fuel trucks eastward, more toward the interior of the special exception itself. Does that change have any bearing on your sector plan analysis in this case? A No, it does not. Q And with respect to the addition of the bollards and of the removable chains, does the addition or does that proposed amendment affect your sector plan analysis in any way? A No, it does not. MR. GROSSMAN: So is it fair to say that none of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q And so you don't know if in fact the proposed gas station in a format shown at Wheaton Mall would indeed fit at this location, do you? A I do not know. Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall in addition to the gas station itself? A Do I know if it would accommodate a wall? I think it would accommodate a wall if it had to. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Let me interrupt for one second. (Discussion off the record.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Sorry for the interruption. Go ahead, Ms. Rosenfeld. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And, Mr. Gang, I have the same two questions for Site 29. First, do you know if that property where that gas station is located is approximately an acre in size? A I do not know for a fact. Q And do you know if a wall could be accommodated on that site? A Yeah, I do think a wall can be accommodated on that site. Q And the same question for Site 30, and I believe

	Page 18		Page 20
1	Q Do you know if the	1	not going to reach.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, let me interrupt	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. The mike is not amplifying
	you. How would whether a wall can be accommodated on other	3	your voice within the room
4	sites really impact on what I have to review here?	4	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
5	MS. ROSENFELD: To the extent that these locations	5	MR. GROSSMAN: as far as I know. Is it?
6	have been shown as corollary to the subject property. There	6	COURT REPORTER: No.
7	are two components to the gas station. One, of course, is	7	THE WITNESS: Could it accommodate a wall on 44
8	the fueling station itself, and where there are adjoining	8	and 45? The answer is yes.
9	residential properties, the zoning ordinance requires a	9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
10	wall. So it's an integral component of what's required. I	10	Q And for Site 47 at Coddle Harbor Lane and Seven
11	believe and I expect to show that these sites are really	11	Locks?
12	apples and oranges, that they don't accurately compare with	12	A Could it accommodate a wall? Yes.
13	the subject property that's before you for consideration.	13	Q And do you know the square footage of that
14	MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed.	14	property?
15	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	15	A No, I do not.
16	Q Site 30, do you know the square footage of either	16	Q And Site 36 at University Boulevard and Lexington
17	of those sites?	17	Street?
18	A No, I do not.	18	A Well, the picture shows a wall. So the answer is
19	Q And do you know if they could accommodate a wall?	19	yes, and I do not know the parcel size.
20	A These I do not because I do not know the setbacks	20	Q And I believe the final location is Site 43 at
21	off of Bel Pre Road.	21	Georgia Avenue and Blueridge, and there are two stations
22	Q Okay, thank you.	22	there. Do you know the square footage at the property for
23	MR. SILVERMAN: Could the witness speak up? We're	23	either of those stations?
24	having a little trouble hearing.	24	A No, I do not.
25	THE WITNESS: Sure, I'll be happy to speak up.	25	Q And do you know if either one
	Page 19		Page 21
1	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.	1	A These, they have buildings as, you know, sitting
2	THE WITNESS: I'm trying a little change of pace	2	on the property lines. So, you know, in reference to the
3	from last time.	3	wall that is being proposed at this filling, at the proposed
4	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	4	filling station, the answer is probably no on those because
5	Q And I have the same questions for Site 48 and 49	5	there's another form of, of buffer in the context of where
6	at Veirs Mill Road and Kensington Boulevard in Wheaton.	6	they are.
7	A Sure. I do not know the size of those parcels,	7	Q Okay, thank you.
8	and a wall could be accommodated.	8	A You're welcome.
9	Q And Site No. 51, 20650 Frederick Road?	9	Q In evaluating the distance between the proposed
10	A Well, if you'll turn to the pictures on 51, you	10	special exception and the nearest residences, did you take
11	can see there's a fence that's a wall that met the zoning	11	into account the homes that had been approved under a
12	ordinance requirements. I do not know the size of I take	12	project known as Mount McComas?
13	that back. Just curious. If you'll hold on for one second.	13	A Sure.
14	The parcel on 51 is 52,000 square feet.	14	Q And what is the distance?
15	Q And I have the same question for Sites 44 and 45	15	A Sure. In my planning report, I think my planning
16	at Democracy Boulevard and Westlake.	16	report had 20, and I think, you know, I had mentioned, you
17	A I'm sorry, 40 and 45 I do not know.	17	know, if we count, there's eight. So the, I'm trying so
18	Q And do you know if it would accommodate a wall?	18	the answer is yes, in my planning report, it did account for
19	MR. SILVERMAN: Michele, could you speak closer to	19	Mount McComas being approved.
20	the mike	20	Q And what is the distance to the nearest proposed
21	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, sure.	21	home in Mount McComas?
22	MR. SILVERMAN: please?	22	A I don't know that because I don't have the plans
23	THE WITNESS: Could it accommodate a wall?	23	in front of me.
24	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know that the	24	Q Do you know if it's closer or more distant than
25	MR. SILVERMAN: That's the problem, the mike is	25	the existing homes, than the nearest existing home?

	Page 22		Page 24
1	A I do not know. I do not know, sorry.	1	please.
2	Q On page 8 of your report, you note that the	2	THE WITNESS: I'd be happy to.
3	proposed, quote, filling station is unique to both	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you.
4	Montgomery County and the surrounding neighborhood, end	4	THE WITNESS: I will do my best.
5	quote, given it is only available to those individuals with	5	MR. GROSSMAN: We don't mind a change of pace but
6	a Costco membership. This unique quality reflects a	6	not a
7	non-inherent characteristic of the gas station, doesn't it?	7	THE WITNESS: I know.
8	A I'm sorry. I'm looking, I was trying to look at	8	MR. GROSSMAN: not a change of volume.
9	you said page 8, or is it	9	THE WITNESS: Okay, change of same volume. Could
10	Q Sure, page 8 of your report.	10	you please repeat your question?
11	MR. GROSSMAN: As I recall, that's Exhibit 10.	11	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
12	THE WITNESS: Could you tell me what paragraph it	12	Q Yes.
13	is?	13	DR. ADELMAN: Would you like the mike
14	MS. ROSENFELD: Exhibit 10.	14	THE WITNESS: No. 1 like to
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	15	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
16	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	16	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
17	Q Yes. It's the second sentence of the second full,	17	Q That unique quality that you referenced, it
18 19	of the second paragraph at the top of the page. A I'm sorry. I'm looking at November 2012. Is that	18 19	reflects a non-inherent characteristic of the gas station, doesn't it?
20	the same? No, I don't see that. I apologize.	20	A Yes, it does.
20	Q I do. That is the one I'm looking at, and I will	20	Q Did you prepare a prior report in the case of
22	be happy to show you my copy.	22	Special Exception 2794?
23	A Okay. No, it's because of the size of the font.	23	MR. GROSSMAN: That's the predecessor
24	Okay. Let's go to No. 3.		application
25	MR. GROSSMAN: What page are you on?	25	MS. ROSENFELD: Predecessor application.
	Page 23		Page 25
1	Page 23 MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the	1	Page 25 MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station
1 2	-	1 2	Ů
	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the		MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location.
2	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where	2	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here?	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible location is perfectly acceptable as long as it's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: Would you ask Mr. Gang to speak a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible location is perfectly acceptable as long as it's not erroneously based. If, in fact, he said that and he can answer if he didn't then it's a perfectly legitimate question as it pertains to this case. You may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: Would you ask Mr. Gang to speak a little bit louder too? When the system is working, it cuts down on volume. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible location is perfectly acceptable as long as it's not erroneously based. If, in fact, he said that and he can answer if he didn't then it's a perfectly legitimate question as it pertains to this case. You may BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: Would you ask Mr. Gang to speak a little bit louder too? When the system is working, it cuts down on volume. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible location is perfectly acceptable as long as it's not erroneously based. If, in fact, he said that and he can answer if he didn't then it's a perfectly legitimate question as it pertains to this case. You may BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And if you don't recall, I'm happy to show you a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not sure. His copy is not the same as mine. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: It is the same. It's just where are we? Right here? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Yes. A Okay, I got it. Thank you. Q All right. MR. GROSSMAN: So what page? MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. THE WITNESS: It's the same place. It's just, fills it up, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but I can't recall the page. MS. ROSENFELD: Page 8. MR. GROSSMAN: 8? Okay, thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman? Excuse me, Mr MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: Would you ask Mr. Gang to speak a little bit louder too? When the system is working, it cuts down on volume. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: to, for the Costco gas station when it was planned at a location a couple hundred feet to the west of the currently planned location. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I'm going to read to you a statement that you made in that report: As a result of existing leases between Westfield and other mall retail tenants and the associated restrictions on the parking field, the proposed location of the filling station is the only feasible location on the mall parcel for the proposed filling station. Do you recall that statement? MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, objection. That's a report that's in a different special exception a statement that's in a different special exception case. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a perfectly legitimate question, though. Whether or not he made the statement at some point that a different location is the only feasible location is perfectly acceptable as long as it's not erroneously based. If, in fact, he said that and he can answer if he didn't then it's a perfectly legitimate question as it pertains to this case. You may BY MS. ROSENFELD:

	Page 26		Page 28
1	A No, I remember what I wrote.	1	MR. GROSSMAN: You said in the minds of the
2	Q Okay.	2	parties at the time.
3	A The answer is yes.	3	THE WITNESS: Well, meaning Westfield also.
4	Q Okay. And the proposed location has since	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
5	changed, has it not?	5	THE WITNESS: So that is my understanding.
6	A Yes, it has.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Your statement that this is the
7	Q And on page 2 of your report, you now say the	7	only feasible location was what the applicant and Westfield
8	southwest corner of the mall property is the only feasible	8	had represented to you?
9	location for the proposed filling station. What makes the	9	THE WITNESS: That is correct.
10	new location feasible now when in your, according to your	10	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. Okay.
11	prior analysis, it was not?	11	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
12	A Sure. I think, basically, it's Zoning Text	12	Q So is it fair to say that these feasibility
13	Amendment 12-07.	13	limitations were contractual and not based on land use
14	Q And explain what about 12-07 would make the	14	considerations?
15	current location infeasible before it was adopted.	15	A Yes.
16	A I'm sorry. I don't understand.	16	Q And what information did you have when you relied
17	Q Well, I think I asked what makes the new location	17	on your conclusion that the only feasible location now is
18	feasible now when it was not feasible before, and you said	18	the current location?
19	it's the zoning text amendment.	19	A One is the contractual, my understanding, the
20	A Oh, what made it now feasible?	20	contractual obligations between the mall, the mall users and
21	Q Correct.	21	the requirements as imposed by the zoning text amendment.
22	A I was not involved in the, how should I say, the	22	Q And have you reviewed those contractual agreements
23	location and the siting of the gas station. I was not	23	yourself?
24	involved in that decision-making process.	24	A No, I have not.
25	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think that's the question.	25	Q And so who gave you the information regarding
	Page 27		Da 11 20
			Pade 74
	-		Page 29
1	I think what she's	1	those contractual limitations?
2	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but	2	those contractual limitations? A My client.
2 3	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that	2 3	those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who?
2 3 4	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet	2 3 4	those contractual limitations?A My client.Q And specifically who?A Erich.
2 3 4 5	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location.	2 3 4 5	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann?
2 3 4 5 6	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current	2 3 4 5 6 7	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that when you used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your current report at page 7, you state that there'll be 13,500
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that when you used the term this is the only feasible location, you were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your current report at page 7, you state that there'll be 13,500 visitors per day during the week. Which is the correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that when you used the term this is the only feasible location, you were talking not about your opinion as to whether it was the only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your current report at page 7, you state that there'll be 13,500 visitors per day during the week. Which is the correct number?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that when you used the term this is the only feasible location, you were talking not about your opinion as to whether it was the only feasible location but rather what the applicant had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your current report at page 7, you state that there'll be 13,500 visitors per day during the week. Which is the correct number? A I think, as Mr. Agliata testified to, it's the new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think what she's THE WITNESS: I know, but MR. GROSSMAN: pointing to is the fact that with the previous location, which was a couple hundred feet to the west, you said that was the only feasible location. THE WITNESS: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Then when asked why in the current location you say it's the only feasible one, how do you account for that difference? THE WITNESS: Sure. It's like information it's like in any other planning process: there's information which at that point in time you are aware of. At the point when the filling station was originally developed, in the minds of the parties, that was the only place where they thought it worked. As time went on and it became much more restrictive in reference to the requirements, you know, whatever the requirements are with the leases of the mall, the major anchors, the setback requirements, those started to define even a more restrictive location. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're saying that when you used the term this is the only feasible location, you were talking not about your opinion as to whether it was the only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 those contractual limitations? A My client. Q And specifically who? A Erich. MR. GROSSMAN: Erich Brann? THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Could I just add one sentence back also in reference to, to limitations? Also the CR zone along Veirs Mill Road. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, can he add a sentence? BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q What about the CR zone provides this limitation? A It doesn't provide the limitation. It's just the goal and vision of the master plan for that's where they would like the redevelopment to occur for Wheaton. Q In your prior report, you stated that there would be 18,000 visitors a day per week at the mall, and in your current report at page 7, you state that there'll be 13,500 visitors per day during the week. Which is the correct number?

	Page 30		Page 32
1	A On a normal weekday, and I think it was like	1	people a day during holidays. Do you have any reason to
2	17,500 on a weekend.	2	question that number from your prior report?
3	Q I'm sorry, 17,500?	3	A I don't remember; so I can't answer that right
4	A I think that's what he mentioned. He said there	4	now.
5	was a range depending upon the day or the week, and he did	5	Q Going back to page 3 of your current report, at
6	give a range.	6	the bottom where you say the improvements on the property
7	Q Does your report reflect a range?	7	are located approximately 396 feet from the residential
8	A Yes, it does.	8	property line to the west and approximately 258 feet to the
9	Q And can you show me where?	9	residential property line from the south, are those
10	A Sure, page 3, third paragraph.	10	distances accurate?
11	Q It says the mall parcel currently receives	11	A No, they are not.
12	approximately 13,500 visitors a day on an average weekday,	12	Q Can you tell me what those correct numbers are,
13	and in your prior report, you said 18,000 visitors a day	13	please?
14	during the week. Is it your testimony that 13,500	14	A Sure. The 396 is 379, and the 258 is correct.
15	represents a range?	15	Q And is this where you addressed Mount McComas?
16	A It's my testimony that Mr. Agliata testified to	16	A No.
17	what the actual ranges were and these fall within the ranges	17	Q Or is that anywhere in your written report?
18	that he testified to.	18	A It's nowhere written in my report.
19	Q Does your report take into account this range,	19	Q Did I misunderstand you earlier when you testified
20	between 13,500 and 17,500 visitors per day?	20	that Mount McComas was addressed in your report?
21	A I'm afraid I don't understand the question.	21	A It was not.
22	Q In your report you're evaluating sector plan	22	Q It was not, okay.
23	conformance and certain compatibility issues, and you say	23	A And these are two property lines. So the property
24	here that the mall parcel currently receives approximately	24	line for Mount McComas is still the southern property line.
25	13,500 visitors a day on an average weekday. Your prior	25	So that, those dimensions do not change.
	Page 31		Page 33
1		1	
1	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and	1	Q In your report at page 4, you state that a
1 2 3	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as		Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the
2	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and	2	Q In your report at page 4, you state that a
2 3	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month.	2 3	Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of
2 3 4	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday.	2 3 4	Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road.
2 3 4 5	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're	2 3 4 5	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A.	2 3 4 5 6	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use
2 3 4 5 6 7	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet in length or it could be nine feet in width.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Do you, in your report, your current report,</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet in length or it could be nine feet in width. THE WITNESS: Width.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Do you, in your report, your current report, indicate how many average visitors arrive each day during 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet in length or it could be nine feet in width. THE WITNESS: Width. MS. ROSENFELD: I believe it was nine foot in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Do you, in your report, your current report, indicate how many average visitors arrive each day during holidays? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet in length or it could be nine feet in width. THE WITNESS: Width. MS. ROSENFELD: I believe it was nine foot in width.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 report indicated 18,000 visitors a day during the week, and you said Mr. Agliata's testimony was that it could range as high as 17,500 per month. A Per day on a Saturday. MR. GROSSMAN: Just so the record is clear, we're talking about Jim Agliata, A-G-L-I-A-T-A. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your prior report, you indicated that you, that the mall would receive approximately 24,000 average visitors on Saturdays. Where did you get that information for the prior report? MR. GROSSMAN: This is the one in the prior application? MS. ROSENFELD: The one in the prior special exception. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Again, from our client. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Do you, in your report, your current report, indicate how many average visitors arrive each day during 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q In your report at page 4, you state that a six-foot wide pedestrian path will be located between the curb and the parallel parking along the outer perimeter of the ring road. A That is correct. Q At one point, you provided a supplemental land use report. Do you recall that supplemental land use report? A Yes, I do. Q And was that provided in this case or in the prior case? A The prior case. Q Okay. And in that report did you indicate that a nine-foot path would be provided in connection with the proposed fueling station? A That, I do not remember. MR. GROSSMAN: When you say nine foot, you mean nine foot wide? MS. ROSENFELD: A nine-foot path was shown. MR. GROSSMAN: I know but that could be nine feet in length or it could be nine feet in width. THE WITNESS: Width. MS. ROSENFELD: I believe it was nine foot in

	Page 34		Page 36
_		_	
1	report?	1	MS. HARRIS: The current special exception plan I
2	MS. ROSENFELD: I have to get it. I'll	2	don't believe is mounted. The most current one was the one
3	MR. GROSSMAN: I mean, once again, I mean, it's	3	that was submitted on June 4th
4	legitimate cross-examination to point out prior inconsistent	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. It's
5	statements, but I don't know that that's inconsistent with	5	MS. HARRIS: and we didn't put a copy of that
6	anything that he said, but	6	
7	MS. ROSENFELD: I'll come back to that question.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: 163(f) is the redline overlay plan,
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	8	if you want. Or the full-size version of the revised
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	proposed plan is Exhibit 152(a), (b) and (c). That's
10	Q On page 9, I'm sorry, on page 6 of your report,	10	actually
11	you state that there are no vehicular or pedestrian	11	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. That's not the special
12	connections between the property and the residential areas	12	exception plan?
13	to the south and west.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: That's an aerial photograph.
14	A Could you show, tell me what sentence?	14	MS. HARRIS: Here's the most current special
15	Q Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Now we're back to the current	15	exception plan. Is that what you're looking for?
16		16	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, thank you.
17	report?	17	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
18	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	18	MS. HARRIS: Do we have clips?
19	Q We're back to the current report, page 6, the	19	MR. BRANN: Yeah. There should be some clips on
20	third paragraph. Second or third sentence from the bottom	20	a couple of those boards have clips on them.
21	states, significantly, there are no vehicular or pedestrian	21	MS. ROSENFELD: And this is Exhibit
22	connections between the property and the residential areas to the south and west.	22	MR. GROSSMAN: What page
23		23	THE WITNESS: May I see it, please?
24	A Well, I think on the footnote there's a Footnote No. 2.	24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: what page of the plan is it, Michele?
25	1 0011010 110. 2.	25	
		_	
	Page 35		Page 37
_	-		
1	Q Yes.	1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
2	Q Yes.A It clarifies that there are two existing	2	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3.
2 3	Q Yes.A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast,	2 3	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c)
2 3 4	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to 	2 3 4	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest.
2 3 4 5	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know,	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c).
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? MS. HARRIS: And what are you looking for? The 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all? A No, they are not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? MS. HARRIS: And what are you looking for? The special exception	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all? A No, they are not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? MS. HARRIS: And what are you looking for? The special exception MS. ROSENFELD: The special exception. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all? A No, they are not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Do you need this still? I'll leave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? MS. HARRIS: And what are you looking for? The special exception	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all? A No, they are not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Do you need this still? I'll leave it here for now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Yes. A It clarifies that there are two existing pedestrian connections located in the southeast, approximately 800 feet, and there's a third connection to the property in the northwest. There is three, you know, from the south. So, as a footnote, so it does show that there, you know the property itself is not abutting any of the properties; so that's why. It's just clarification of, technically, this special exception does not have any sidewalks. Q And could you show me on the, on the current special exception site plan where the location of those three pedestrian connections are located? MR. GROSSMAN: Do you have a copy of the plan for him to look at? And let's identify which exhibit number you're referencing. MS. ROSENFELD: Pat MS. HARRIS: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: which is the latest? MS. ROSENFELD: The special exception. MS. ROSENFELD: The special exception. MS. HARRIS: Well, that's right in front of you, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: 3 of 3. MR. GROSSMAN: 3 of 3. Then that's Exhibit 152(c) if that's the latest. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q If you'll just look at 152(c). A Sure. Exhibit 153? MR. GROSSMAN: 152(c) THE WITNESS: 152(c). MR. GROSSMAN: if that's page 3. That's the Revision 7 dated May 24, 2013. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q I have a blue highlighter here. Could you just highlight there the general location of the paths that you're referencing in your footnote? A They're not on this plan. Q Oh, they're not on that plan at all? A No, they are not. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Do you need this still? I'll leave

	Page 38		Page 40
1	we'll have it throughout. We don't need it because	1	Q And if I were to draw your attention to the same
2	MR. BRANN: Between the two of us, we were able to	2	exhibit, 102, do you see an open area directly to the south
3	get it.	3	of the special exception location, south, just below the
4	THE WITNESS: There is no, per the question, there	4	western side of the warehouse?
5	are none.	5	A I do see it.
6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	6	MR. GROSSMAN: The Costco warehouse?
7	Q Looking at Exhibit No. 102, can you locate any of	7	MS. ROSENFELD: The Costco warehouse.
8	these three pedestrian paths on that exhibit?	8	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Exhibit 102 is the aerial	9	Q Do you see this open
10	photograph that you're displaying now?	10	A I do see that.
11	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct	11	Q And if I give you a chance to take a look at this,
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	12	do you see
13	MS. ROSENFELD: dated 10/2012.	13	A Sure.
14	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	14	Q any informal pedestrian pathway through there?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, I can. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: How do you mean by informal? BY MS. ROSENFELD:
16 17	Q And could you show me where those three paths are	16	Q Do you see any indication of a pedestrian,
18	located, please?	18	informal pedestrian trail at that location?
19	A Sure. Let me describe verbally, and then I'll go	19	A On this aerial?
20	up to the board and point them out to you. One is off the	20	Q Yes.
21	cul-de-sac off of Faulkner Place, which is in the northwest	21	A Yes, I do.
22	corner of the Westfield Mall property.	22	Q Okay. And could you just show generally where you
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Do you want to use a laser pointer	23	see can you describe it?
24	to point it out?	24	A Sure. It runs in a north-south direction through
25	THE WITNESS: Sure, that would be great.	25	the parcel, generally.
	Page 39		Page 41
1	MR. GROSSMAN: That might be easier for you.	1	Q And
2	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let's see. It's right, let	2	MR. GROSSMAN: And comes in right south of the, of
3	me see, it's right there.	3	the Costco warehouse location?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Pointing at the western	4	MS. ROSENFELD: Correct.
5	side, a little bit north of center on the west.	5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, just in the corner of it.
6	THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's due west of where the	6	It's the, I guess it's the southwest corner
7	Target loading area is. And the other two, there's two	7	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
8	coming off of the Stephen Knolls School	8	Q And did you
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. To the	9	MR. GROSSMAN: of the Costco warehouse.
10	THE WITNESS: just to the west of that.	10	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: And that's to the southeast of the mall.	11 12	Q And did you take that informal pedestrian path into consideration in your analysis of the sector plan?
12	THE WITNESS: Right. And the third one, if you	13	A I didn't prepare the sector plan. So
14	want to call it, in this area	14	Q In your analysis of the project's conformance to
15	MR. GROSSMAN: South, I guess on the south side of	15	sector plan goals.
16	the mall.	16	A Did I take that into consideration? Again, I
17	THE WITNESS: Yeah, is off of Toreno Court, if I	17	don't know how to answer that. It's
18	got	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it's a pretty straightforward
19	MS. CORDRY: Torrance.	19	question.
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Torrance, which is right	20	THE WITNESS: But I
21	there.	21	MR. GROSSMAN: Did you take into account, when you
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	analyzed conformance with the sector plan, of the proposed
23	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	23	plan, did you take into account what you have found to be an
24	MR. GROSSMAN: You're welcome.	24	apparent informal pedestrian path just to the southeast
25	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	25	corner of the Costco warehouse location?
1		1	

	Page 42		Page 44
1	THE WITNESS: No.	1	property, and you conclude that the proposed special
2	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	exception will not cause any of these effects. Where did
3	Q Are you aware of any other informal pedestrian	3	
4	paths of a similar nature along the perimeter of the mall	4	rely on?
5	parcel?	5	A From our experts, our health experts.
6	A No, I am not.	6	Q Your health expert. And can you identify which
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do we know if that,	7	
8	that particular informal path that you're talking about	8	A Can I get the list of exhibits, please? Thank
9	actually connects into the ring road or	9	you. Exhibit 15, environmental report/health report. I'll
10	MS. ROSENFELD: I think you'll have	10	go through all of these with you.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: There'll be evidence to that	11	Q And did you make any independent analysis in
12	effect?	12	reaching these conclusions?
13	MS. ROSENFELD: extensive testimony	13	A No, I did not.
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	14	Q And going to Section 59-G-1.21(a)(8) of the zoning
15	MS. ROSENFELD: on that point, yes.	15	code, which addresses findings relating to the health of
16	MR. GROSSMAN: All right, thank you.	16	residents, visitors, or workers in the area of the subject
17	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	17	property, and you conclude that there will be no adverse
18	Q In your report you state there'll be approximately	18	effect on those populations, where did you what
19	between one and five fuel deliveries a day and that each	19	information did you rely on to reach that conclusion?
20	delivery takes approximately 45 minutes, is that correct?	20	A Same thing, my health experts.
21	A That's what my report states.	21	Q Your health experts. Can you identify where in
22	Q And where did you get this information?	22	the record Mr. Sullivan is identified as a health expert?
23	A Same place.	23	A Well, again, I don't know who I don't remember
24	Q The same	24	who did the health report, but there are two reports. One
25	A Yeah, source.	25	was environmental, and the other was a health report.
	Page 43		Page 45
	-		
1	Q Which source? We've cited to several today.	1	Q You also reached a finding related to the impact
2	A Erich.	2	of the potential the impact of the special exception on
3	Q Mr. Brann?	3	property values, is that correct? Actually, strike that.
4	A Yes.	4	I've already asked the question.
5	Q And do you know how many days a week the	5	Going to Section 59-G-2.06(a)(2) of the zoning
6	deliveries are expected to occur?	6	code, which you address on page 20 of your report, you
7	A No, I do not.	7	
8	Q On page 17 of your report, you make a	8	hazard or traffic nuisance. What information did you rely
9	determination going to Section 59-G-1.21(a)(5) of the zoning	9	upon in reaching that conclusion?
10	ordinance relating to the economic value of surrounding	10	A Mr. Guckert's report.
11	properties, and you conclude that the special exception application I'm sorry. You rely on a report by Lipman,	11	Q And did you do any independent traffic analysis
12	Frizzell & Mitchell to conclude that there will be no	12	with respect to vehicular impact on intersections within the mall parcel?
13 14	detrimental economic value, don't you? Is that correct?	13 14	A No, I did not.
14 15	A Yes, it is.	14	Q Or intersections outside of the mall parcel?
15	Q Did you make any independent evaluation as to	16	A No, I did not.
10	impact on economic value?	17	Q And did you do any analysis with respect to
18	A No, I did not.	18	pedestrian movements within the mall parcel?
19	Q Okay. So your conclusion relies on their report,	19	A No, I did not.
20	is that	20	Q Or pedestrian movements outside of the mall
20	A Yes, it does.	20	parcel?
22	Q Okay. And going to Section 59-G-1.21(a)(6), also	22	A No.
23	in your report, again on page 17, addresses issues of	23	Q Are you familiar with where the fuel tankers will
24	objectionable noise, vibrations, fumes, odors, dust,	24	be located when they deliver fuel?
25	illumination, glare, or physical activity at the subject	25	A From the testimony when I was here, the answer
1		1	

	Page 46		Page 48
1	would be yes.	1	MR. GROSSMAN: When you said, or you asked the
2	Q Okay. Have you reached any conclusions as to	2	witness are you aware of where the fuel tankers would be
3	traffic or pedestrian circulation or safety given at the	3	MS. ROSENFELD: Right.
4	time that fuel tankers are unloading fuel?	4	MR. GROSSMAN: when they are unloading their
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Now, just so we, I assume that	5	fuel, I wasn't sure whether you were referring to under the
6	under the revised plans, the fuel tankers will be at a	6	current proposed plan or under the one immediately before
7	slightly different location; that is, they'll be a few feet	7	it. I just want you to make sure that you're
8	to the east. Is that, are you assuming that or not,	8	MS. ROSENFELD: Sure.
9	Ms. Rosenfeld, in your question?	9	MR. GROSSMAN: that the witness understands
10	MS. ROSENFELD: I do assume that	10	which location you're talking about.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	11	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I think what I'll do
12	MS. ROSENFELD: but I'm not aware that that	12	is just strike that question in its entirety
13	plan is technically before us at this point in time.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's a fair question. I	14	MS. ROSENFELD: and after we have more
15	guess we have two proposed plans before us in that sense.	15	technical testimony from the other experts on the new plan,
16	We have the next to the last plan and then the one that's	16	I'll recall Mr. Gang, if I think it's appropriate, on that
17	most recently proposed, which would have which would move	17	issue.
18	the refill location to the right. We haven't had technical	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I leave it to you. I'm not
19	staff give their final opinion on the newly proposed	19	telling you you can't ask the question of this witness. I'm
20	location, but it is before us because, if I understand	20	just saying let's make sure we're clear as to which location
21	correctly, Ms. Harris, that is the plan that you are	21	you're talking about in the question, that's all, if you
22	proposing at this point, is the last one that you submitted,	22	would.
23	correct?	23	MR. SILVERMAN: Sir, we can recall him on our
24	MS. HARRIS: Correct.	24	volition? So it's not dependent on Ms. Harris?
25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So it's conceivable that	25	MR. GROSSMAN: You can recall Mr. Gang
	Page 47		Page 49
1			
	technical staff may have an objection which may influence	1	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
2	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is	1 2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to?
2 3			
	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is	2	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to?
3	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
3 4	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to
3 4 5 6	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm
3 4 5 6	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a
3 4 5 6 7	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say,
3 4 5 6 7 8	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change,
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's necessary, but at this point, you can certainly ask the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's necessary, but at this point, you can certainly ask the witness what you asked, but I just wanted to make clear 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your opinion, is the Costco warehouse a, quote,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's necessary, but at this point, you can certainly ask the witness what you asked, but I just wanted to make clear which location you're talking about in your question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your opinion, is the Costco warehouse a, quote, structure or a, quote, building?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's necessary, but at this point, you can certainly ask the witness what you asked, but I just wanted to make clear which location you're talking about in your question. That's all. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your opinion, is the Costco warehouse a, quote, structure or a, quote, building? A Outside of my outside my realm of expertise.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 whether or not that ultimately becomes the plan that is proposed, but right now I think we can work off the assumption that that is the proposed plan by the applicant based on what they say. You can certainly ask, if you want to cover all the bases, you can ask the question for both of those plans, the one immediately before that one since that's MS. ROSENFELD: Well, Mr. Gang has testified that on most of these issues, he has relied on the opinions of other experts to make certain of his findings. And MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: the location of the tankers and the relocated fuel tank pad and the issue of the bollards and the chain are all issues that, I think, need to be addressed by Mr. Duke from a technical perspective and/or perhaps Mr. Guckert. I think it would be appropriate to have their technical testimony before Mr. Gang speaks to the revised plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know that that's necessary, but at this point, you can certainly ask the witness what you asked, but I just wanted to make clear which location you're talking about in your question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: you're referring to? MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: I suppose if it became necessary to make Mr. Gang available, you know, we would do that, but I'm not sure that that's the case. So I'm not going to, I'm not going to say I mean, I want to give the parties some leeway in terms of cross-examination since we have had a plan change in the middle of a case somewhat, I would say, in response to a concern raised by the questioning by the opposition about the impacts on traffic within the parking area. So I presume, based on the nature of the change, that it was to improve a situation, the potentially problematic aspect of which was pointed out by the opposition in its questioning. Whether that requires further testimony from Mr. Gang, who said he based his analysis on another expert, I don't know. So let's cross that bridge when we come to it. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q In your opinion, is the Costco warehouse a, quote, structure or a, quote, building?

	Page 50		Page 52
1	if the Costco warehouse is a structure or a building?	1	MS. ROSENFELD: 121, the aerial photo, this
2	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	2	aerial, Exhibit No. 121.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's definitional in the	3	MR. BRANN: Oh, we don't, no, we don't have that
4	code. It's both. I mean, I don't understand.	4	one.
5	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	5	MS. ROSENFELD: You don't have that one? Okay.
6	Q Are you familiar with the location of the Costco	6	MR. BRANN: We have a newer one, but we don't have
7	warehouse loading docks as they're incorporated into that	7	that particular shot with the yeah, we don't have that
8	building?	8	shot.
9	A Yes, I am.	9	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
10	Q And what is the distance between the loading docks	10	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
11	and the proposed special exception?	11	Q All right. Mr. Gang, I'm going to show you what's
12	A I'm looking at the special exception plan.	12	been marked as Exhibit No. 121
13	Q And can you just give an exhibit number?	13	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
14	A Sure. It's 152(c).	14	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
15	Q Thank you.	15	Q it is the special exception file. Are you
16	A It does not show the westerly portion of the	16	familiar, does that show the, generally, the mall parcel?
17	building; so I can't give the answer in front of the	17	A Yes, it does.
18	information I have in front of me.	18	Q In your report you had discussed a former use at
19	Q Okay. Do you, in your report, analyze the traffic	19	that location: the Montgomery Ward auto service center.
20	impact of the special exception in relation to the loading	20	Did you?
21	docks for the Costco warehouse?	21	A Can you point to what page in my report, please?
22	A In my report, no.	22	Q Oh, actually, I'm not
23	Q Do you analyze	23	A I mean, I do know about the page 2, second
24	A Or I don't remember unless you can point that out	24	paragraph from the bottom.
25	to me.	25	Q Yes, thank you.
	Page 51		Page 53
1	Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco	1	A You're welcome.
1 2	-	1 2	
	Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse?A Not in my report.		 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up
2	Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse?A Not in my report.Q Or the loading docks?	2	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile
2 3	Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse?A Not in my report.Q Or the loading docks?A Not in my report.	2 3	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located
2 3 4	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service 	2 3 4	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where
2 3 4 5	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? 	2 3 4 5	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the special exception in the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which you're talking about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: It's an aerial photo of a portion of the Wheaton Mall site dated July 31, '06. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which you're talking about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: It's an aerial photo of a portion of the Wheaton Mall site dated July 31, '06. MS. ROSENFELD: Do you know if that was on a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which you're talking about. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And is it shown generally as a stand-alone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: It's an aerial photo of a portion of the Wheaton Mall site dated July 31, '06. MS. ROSENFELD: Do you know if that was on a board, Pat? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which you're talking about. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And is it shown generally as a stand-alone rectangular building?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Do you analyze the traffic pattern from the Costco warehouse? A Not in my report. Q Or the loading docks? A Not in my report. Q And are you familiar with the tire service component of the warehouse? A Do I know where it's located? Q Yes. A Yes, I do. Q Okay. Are they located in the warehouse structure, in the warehouse building? A Yes, they are. Q And do you, in your report, analyze the traffic impact of the special exception in relation to the traffic from the tire service component of the warehouse? A In my report, no. Q I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 121, which I believe is on a board. Let me see if I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: It's an aerial photo of a portion of the Wheaton Mall site dated July 31, '06. MS. ROSENFELD: Do you know if that was on a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A You're welcome. Q Page, that's correct, second to the last full paragraph: During the entire existence of the mall and up to approximately 2002, there was a full-service automobile repair center owned and operated by Montgomery Ward, located on the mall parcel. Can you locate on Exhibit 121 where that auto service center was located? A Yes, I can. Q And is the building generally shown on that aerial photograph? A Yes, it is. Q And can you just identify on that exhibit where it's located? MR. GROSSMAN: You can hold it up so we can all see. THE WITNESS: Sure. This is, I think, the, I'm going to call it, the existing parking garage, which is on the right side of the photograph. Due west and due left of the existing garage, I think, was the old Hecht's building, and due west of that is where the, the, the building which you're talking about. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q And is it shown generally as a stand-alone

	Page 54		Page 56
1	Q Okay. What firsthand knowledge do you have about	1	MS. ROSENFELD: That the intensity of the use in
2	the operations of the Montgomery Ward service center?	2	no way correlates.
3	A I've lived in the area 30 years. I've gone to	3	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
4	this mall many times. So I'm very aware what's on that	4	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5	mall. So the answer is yes.	5	Q In your review of the sector plan, is there any
6	Q Is the Montgomery Ward building closer or more	6	indication that there's a shortage of gas stations in the
7	distant to the southern boundary of the mall than the	7	Wheaton area?
8	location of the proposed special exception?	8	A I did not review I did not review gas stations
9	A Further away from the southern property line.	9	in the sector plan.
10	Q And do you have any personal knowledge, on	10	Q Meaning you didn't look for anything or you didn't
11	average, as to how many customers a day visited the service	11	find anything?
12	center?	12	A I know there's six gas stations within the sector
13	A I do not.	13	plan area, but did I review whether there's a shortage or
14	Q Do you have any firsthand knowledge as to whether	14	not, outside my realm of expertise.
15	there were vehicular queues waiting for service on a regular basis?	15	Q Was there any recommendation in the sector plan
16	A I do not.	16 17	that more gas stations would be encouraged or appropriate? A No.
17 18	Q Do you know what the hours of operation were for	18	Q In your report at page 14, you reference a TOD.
19	the service center?	19	Could you please explain to me what that is?
20	A I do not.	20	A Transit-oriented characteristics, that's what TOD
21	Q Do you know how frequently supplies were delivered	21	means. It means that a mix of uses that, that can be, how
22	to the service center?	22	should I say TOD is transit-oriented development.
23	A I do not.	23	Transit-oriented is a mix of uses within confines of close
24	Q Were there ever fuel deliveries to the service	24	proximity to, to public transportation.
25	center?	25	Q Is that term actually used in the sector plan?
	Page 55		Page 57
1	Page 55 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer	1	A No, it is not.
1 2	A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no.	1 2	A No, it is not.Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code
	A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no.Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the	2 3	A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps?
2 3 4	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered 	2 3 4	A No, it is not.Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning codeperhaps?A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no.
2 3 4 5	A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no.Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products?	2 3 4 5	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature?
2 3 4 5 6	A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no.Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products?A I do not.	2 3 4 5 6	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? MS. ROSENFELD: There are, has been testimony in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to turn your attention to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? MS. ROSENFELD: There are, has been testimony in at least one of the reports, if not more, that the auto 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 150, 150, which is the Wheaton CBD Sector Plan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? MS. ROSENFELD: There are, has been testimony in at least one of the reports, if not more, that the auto service center on the mall parcel is similar or precedential for purposes of the automobile filling station. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. And so you're drawing a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 150, 150, which is the Wheaton CBD Sector Plan that you had marked up and that you've previously testified to. I'd like to first turn your attention to page 28, and on the left-hand side of page 28, there's a large blue arrow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? MS. ROSENFELD: There are, has been testimony in at least one of the reports, if not more, that the auto service center on the mall parcel is similar or precedential for purposes of the automobile filling station. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. And so you're drawing a distinction between what might have happened at that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 150, 150, which is the Wheaton CBD Sector Plan that you had marked up and that you've previously testified to. I'd like to first turn your attention to page 28, and on the left-hand side of page 28, there's a large blue arrow from the lower left-hand corner pointing toward and through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A I could say, since it was a tire place, the answer is no. Q Okay. In terms of general deliveries to the service center, do you know how often trucks delivered products? A I do not. Q Do you know if the auto center operated through a special exception approval, or is it allowed by right in the C-2 zone? A I do not know. Q Okay. I'd like to turn back to your report. A Who may I give this exhibit back to? Q Thank you. A You're welcome. MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, do you want to enlighten me as to how do I factor that, those tidbits of information in, the responses to those cross-examination questions? MS. ROSENFELD: There are, has been testimony in at least one of the reports, if not more, that the auto service center on the mall parcel is similar or precedential for purposes of the automobile filling station. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. And so you're drawing a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A No, it is not. Q Is it defined somewhere in the zoning code perhaps? A In the zoning code? To best of my knowledge, no. Q So where did you get that nomenclature? A It's an acronym among planners in reference to, to design concepts in higher density areas near Metro stations. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, do you mind if we take a five-minute break? MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. It's now 10 to 11:00. So we'll come back about, about five to 11:00. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Back on the record here. You may resume, Ms. Rosenfeld. MS. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much, Mr. Grossman. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit No. 150, 150, which is the Wheaton CBD Sector Plan that you had marked up and that you've previously testified to. I'd like to first turn your attention to page 28, and on the left-hand side of page 28, there's a large blue arrow from the lower left-hand corner pointing toward and through

	Page 58		Page 60
-	learned on the right hand side of that some page, that ison	-	amphasize?
1	legend on the right-hand side of that same page, that icon	1	emphasize?
2	is reflected as local access to downtown core. Could you	2	MS. ROSENFELD: I'd like him to highlight that
3	please explain in your opinion what that arrow represents? A Sure. It shows that there are a number of options	3	sentence and then offer his opinion as to what that means.
4	to go from the Kensington Heights community to the yellow	4	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, let's not have
5	area, which is the redevelopment area for the, you know, for	5	him highlight it because I don't want to change an exhibit
6	the downtown area.	6	that we already have here. If you want to have that page submitted with highlighting on it as a new exhibit, you can
7		7	
8	Q And in your opinion, does that reflect pedestrian access?	8	do that, but let's so you want to know what this sentence, the Westfield Wheaton Mall will be integrated with
		9	
10 11	A It could, I think, and as I mentioned, was, was, there are a number of choices. This is like a big bold	10 11	the CBD through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges?
12	arrow. There are no specifics saying this is down the	12	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.
	street you need to go to. So you're shown, you know, the	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. What does
13 14	exhibit on Map 8 shows five arrows, and each of those arrows	14	THE WITNESS: Sure. Sure. I would go to, you
15	are saying I have a number of options: it could either be	15	know, like the opening paragraph of this urban design.
16	by car, it could be by bike, it could be by walking, it	16	Third sentence says the Wheaton Urban Design Guidelines will
17	could be by it won't be by mass transit, but it could be.	17	be prepared to complement this plan, to provide additional,
18	It says local access. So it's any one of these ways to get,	18	provide additional detail. If we go and this is, this is
19	you know, get to the area for redevelopment.	19	like the basic concept if we go to the urban design
20	Q On page 29 I'm going to give you a little, a	20	concept plans and we look at well, I'll go through each
21	little highlighter.	21	one of these things. We can almost go through any one of
22	A Okay.	22	these pages in the beginning. They talk about the different
23	Q On page 29 under Connectivity, the second, third	23	types of connectivity. For example, we'll start on page 13,
24	sentence says the Westfield Wheaton Mall will be integrated	24	which is, I think, is the closest to the mall. They talk,
25	with the CBD through pedestrian connections and	25	they show they have, first of all, the first thing is
	Page 59		Page 61
1		1	
1	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight	1	major highways, which is identified also in this section
1 2 3	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that	2	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says
2	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means?		major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be
2 3	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that	2 3	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says
2 3 4	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book?	2 3 4	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going
2 3 4 5	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book?	2 3 4 5	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in
2 3 4 5 6	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the	2 3 4 5 6	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going
2 3 4 5 6 7	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit.	2 3 4 5 6 7	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: under Connectivity MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: and the third sentence,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much more specific. The specifics, as Ms. Rosenfeld identified,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: under Connectivity MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: and the third sentence, beginning with the Westfield Wheaton Mall.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much more specific. The specifics, as Ms. Rosenfeld identified, was the road, you know, the local access, you know, those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: under Connectivity MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: and the third sentence, beginning with the Westfield Wheaton Mall. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much more specific. The specifics, as Ms. Rosenfeld identified, was the road, you know, the local access, you know, those big arrows. Then it starts talking about how you're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: under Connectivity MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: and the third sentence, beginning with the Westfield Wheaton Mall. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: And if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much more specific. The specifics, as Ms. Rosenfeld identified, was the road, you know, the local access, you know, those big arrows. Then it starts talking about how you're going to integrate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	street-oriented uses along its edges. Would you highlight that and then please explain to me what in your opinion that means? A I'm sorry. I'm highlighting it in my book, or whose book? Q Actually, if you could highlight it in the official exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, no, let's not. Let's first of all, what page are we looking at now? THE WITNESS: Twenty-nine. MS. ROSENFELD: We're on page 29. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's not change any exhibits that we MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: have already got. What are you referencing here, what paragraph? MS. ROSENFELD: It's page 29 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: under Connectivity MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: and the third sentence, beginning with the Westfield Wheaton Mall. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	major highways, which is identified also in this section where you talk about connectivity. The first sentence says Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University Boulevard will be boulevards to tie Wheaton together, and as was testified by Mr. Guckert, you know, there's 100,000 trips per day going through this area. Then I just heard people talking in the background. So I just want to make sure, if they want to talk MR. GROSSMAN: No. Let's THE WITNESS: I'll hold. MR. GROSSMAN: No, nobody's talking. Go ahead, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. Then MS. CORDRY: I'm sorry. Were you referring to page 13, though? I thought THE WITNESS: 13 of the urban design guidelines. MS. CORDRY: Oh, of the urban design guidelines. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry, because it references, this is like you know, sector plans give overall visions, and then as time goes on, they become much more specific. The specifics, as Ms. Rosenfeld identified, was the road, you know, the local access, you know, those big arrows. Then it starts talking about how you're going

	Page 62		Page 64
1	arrows, has the points, shows the street connections, shows	1	MS. HARRIS: Michele, do you have a copy?
2	the sidewalk. So it does show specifically where those	2	MS. ROSENFELD: I have a complete copy here.
3	connections to the mall should occur and what they, you know	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Let me see if I have another copy
4	and the design guidelines reference the building	4	here. I don't have a copy here of the design guidelines.
5	setbacks, et cetera	5	What pages are we going to be referencing?
6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	6	THE WITNESS: Right now, I think only page 13
7	Q And do those, do those	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8	A so this becomes a lot more sorry.	8	THE WITNESS: because this gets into the
9	Q Well, let me interrupt you for a minute. Where in	9	details.
10	those, where in the page that you're referencing is it	10	MS. ROSENFELD: Let me just ask one clarifying
11	talking about the southwestern quadrant of the mall parcel?	11	question about page 13.
12	A If you look on page 5	12	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
13	Q Yes.	13	Q Does page 13 talk about the southern perimeter of
14	A I'm sorry, page 13, page 13 is Veirs Mill Road	14	the ring road as it abuts the Kensington Heights community?
15	running from the upper left to the lower right, has	15	A Page 13? No, it does not.
16	University Boulevard in the lower right-hand corner	16	MS. ROSENFELD: I have no questions on this page
17	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. Mr. Grossman	17	13 of the design guidelines.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Does your answer
19	MR. SILVERMAN: last week we got handed the	19	require something from page 13? Do you
20	design guidelines. Is that what you're referring to?	20	THE WITNESS: Yes, it does. Was her question
21	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.	21	MR. GROSSMAN: do you have page 13 in front of
22	MR. GROSSMAN: That's what he's referring to.		you?
23	That's what he said.	23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24	MR. SILVERMAN: We didn't get the whole document.	24	Q My question was, how does this sentence, the
25	We just got pages.	25	Westfield Wheaton Mall will be integrated with the CBD
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		5
	Page 63		Page 65
1	Page 63 MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of	1	
1	Ŭ	1	Ű
	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of		through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses
2	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7,	2	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page
2 3	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking	2 3	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28
2 3 4	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about.	2 3 4	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying
2 3 4 5	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears,	2 3 4 5	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan?
2 3 4 5 6	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines	2 3 4 5 6	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in	2 3 4 5 6 7	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central business district is along Veirs Mill Road. The core is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it up there. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is it? What page were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The core is across the street, as well as all the other redevelopment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it up there. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is it? What page were you referencing?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central business district is along Veirs Mill Road. The core is across the street, as well as all the other redevelopment areas, as I talked about previously, is within that area,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it up there. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is it? What page were you referencing? THE WITNESS: Page 13.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central business district is along Veirs Mill Road. The core is across the street, as well as all the other redevelopment areas, as I talked about previously, is within that area, and it's also the area highlighted in yellow on page 28. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it up there. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is it? What page were you referencing? THE WITNESS: Page 13. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's see if we have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central business district is along Veirs Mill Road. The core is across the street, as well as all the other redevelopment areas, as I talked about previously, is within that area, and it's also the area highlighted in yellow on page 28. It also, on page 28, it has the two red arrows, mall/core
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. CORDRY: Yes, that's not the only pages of the design guidelines that are currently an exhibit are 7, 10, and 25. So we don't, we don't know what he's talking about. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. And so it appears, Exhibit 151, design guidelines MS. HARRIS: Mr. Grossman, that's correct. We, in connection MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: with Mr. Gang's direct, we submitted the relevant pages MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. HARRIS: but I would note that these were adopted by the Council, and we would request judicial notice of the design guidelines. MR. GROSSMAN: That's fair, but let's just, so that people have an opportunity to know what he's saying while he's talking about it, do we have other MS. HARRIS: I have just one copy. I can put it up there. MR. GROSSMAN: What page is it? What page were you referencing? THE WITNESS: Page 13.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 through pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its edges, relate to the graphic that's shown on page 28 A Sure, and all I'm saying Q of the Wheaton Sector Plan? A The answer is, is page 28 is very diagrammatic at this stage, basically gives the overall concept of how. Page 13, as, you know, as identified MR. GROSSMAN: Page 13 of the design guidelines? THE WITNESS: Of design guidelines. As identified in the opening paragraph, the last sentence is the guidelines will be more specific. Since we want to talk about more specific issues, because we're at that stage, it does talk about how that will occur. It shows the BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Along Veirs Mill Road? A The entry the connections, which, which talks about the Westfield connections, will be integrated with the CBD, which is the central business district. The central business district is along Veirs Mill Road. The core is across the street, as well as all the other redevelopment areas, as I talked about previously, is within that area, and it's also the area highlighted in yellow on page 28. It

	Page 66		Page 68
1	MR. GROSSMAN: The page 28 you're referring to is	1	Q And can you speak particularly with any
2	back to the actual sector plan itself?	2	significance it may have with respect to the Kensington
3	THE WITNESS: Correct. And all I'm saying is the	3	Heights component of the sector plan?
4	specifics in reference to how that meets will be	4	A That, I can't.
5	integrated through the central business district through	5	Q I would like to turn your attention now to page 61
6	pedestrian connections and street-oriented uses along its	6	of the sector plan.
7	edges is in the design guidelines on page 13 of exactly	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Rosenfeld, let me ask you a
8	what that vision is.	8	question that pertains to this line of questioning. How
9	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	9	does it bear on what I have to analyze whether or not the
10	Q So is it your view	10	sector plan is advocating some sort of pedestrian connection
11	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Now, Ms. Rosenfeld, do	11	through the southwest, as your questions kind of imply?
12	you have the design guidelines in front of you now?	12	MS. ROSENFELD: One of the findings that you need
13	MS. ROSENFELD: I do.	13	to make is whether or not the special exception conforms to
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	14	the recommendations of the master plan or the sector plan in
15	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	15	this case, and in fact, one of the Planning Board's
16	Q So is it your view that the edges referenced on	16	recommendation of denial turns on a lack of conformance, in
17	page 29 of the sector plan relate only to the edge of the	17	its view
18	mall, as it's reflected on page 13 of the design guidelines?	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
19	A Yes.	19	MS. ROSENFELD: and with the overall principles
20	Q Okay. And so in your view, the arrow on the lower	20	of the sector plan, which include transit-oriented design
21	southwestern quadrant of the map on page 28 has no	21	and pedestrian-friendly connectivity and an effort to get
22	significance?	22	away from vehicular-intensive uses.
23	A Oh, I think it has I mean, it does have	23	MR. GROSSMAN: But the vehicular-intensive use is
24	significance.	24	a separate question. I mean, you're addressing a
25	Q What significance does it have?	25	pedestrian-access question here, and I'm trying to
	Page 67		Page 69
			Tage 03
1		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	A The significance is, is that there is	1	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas
1 2 3	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the		understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a
2	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and	2	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern
2 3	 A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it 	2 3	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's
2 3 4	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and	2 3 4	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern
2 3 4 5	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't	2 3 4 5	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself.
2 3 4 5 6	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please.	2 3 4 5 6	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of
2 3 4 5 6 7	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his	2 3 4 5 6 7	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the sector plan area that there are multiple options for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are really pertinent to what I have to recommend in terms of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the sector plan area that there are multiple options for those residents, whether, again, it's by car, walking,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are really pertinent to what I have to recommend in terms of a proposal for a gas station which is, technically doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the sector plan area that there are multiple options for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are really pertinent to what I have to recommend in terms of a proposal for a gas station which is, technically doesn't abut the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the sector plan area that there are multiple options for those residents, whether, again, it's by car, walking, bikes, that they do have those options to get to the core area.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are really pertinent to what I have to recommend in terms of a proposal for a gas station which is, technically doesn't reach the ring road and is, technically doesn't abut the outside of the, of the ring road. I mean, I understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A The significance is, is that there is redevelopment planned within the core area, which is the area highlighted in yellow, and Q So it relates, it relates to the core, and it doesn't MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, if he could finish his answer, please. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish his answer. MS. ROSENFELD: I apologize. THE WITNESS: Okay. And I'm sorry, I got to get my thoughts together. So that's MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. THE WITNESS: Excuse me? MR. GROSSMAN: Just answer. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I am. I just okay. The core area is where redevelopment is going to occur. It is important that the, how should I say, the, it's not only the areas and you'll notice that the arrow goes outside the sector plan area that there are multiple options for those residents, whether, again, it's by car, walking, bikes, that they do have those options to get to the core	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understand how you connect that with the proposal for a gas station at this location. I understand that there's been a proposal to first have a pedestrian path along the southern ring road, then not, and then adding it back in, but it's technically outside of the special exception area itself. So I'm not sure I understand the line of questioning that goes to interpreting the sector plan, as to whether or not the gray arrow that's shown in the well, the series of gray arrows, one of which passes through the southwestern section of the sector how that exactly pertains to what I have to analyze. MS. ROSENFELD: Well, to the extent that the vehicular-intensive use of this particular special exception undermines the overall goals of the sector plan, the pedestrian path, if proposed, could help offset that impact. So I think it does go to that issue. It also goes to broader issues respecting, with respect to pedestrian safety overall within the mall parcel. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'm not saying those issues don't exist. I'm just wondering whether those issues are really pertinent to what I have to recommend in terms of a proposal for a gas station which is, technically doesn't abut the

	Page 70		Page 72
1	MR. GROSSMAN: the, you know, the air pollution	1	heading which says pedestrian connection. Then the dashed
2	issues, but I'm just, and also the question of whether or	2	line with the star says proposed, then under that says not
3	not this is traffic-centric or vehicular-centric versus	3	designated in the Master Plan of Highways; alignment to be
4	pedestrian, I understand those, but I'm not sure how your	4	determined during the development review process; these
5	line of questioning actually pertains to something that I'd	5	connections could be public or private.
6	have to analyze.	6	Q And does it contemplate that there would be a
7	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I certainly think that the	7	pedestrian connection? Do you know the name of that road?
8	pedestrian path, to the extent that it's offered, is being	8	A Yeah.
9	offered as a component of the special exception. It's an	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Which road?
10	off-site design amenity associated with the special	10	MS. ROSENFELD: The one that has the dashed green
11	exception.	11	arrow.
12	MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that and I'm not	12	THE WITNESS: Peregoy Drive. Peregoy Drive.
13	criticizing having it in there. I'm just saying that you're	13	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
14	going a step further and trying to analyze whether or not	14	Q Peregoy Drive. So does this, Map 17, indicate
15	the, whether or not the gray arrows are supposed to indicate	15	that a pedestrian connection is contemplated somewhere in
16 17	something to me that affects whether or not, or how I'd analyze the proposal for a gas station. I'm not sure I make	16 17	the area of Peregoy Drive to the mall? MR. GROSSMAN: When you say contemplated
18	that, quite that connection with regard to the pedestrian	18	THE WITNESS: Yeah. It's
19	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, let me state it another way.	19	MR. GROSSMAN: it uses the word proposed in
20	Depending on the ultimate design of the gas station	20	the
21	itself	21	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	22	Q Proposed.
23	MS. ROSENFELD: if it's location and size and	23	A Yeah, it does show proposed.
24	operational features preclude future, the future ability to	24	Q And the three straight green lines, undashed green
25	provide a pedestrian path, then that additionally would	25	lines that are indicated as existing, would those be the
	Page 71		Page 73
1	Page 71 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be	1	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in
1 2	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis.	1 2	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony?
2 3	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the	2 3	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be.
2 3 4	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path?	2 3 4	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony?A Yes, they would be.Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall,
2 3 4 5	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has	2 3 4 5	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony?A Yes, they would be.Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these
2 3 4 5 6	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this	2 3 4 5 6	three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony?A Yes, they would be.Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections?
2 3 4 5 6 7	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site	2 3 4 5 6 7	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian that it's halfway between the proposed and existing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. Q And I believe you highlighted that in your 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the southwestern quadrant it would end?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. Q And I believe you highlighted that in your previous in your exhibit, is that correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the southwestern quadrant it would end? A It would end, let's see if I could do you see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. Q And I believe you highlighted that in your previous in your exhibit, is that correct? A Yes, I did. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the southwestern quadrant it would end? A It would end, let's see if I could do you see off of McComas Avenue, even though it's not labeled off of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. Q And I believe you highlighted that in your previous in your exhibit, is that correct? A Yes, I did. Q And can you explain what that dashed green line 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the southwestern quadrant it would end? A It would end, let's see if I could do you see off of McComas Avenue, even though it's not labeled off of McComas Avenue, there are two streets going up with two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 undermine the goals of the sector plan because it will be here on a long-term basis. MR. GROSSMAN: So if the, you're saying, if the gas station itself somehow precluded a pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly. Certainly. It has long-term implications for the future development of this site MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: and to the extent that it impacts on the long-term goals envisioned of this sector plan, I think it's highly relevant. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right, thank you. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Would you please go to page 61 of the sector plan? A I'm there. Q And on that map, on the lower southern quadrant, southwestern quadrant of that map, there's a dashed green line. Do you see that line? A Yes, I do. Q And I believe you highlighted that in your previous in your exhibit, is that correct? A Yes, I did. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 three pedestrian connections that you discussed earlier in your testimony? A Yes, they would be. Q And do you know where the terminus of the wall, the proposed wall, begins and ends in relationship to these existing and proposed pedestrian connections? A I know approximately. Q Do you know if it begins, is starting with the most northwestern quadrant? Would the wall preclude or block that existing pedestrian access? A No, it would not. Q And does the wall begin somewhere to the south of that pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? A Which pedestrian connection? Q The one in the upper west, northwest corner. A I would estimate that it's halfway between the proposed and existing. Q Okay. And that it would continue along the perimeter of the ring road. And do you know where along the southwestern quadrant it would end? A It would end, let's see if I could do you see off of McComas Avenue, even though it's not labeled off of

	Page 74		Page 76
1	Q Could you show on the aerial map which one you're	1	think, as Mr. Duke might have testified, it is very severe
2	looking at?	2	and you probably would not want to go straight up; you would
3	A Sure. Let me just show you. Actually, it's	3	probably would want to run parallel to the contours. So
4	probably easier to identify where the wall would	4	would you have the ability to connect to a proposed walkway?
5	approximately end.	5	The answer would be yes.
6	Q That would be terrific.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Gang, would the the proposed
7	A Okay. This is Exhibit, sorry if I don't see a	7	wall would not block the pedestrian path in the, that's
8	number	8	indicated in the southwest corner of the mall right there?
9	MR. BRANN: 102.	9	THE WITNESS: What I'm saying is, is, if you're
10	MR. GOECKE: Bottom left, 102.	10	going as a straight shot and assuming it's a flat
11	THE WITNESS: Oh, 102, thank you. Okay. The	11	topography, which was testified to, is, is, yes, it would
12	wall, the existing pathways, which you were, which we were	12	block in that direction. I'm saying, if you were planning a
13	talking about; this was the one which we were just	13	walkway, because it is rather severe topographically in that
14	mentioning. The wall	14	area, that you might consider and I say, you know, this
15	MR. GROSSMAN: You're indicating	15	is Mr. Duke's expertise
16	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
17	Q Which is just south of what street?	17	THE WITNESS: and Mr. Willard you might
18	MR. GROSSMAN: in the northwest	18	consider, you know, just like you'd go up a mountain, you
19	THE WITNESS: Northwest corner.	19	know, a meandering walk so you do have a flatter slope.
20	MR. GROSSMAN: corner?	20	You're going up at two to five percent instead up, you know,
21	THE WITNESS: The wall would end approximately due	21	at a four to one slope. So my answer is, if you went
22	east of the tennis courts.	22	straight up, it would block it; if you were doing it, you
23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	23	know, to be, you know, handicap accessible, you would do,
24	Q End or begin?	24	you would connect where the wall ends or begins.
25	A Let's say begin	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I just want to make sure I
	D 75		
	Page 75		Page 77
1	Q Okay.	1	Page 77 understand. The wall does not extend all the way the
1 2		1 2	
	Q Okay.		understand. The wall does not extend all the way the
2	Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end	2	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the
2 3	Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the	2 3	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the
2 3 4	Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end	2 3 4	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5	Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse.	2 3 4 5	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall
2 3 4 5 6	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was 	2 3 4 5 6	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the 	2 3 4 5 6 7	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? A Sure. You could run the wall, the walk parallel 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the southern ring road? Is that what you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? A Sure. You could run the wall, the walk parallel to the wall in either direction and then connect up. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the southern ring road? Is that what you THE WITNESS: That's what we right. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? A Sure. You could run the wall, the walk parallel to the wall in either direction and then connect up. Q On the outside perimeter of the wall? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the southern ring road? Is that what you THE WITNESS: That's what we right. I'm saying, just working with the topography, yeah, I would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? A Sure. You could run the wall, the walk parallel to the wall in either direction and then connect up. Q On the outside perimeter of the wall? A Right, and you probably would do that anyway 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the southern ring road? Is that what you THE WITNESS: That's what we right. I'm saying, just working with the topography, yeah, I would be working out with the appropriate parties on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Okay. A all right, with one I go clockwise, so sorry, would begin at the, at the, approximately where the tennis court would end. The other wall would end approximately I'll give you an approximate location because these are without sidewalks would end approximately in the middle of the Costco warehouse. Q And do you know if that is the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall as it was submitted, or do you know if that's the wall with the proposed 46-foot extension? A It's with the wall with the 46-foot extension. Q Okay. All right. A And the reason I'm giving you approximate is the question would it impact the existing walkways. The answer is no. Q And would the wall, if constructed, completely block the ability to provide a pedestrian connection for the length of the wall, a new pedestrian connection? A Not necessarily. Q And could you explain? A Sure. You could run the wall, the walk parallel to the wall in either direction and then connect up. Q On the outside perimeter of the wall? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understand. The wall does not extend all the way the proposed wall would not extend all the way up to the pedestrian path which is indicated as existing in the northwestern THE WITNESS: Nowhere near. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: All I'm saying is the wall MR. GROSSMAN: It would THE WITNESS: ends approximately right in that location, you know, halfway between. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: So MR. GROSSMAN: But it would extend in that portion where it looks like with the dotted green in the southwestern corner where it says proposed pedestrian path, is that correct? THE WITNESS: Yes, there's a wall in that area. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what you're suggesting is that if the pedestrian path in that area where it says proposed continued on, it would continue on along the southern ring road? Is that what you THE WITNESS: That's what we right. I'm saying, just working with the topography, yeah, I would be

	Page 78		Page 80
1	THE WITNESS: if the wall is built, how to	1	Q Okay. Class 3?
2	accommodate	2	A Yes, Class 3.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	3	Q Okay. And does that proposed segment, LB-5, does
4	THE WITNESS: that sidewalk.	4	that connect elsewhere with other proposed paths on the mall
5	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Thank you.	5	parcel?
6	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	6	A Yes, it does.
7	Q And on the aerial photograph, Exhibit 102, can you	7	Q And can you identify what those segments are?
8	show where the proposed Mount McComas development would be	8	A LB-3, which is the ring road connecting parallel
9	located?	9	of University Boulevard from Valley View Avenue through
10	A Yes, I can. You were nice enough to borrow the	10	Reedie Drive, and then from the Reedie Drive connection,
11	highlighter, I mean, the I'll get my own. It is the	11	there's an SR-26.
12	area, it's, there's a road open, running parallel to the	12	Q And taken together, do those three segments
13	west side of the Costco warehouse. If you went straight	13	entirely circumvent the mall parcel?
14	down south, that's the Mount McComas area and it's also the	14	A Circumvent? Meaning connect?
15 16	area open with no vegetation. Q And so would the proposed wall include pedestrian	15 16	Q Connect A Yes, they do.
17	access from that location as well?	17	Q around the entire perimeter of the mall parcel?
18	A There's the wall right in front. As I remember	18	A Yes, they do.
19	their grading plan, there is a grade of homes Mount	19	MR. GROSSMAN: I want to mention something. I
20	McComas right now is built up on a hilltop coming up from	20	didn't realize when I marked Exhibit 170 that was
21	McComas Avenue. So that grade needs to be dropped. As I	21	Ms. Rosenfeld's letter to Renee Kamen, technical staff
22	recall, they have, from a, you know, from a planner's	22	that it also attached a memorandum supporting the letter.
23	perspective, there are uphill townhomes in the back which	23	And I've now designated that memorandum as Exhibit 170(a),
24	means they pick up grade from front to rear. So it would be	24	memorandum supporting June 17 Rosenfeld letter, just so it's
25	the concept, that if that walk gets built, it could meander	25	easily referenced in the record.
	Page 79		Page 81
			Fage of
1	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway.	1	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked
2	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel	2	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.)
2 3	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other	2 3	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you	2 3 4	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page
2 3 4 5	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site?	2 3 4 5	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced
2 3 4 5 6	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again,	2 3 4 5 6	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table
2 3 4 5 6 7	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. Q That is a Map 18 A Yes. Q and you testified about Map 18 earlier. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. Q That is a Map 18 A Yes. Q and you testified about Map 18 earlier. A Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. Q That is a Map 18 A Yes. Q Could you identify in this map if there is any 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. Q That is a Map 18 A Yes. Q Could you identify in this map if there is any kind of existing or proposed bikeway identified around the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas. Q And this is a site-specific recommendation, is it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A I'm here. Q That is a Map 18 A Yes. Q Could you identify in this map if there is any kind of existing or proposed bikeway identified around the southern perimeter of the mall parcel? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas. Q And this is a site-specific recommendation, is it not, site-specific to the mall parcel?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A Yes. Q could you identify in this map if there is any kind of existing or proposed bikeway identified around the southern perimeter of the mall parcel? A Yes. It's labeled LB-5, and in the legend it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas. Q And this is a site-specific recommendation, is it not, site-specific to the mall parcel? A Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A Yes. Q could you identify in this map if there is any kind of existing or proposed bikeway identified around the southern perimeter of the mall parcel? A Yes. It's labeled LB-5, and in the legend it shows an LB. It's a signed shared roadway/on-road proposed 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 (Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas. Q And this is a site-specific recommendation, is it not, site-specific to the mall parcel? A Yes, it is. Q Was this contained in your report?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 somewhere in the rear to connect up to that pathway. Q So your suggestion is that a path would parallel the wall until you reach one end or the other A Once, once you Q to access the mall site? A That is one option. The other option again, the purpose of the wall was to screen the fueling station that if it did make sense, you could also punch an opening in the wall. So, I mean, there's a number of different options as you, as, I'm going to say, we go through the process to determine the most appropriate location for that walkway on how to connect to the adjoining properties. Q If you would please turn to page 67 of the sector plan. A Yes. Q could you identify in this map if there is any kind of existing or proposed bikeway identified around the southern perimeter of the mall parcel? A Yes. It's labeled LB-5, and in the legend it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Exhibit No. 170(a) was marked for identification.) BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, I'd like to bring your attention to page 66 of the sector plan. I don't believe that you referenced this either in your testimony or in your report. It's Table 3. It's a chart of countywide and local bikeways. If I can draw your attention to the left-hand column, it says route number, and if you look down that column, it says LB-5. Do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And the second half of that column speaks to the mall ring road, is that correct? A Yes, it does. Q And can you explain what that, what that chart means, in your opinion? A Sure. It shows that there is either a shared roadway or a shared-use path; there is a path in both of those locations in reference to the connections which are showing from Kensington Heights to those two areas. Q And this is a site-specific recommendation, is it not, site-specific to the mall parcel? A Yes, it is.

	Page 82		Page 84
-	Q Did you address it in your testimony?	-	ahanga Mu point in
1	Q Did you address it in your testimony?A The specific thing on Table 3?	1	change. My point is MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure why you
3	Q Yes.	3	reference back to it. It does reflect it already.
4	A No, it was no, I did not.	4	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes, but my point is that this was
5	Q Okay. I'd like to turn your attention to page 92	5	a Council-level change. It was a change to the amended
6	of the sector plan, please, and 92 actually is a duplication	6	plan
7	of the County Council's resolution in adopting the sector	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
8	plan. And on what's reflected as page 11 of the resolution,	8	MS. ROSENFELD: and it's a site-specific
9	do you see a reference to page 64, Table 3?	9	reference in the sector plan.
10	A I see the upper left-hand corner or the second	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And that LB-5 says that a
11	bullet point: Page 64, Table 3, Countywide and Local	11	shared roadway or a shared-use path, and that LB-5 reflects
12	Bikeways.	12	the southern ring road?
13	Q That's correct. If you would look at the first	13	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct.
14	table under that. It says modify LB-5 as follows. Do you	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
15	understand in a resolution when text is underlined, do you	15	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
16	understand that to mean that it was added?	16	Q And if I could turn your attention to page 53 of
17	A The answer is yes, I do understand that.	17	the sector plan.
18	Q Okay. And is this a site-specific recommendation	18	MR. GROSSMAN: I have one other question.
19	in the sector plan?	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, sure.
20	A Yes, it is.	20	MR. GROSSMAN: When they say shared roadway, in
21	Q Okay. And was this included in your report?	21	your mind or by definition, does that always include a bike
22	A No, it was not.	22	path or can it be a pedestrian path alongside of a vehicular
23	Q And did you address this in your testimony?	23	road?
24	A No, I did not.	24	MS. ROSENFELD: I think we'll be testifying on
25	MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to make sure I	25	that through the course of our
	Page 83		Page 85
	Page 83		Page 85
1	understand which underline you're referring to here.	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint
2	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it.
2 3	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I
2 3 4	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either
2 3 4 5	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No.	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian
2 3 4 5 6 7	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path.
2 3 4 5 6	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the chart and maps on page 66 and page 67 of the sector plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you just submitted this letter today, I haven't had a chance to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the chart and maps on page 66 and page 67 of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Hold on one second. So if I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you just submitted this letter today, I haven't had a chance to read over your whole text in your memorandum, but I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the chart and maps on page 66 and page 67 of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Hold on one second. So if I understand what you're getting at, when I look at LB-5 on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you just submitted this letter today, I haven't had a chance to read over your whole text in your memorandum, but I did catch the essence of it, I think, which is that you're,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the chart and maps on page 66 and page 67 of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Hold on one second. So if I understand what you're getting at, when I look at LB-5 on page 67, which in other words, the table, Table 3 on page	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you just submitted this letter today, I haven't had a chance to read over your whole text in your memorandum, but I did catch the essence of it, I think, which is that you're, you're asking technical staff to reject the current
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	understand which underline you're referring to here. MS. ROSENFELD: The first table on it's page 92 of the sector plan. It's shown MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: as page 11 of Resolution No. 17-313. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: And the first table here specifically adds a shared, signed shared roadway or shared-use path for the southern edge of the ring road, listed as LB-3, which, on MS. CORDRY: LB-5. MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, I'm sorry. It's LB-5, LB-5, which MR. GROSSMAN: You mean where it says modify LB-5 as follows, and then it MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, and it's MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and it's, it correlates to the chart and maps on page 66 and page 67 of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Hold on one second. So if I understand what you're getting at, when I look at LB-5 on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, give me an advanced hint while my mind is on it. MS. ROSENFELD: I think it could be either. I think it could be either MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: pedestrian and/or pedestrian and bike path. MR. GROSSMAN: Along a vehicular? MS. ROSENFELD: Oh, absolutely, along a vehicular roadway. MR. GROSSMAN: If LB-5, as indicated here, does contain a pedestrian path, even if it's not the six-foot wide one that you would like, along the ring road, that would be that would comply with that, that Council addition to the MS. ROSENFELD: I think it would be consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And also, since we're on this point, let me pose this question because since you just submitted this letter today, I haven't had a chance to read over your whole text in your memorandum, but I did catch the essence of it, I think, which is that you're,

	Page 86		Page 88
1	I just wonder whether as I understood from an	1	to me they were suggesting the same thing we said, which
2	earlier question I asked the opposition back when we were in	2	was
3	the auditorium, you do want a pedestrian path there, but if	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Technical staff's letter or you're
4	it were not possible to have a pedestrian path as wide as	4	talking about
5	you would like it but it is possible to have one that's	5	MS. CORDRY: Or Renee Kamen's e-mail. In any
6	ADA-compliant along that ring road, are you perhaps making	6	case, I thought I read that to say the same point we were
7	the perfect the enemy of the good here in your position if	7	making, which was that they thought that three feet was not
8	in fact the Board of Appeals ultimately would decide to	8	adequate to be a safe pedestrian path.
9	approve this application but would be concerned about	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I thought that was that was
10	technical staff's recommendation against the pedestrian path	10	their preliminary look at it, and I don't want to
11	based on your opposition? I just wonder whether or not	11	MS. CORDRY: Right. I don't think either one of
12	MS. ROSENFELD: No, I think you're overstating our	12	us suggested that zero was better than three or six.
13	position.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know. If here's
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	14	the point, though if in fact they decide that what's been
15	MS. ROSENFELD: Certainly a pedestrian path is	15	suggested is sufficiently unsafe, maybe it is zero versus
16	preferable to no pedestrian path. It's our view that the	16	you may end up with a no path and a Board of Appeals
17	pedestrian path is inadequate, and so for that and other circulation reasons, we think that the special exception	17	decision that is in favor of the gas station. I don't know. I have no idea what I'm just saying that when you make
18 19	should be denied. But if you're asking do we want	18 19	that argument, as I think you strongly have in the papers
20	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I know you believe it should be	20	that Ms. Rosenfeld filed, and as I said, I just had a
21	denied, but I just wonder whether or not, if you happen to	21	preliminary look at it because it just came in today, you do
22	get a recommendation from technical staff they've already	22	raise that issue. If that's what you want to raise, you are
23	recommended denial in their ultimate if you were to get a	23	perfectly right and within your rights to raise it.
24	recommendation from the technical staff against the	24	MS. ROSENFELD: I appreciate your observations.
25	pedestrian path that's recommended, in part, because you've	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
	Page 87		Page 89
1	Page 87 opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what	1	Page 89 MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit
1 2		1 2	
	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian		MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments.
2	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path?	2	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian	2 3	 MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages
2 3 4 5 6	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We	2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have
2 3 4 5 6 7	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are	2 3 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending on what the, what technical staff recommends here, is ultimately going to be forwarding the interest that you ultimately have, is all, and I just wanted the opposition to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's labeled on the, in the sector plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending on what the, what technical staff recommends here, is ultimately going to be forwarding the interest that you ultimately have, is all, and I just wanted the opposition to cogitate that, is all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's labeled on the,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending on what the, what technical staff recommends here, is ultimately going to be forwarding the interest that you ultimately have, is all, and I just wanted the opposition to cogitate that, is all. MS. CORDRY: If I might say, in reading technical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's labeled on the, in the sector plan. MS. ROSENFELD: I overlooked that. You're correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending on what the, what technical staff recommends here, is ultimately going to be forwarding the interest that you ultimately have, is all, and I just wanted the opposition to cogitate that, is all. MS. CORDRY: If I might say, in reading technical staff's letter, it did not appear to me that they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's labeled on the, in the sector plan. MS. ROSENFELD: I overlooked that. You're correct. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opposed it on a safety ground, you know, I don't know what the Board of Appeals ultimately does. If it decides to grant the special exception, what happens to the pedestrian path? MS. ROSENFELD: It's our view that the pedestrian path that's been proffered is not safe in and of itself. We don't think it's adequate. If you're asking do we want to make the perfect the enemy of the good, no. A path is preferable to no path. We don't think that what's been proffered is adequate for a number of reasons, which are contained in that letter. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I just want to raise the concern I have MS. ROSENFELD: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: about this. I understand the position of the opposition, you know, certainly the overall opposition to the gas station, but I don't know if every element of what you've suggested here is actually, depending on what the, what technical staff recommends here, is ultimately going to be forwarding the interest that you ultimately have, is all, and I just wanted the opposition to cogitate that, is all. MS. CORDRY: If I might say, in reading technical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: We'll go back and revisit MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MS. ROSENFELD: our comments. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Mr. Gang, if you could please take a look at pages 52 and 53 of the sector plan, and I believe you did have some discussion of this in your testimony, these site-specific recommendations. Looking at the, Figure 4 on page 52 along the southern boundary of the mall parcel, the lighter orange mall parcel, there's a segment along the southern boundary that's highlighted in a darker orange. Do you see that? A Do you mean the thin line Q Yes. A which is identified as existing green buffer? Q Yes. Well, that was my question. Is that the existing green buffer as you understand it? A Yes, it is. Q Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: That's the way it's labeled on the, in the sector plan. MS. ROSENFELD: I overlooked that. You're correct.

	Page 90		Page 92
1	bullet which you mentioned, would you please read the first	1	somehow is within the buffer. I'm not sure
2	sentence of that bullet?	2	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, I will note
3	A Sure, no structures should be allowed within the	3	MR. GROSSMAN: it means that. I mean, you can
4	buffer zone.	4	argue it. I'm just saying that
5	Q Are you familiar with the definition of structure	5	MS. ROSENFELD: I will note that Ms. Kamen's
6	in the county zoning ordinance?	6	letter raised, among other concerns, the issue of the
7	A Conceptually, yes. The exact definition I don't	7	construction of a wall within the buffer.
8	have in front of me.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. It may or may not. I mean,
9	Q Okay. The zoning code defines a structure and	9	I'm not saying you're wrong. I'm just saying that that's
10	I'll read the relevant excerpts as an assembly of	10	another interpretation of this, and one could certainly
11	materials forming a construction for occupancy or use	11	argue that a wall there protects the buffer.
12	including, among other things, fences, walls, and poles.	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Can I take exception to protects?
13	Assuming that's the correct definition, would placing the	13	I mean, that's a forestry determination. Nobody's testified
14	wall within the buffer conform to this recommendation on the	14	that it protects the buffer.
15	top of page 55?	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know whether they
16	MR. GROSSMAN: Does your question assume that that	16	will or they won't. I'm saying one could argue that that,
17	wall will be within the buffer	17	that the purpose of the wall is to protect the buffer in
18	THE WITNESS: Right.	18	some way. I don't know whether that's going to be in
19	MR. GROSSMAN: as opposed to just outside it?	19	evidence or not. I just, I don't want to make an assumption
20	MS. ROSENFELD: Their current plan shows it in the	20	about what the exact dimension of the buffer is unless I see
21	buffer. So, yes, it does assume that.	21	it specified somewhere, and I also don't want to make an
22	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well, I guess that's	22	assumption that a wall at the periphery of the buffer is
23	the question. If you're saying that the buffer begins at	23	within the buffer. I don't know that. I mean, one could
24	the very end of the ring road; is that what you're saying?	24	argue it. I just don't know the answer to that. I don't
25	MS. ROSENFELD: The buffer ends at the curb line.	25	want you to go off on an assumption that that's not the
	Page 91		Page 93
1	MR. GROSSMAN: At the curb line. Is that defined?	1	case. And I guess I'll add on to my question, does the
2	Is that specific line included somewhere, that, that the	2	community not want the wall there? I mean, what is the
3	buffer ends at the curb line?	3	opposition's, what's your position, Ms. Rosenfeld? Do you
4	MS. ROSENFELD: It is shown in their NRI as the	4	not want a wall there if in fact the special exception were
5	buffer.	5	approved?
6	MR. GROSSMAN: No, I just wonder, is there	6	MS. ROSENFELD: The wall is there because of the
7	language that says the buffer is, you know, ends at the curb	7	special exception. It's a mandatory component of the
8	line? And I wonder whether the meaning of this, of this	8	special exception itself
9	sentence in this sector plan, when they say within the	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
10	buffer, are they talking about things that are right at the	10	MS. ROSENFELD: and the wall is clearly not
11	border of the buffer or are they talking about things that	11	there to protect the buffer. The wall is there because of
12	are constructed inside of the buffer zone?	12	the special exception and not if it was there to protect
13	MS. ROSENFELD: It says, no structures shall be	13	the buffer, it would, and if it was necessary, it would have
14	allowed within the buffer zone, and our reading	14	been put there a long time ago. If we're correct in that
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	15	the wall is not allowed within the buffer, then it needs to
16	MS. ROSENFELD: certainly means that includes	16	be located elsewhere on the property. We're not saying we
17	anything havand the curb line of the group of	17	don't want a wall. We do need a wall, but we want a wall
10	anything beyond the curb line of the property.	10	
18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with	18	that complies with the standards of the code
19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that	19	MR. GROSSMAN: I see.
19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that MS. ROSENFELD: I understand.	19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. MS. ROSENFELD: and the requirements of the
19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that it's reasonable to,	19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. MS. ROSENFELD: and the requirements of the sector plan.
19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that it's reasonable to, to read that as being, you know, don't build something	19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. MS. ROSENFELD: and the requirements of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. You may proceed.
19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that it's reasonable to, to read that as being, you know, don't build something inside the buffer, but it doesn't mean that if you build a	19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. MS. ROSENFELD: and the requirements of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. You may proceed. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.
19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I'm not sure I agree with that reading. I mean, I think that MS. ROSENFELD: I understand. MR. GROSSMAN: I think that it's reasonable to, to read that as being, you know, don't build something	19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. MS. ROSENFELD: and the requirements of the sector plan. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. You may proceed.

	Page 94		Page 96
1	a wall is required, is 59-G-2.06(b)(2), is that correct? Is	1	just saying that I just want the community to be aware
2	that what you're referring to?	2	what its potential is with what it's advocating. Yes.
3	MS. ROSENFELD: I believe so, Mr. Grossman. Can I	3	MR. SILVERMAN: The oh, go ahead.
4	give you an answer after lunch?	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Ms. Adelman.
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Well	5	MS. ADELMAN: Mr. Grossman, I have a question, and
6	MS. ROSENFELD: It's the provision specific to the	6	I'm glad you read that section of the code.
7	automobile filling station.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm going to read it to	8	MS. ADELMAN: I have a background in this type of
9	you	9	construction. My understanding is a wall has a footing that
10	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.	10	goes consistently along wherever it was going to be located.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: that's why I it's 59-G-2.06	11	My, I would say this is a fence and not a wall because it
12	parens (b), parens (2), which says, when such use abuts a	12	has separate and distinct footings that occur at periodic
13	residential zone or institutional premises not recommended	13	intervals.
14	for reclassification to commercial or industrial zone on an	14	MR. GROSSMAN: They described it as sonotubes, and
15	adopted master plan and is not effectively screened by a	15	it would be, it would be set in
16	natural terrain feature, comma, the use must be screened by	16	MS. ADELMAN: That's right.
17	a solid wall or a substantial, solid fence, not less than	17	MR. GROSSMAN: sonotubes put into the ground.
18	five feet in height, together with a three-foot planting	18	MS. ADELMAN: So my question is, why throughout
19	strip on the outside of such wall or fence, planted in	19	this hearing is this referred to as wall when in fact it's a
20	shrubs and evergreens. That's the provision you're talking	20	fence?
21	about?	21	MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know. I'd have to look
22	MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, that's the	22	back. I'm not sure whether it falls into a fence or a wall.
23	provision I was referencing.	23	MS. ADELMAN: They make a distinction like you
24 25	MR. GROSSMAN: So if in fact the special exception were effectively screened by natural terrain features, then	24 25	just read. You said wall or fence, and, and MR. GROSSMAN: Right. I'm not sure whether this
25		25	
	Page 95		Page 97
1	Page 95 there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct?	1	-
1 2		1 2	-
	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct?		falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to
2	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading.	2	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an
2 3	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once	2 3	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about
2 3 4	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably	2 3 4	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about;
2 3 4 5	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a	2 3 4 5	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of
2 3 4 5 6	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful	2 3 4 5 6	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my recollection of the statute. And, when Ms. Rosenfeld said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my recollection of the statute. And, when Ms. Rosenfeld said the wall is required by the special exception, it's a wall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my recollection of the statute. And, when Ms. Rosenfeld said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: but the fence sections, then you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my recollection of the statute. And, when Ms. Rosenfeld said the wall is required by the special exception, it's a wall is required if certain circumstances are not met, and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: but the fence sections, then you have a maintenance issue where trash and everything gets
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there is no requirement for a wall, is that correct? MS. ROSENFELD: That's my reading. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So I'm not sure that once again, I want the community to be aware that you conceivably could set up a situation here where your advocacy against the proposed wall ends up with a gas station and no wall, and I just want you to understand that since you do have a forest buffer here, that sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for, okay? All right. You may proceed. MR. SILVERMAN: To get to that situation where you have no wall, then the Board would have to find that Costco was wrong in proposing a wall? MR. GROSSMAN: No. They would just have to find that the section requirements were met without the wall, that there was adequate natural terrain screening without the wall. I don't know if the evidence is going to lead to that kind of conclusion, but I just want you to be aware that that, my recollection of that that's why I went back to look at the actual wording, because that was my recollection of the statute. And, when Ms. Rosenfeld said the wall is required by the special exception, it's a wall is required if certain circumstances are not met, and it could conceivably, depending on the evidence, how the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	falls into the definition of wall or fence. I'd have to look back at the code to know. I don't really have an opinion. I didn't look at it. I have no opinion about that. I don't I think we know what we're talking about; that is, we know they're referencing the wall or fence that they have proposed, whichever it is. I don't think does it make a difference in terms of MS. ADELMAN: Well, it makes a difference in several ways, actually, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ADELMAN: My understanding of the definition, architectural definition, this is by definition a fence. MR. GROSSMAN: And why does it make a difference in your mind whether it's a wall or a fence here if it's MS. ADELMAN: Oh, well, first of all, maintenance comes just to mind instantly because if you have a separation I believe the drawing showed six inches between grade and the base, the bottom of the fence sections, not, not the sonotubes before it MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ADELMAN: but the fence sections, then you have a maintenance issue where trash and everything gets stuck in there which wouldn't occur with a wall.

	Page 98		Page 100
			-
	wall, fence, or whatever it is there, but I don't I'd	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2	have to look back at it.	2	MS. ROSENFELD: do believe that there might be
3	MS. ADELMAN: Well, you make a good point because	3	other community groups who
4	the documents are inconsistent. At some points, they say	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, certainly.
5	six inches above; very specifically it's called out, and	5	MS. ROSENFELD: have cross-examination.
6	other times it isn't.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Who wishes to take it for the
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	7	Coalition?
8	MS. ADELMAN: That's a good point.	8	DR. ADELMAN: Yes.
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to make a point.	9	MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman
10	l just don't, I just don't recall whether it is. I just	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
11	my recollection of the testimony was not that there was six	11	MR. SILVERMAN: I think we both would, and we
12	inches' separation between the ground and the wall, fence,	12	and I promise that after Dr. Adelman is finished, I will
13	whatever you want, material, but	13	not ask any repetitive questions, but I have some questions
14	MS. ADELMAN: Well, the documents show that.	14	somewhat different from his.
15	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I mean, I yes, it	15	MR. GROSSMAN: No. In fairness, we're allowing a
16	might make a difference in terms of maintenance. I'm not	16	lot of cross-examination here, and each group is allowed to
17	sure whether it makes a difference in terms of what the	17	have one questioner cross-examine. That's the general rule
	statute calls for, a fence or a wall, something providing		in any, in any court proceeding. You can't have multiple
18	· · · ·	18	
19	screening. So they might be compliant if one of those is	19	people from the same entity doing cross-examination. So you
20	necessary, some sort of structure like that is necessary,	20	can choose one or the other.
21	then, then they may be compliant with it regardless of	21	BY DR. ADELMAN:
22	whether it's a wall or a fence. Mr. Silverman.	22	Q Mr. Gang, I believe you may have already answered
23	MR. SILVERMAN: The issue, the wall, the reason	23	this question, so if you'll excuse me. In your report on
24	for the wall is not just the statute. The statute talks	24	page 1, you say the subject property on which the filling
25	about five feet. We're talking about we're talking about	25	station will be located consists of 37,754 square feet of
	Dana 00		Dana 404
	Page 99		Page 101
1	Page 99 a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some	1	
1 2		1 2	
	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some		area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly?
2	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this	2	area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are.
2 3	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the	2 3	area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly?A Yes, you are.Q In the most recent revision of this special
2 3 4	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the	2 3 4	area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly?A Yes, you are.Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit
2 3 4 5	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly.	2 3 4 5	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a
2 3 4 5 6	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected	2 3 4 5 6	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to	2 3 4 5 6 7	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN, Dr. Adelman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: BY DR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes might be. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2 A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes might be. So MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2 A Yes. Q it says the special exception area would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes might be. So MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2 A Yes. Q it says the special exception area would be 36,800 square feet; am I correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes might be. So MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. ROSENFELD: no further cross-examination at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2 A Yes. Q it says the special exception area would be 36,800 square feet; am I correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a much higher wall here, eight feet or 12 feet in some places. And I take it there was a reason for this additional screening, which, you know, if you went to the property, went to someone's bedroom, you would see the reason very quickly. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, the hearsay you objected to MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: before from the witness MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: suggested that it was a community request when there was a walk-along. I don't know. You'd probably know that answer better than I. It says not less than five feet in height. So I think from the, from the views that they showed a couple of weeks ago, the presently planned height would entirely screen a view of the station. Whether a lower height would entirely screen it I can't recall without looking back at those particular shots of what it would look like, but I just wanted you to all make sure you understood what the potential outcomes might be. So MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 area, et cetera. Am I, am I quoting your report correctly? A Yes, you are. Q In the most recent revision of this special exception plan that the applicant filed that's Exhibit 148, which is this packet on page 2 of 2 there's a statement that the special exception area is 36,800 square feet, is that correct? A I don't have a copy of the plan in front of me. MR. GROSSMAN: You have a copy now, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Okay. It's in the lower right corner. MR. GROSSMAN: Actually, the full-size version of that, page 2, would be 152(b). You're looking at the 11 by 17, but so we're going to look at the full-size version of that. All right. All right. And now what was your question, DR. ADELMAN: Q The statement is, am I correct in saying that in the lower left corner of the second page, which is page 2 of 2 A Yes. Q it says the special exception area would be 36,800 square feet; am I correct?

	Page 102		Page 104
1	square footage of the special exception area?	1	A I have not seen 3(a); so I can't answer that.
2	A No, I cannot.	2	Q Are you aware that the OZAH exhibit list includes,
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Do we want to have Ms. Harris	3	as Exhibit 15(b), a health report?
4	explain it, if you, if that would	4	A Yes, I am.
5	DR. ADELMAN: No. I think, I think Mr. Gang can	5	Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement,
6	answer it.	6	OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits again, none of
7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	7	which are named health report?
8	BY DR. ADELMAN:	8	MR. GROSSMAN: He's already answered that
9	Q Were you aware of this apparent discrepancy	9	question.
10	before?	10	DR. ADELMAN: It's a slightly different question
11	A No, I was not.	11	than asking about the distinction between naming something
12	Q Had you been aware of it, would it have been	12	health analysis versus health report.
13	appropriate strike that. Strike that, sorry.	13	MR. GROSSMAN: What difference does it make?
14	A different topic entirely. In your report you	14	DR. ADELMAN: If you'll let me finish the next two
15	referred to, in Section IV-A6, the results of the traffic	15	questions, I think it will become obvious.
16	impact analysis, is that correct?	16	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Go ahead, sir.
17	A Could you please tell me what page that's on?	17	DR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
18	Q Yes, just a second. Yes, that's on page 12 of	18	BY DR. ADELMAN:
19	your report, Item 6, a long discussion of the elements of	19	Q Are you aware that the CD by which the applicant
20	all the requirements for a traffic impact analysis,	20	transmitted the digital filings, the digital versions of its
21	et cetera.	21	filings, contains a file labeled ChaseCostcoReport
22	A I see that.	22	11-19.PDF
23	Q Okay. Excuse me. I lost my questions. With	23	A No, I
24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	24	Q and that this report is what the OZAH exhibit
25		25	list names as health report?
	Page 103		Page 105
1		1	Page 105 A No, I am not.
1	Page 103 trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct?	1 2	
	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that		A No, I am not.
2	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct?	2	A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the
2 3	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that.	2 3	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate,
2 3 4	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA	2 3 4	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring
2 3 4 5	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are	2 3 4 5	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right.
2 3 4 5 6	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia,	2 3 4 5 6	A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this.
2 3 4 5 6 7	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are named a health analysis?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a distinction between a label health report and a label health
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are named a health analysis? A I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a distinction between a label health report and a label health analysis. Why are you making that distinction?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are named a health analysis? A I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a distinction between a label health report and a label health analysis. Why are you making that distinction? DR. ADELMAN: I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are named a health analysis? A I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, which is OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a distinction between a label health report and a label health analysis. Why are you making that distinction? DR. ADELMAN: I'm not MR. GROSSMAN: You promised me I'd understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	trips expected to be generated and so forth, is that correct? A This report does mention that. Q Okay. Are you aware that the section of the TIA that's OZAH Exhibit 11(a) on which those numbers are based, or estimated, excuse me, was based on a Columbia, Maryland, site that's the Gateway Overlook site and that that station has some 12 pumps, whereas the proposed gas station will have 16 pumps? A No, I am not. Q Do you know the square footage of the Columbia, Maryland, station? A No, I do not. Q In Section oh, excuse me. On page 19 of your report, you refer in the first full paragraph, the one that begins the proposed filling station, you refer to a health analysis, is that correct? A That is correct. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement, OZAH Exhibit 3(a), lists some 29 exhibits, none of which are named a health analysis? A I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Q Are you aware that the petitioner's statement,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A No, I am not. MR. GROSSMAN: I'll take your word for it, by the way. I haven't checked back to make sure you're accurate, but I'll assume you're accurately referring THE WITNESS: Right. DR. ADELMAN: I've been working on this. MR. GROSSMAN: I believe you, sir. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Are you aware that this report, which is now OZAH Exhibit 15(b), is a three-and-a-half page letter which lists some 15 literature references, all of which refer to diesel gas? A No, I am not. Q Will the gas station proposed in S-2863 be selling diesel gas? A No, it will not. Q There has been some discussion about the definition of neighborhood as MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you get to that, Dr. Adelman, you I still don't understand why you make a distinction between a label health report and a label health analysis. Why are you making that distinction? DR. ADELMAN: I'm not

	Page 106		Page 108
1	understand.	1	basically, the reason, you know, one of the reasons or many
2	DR. ADELMAN: Well, I'm not actually making a	2	reasons defined the Westfield District as a separate
3	distinction between health report and health analysis. I'm	3	neighborhood was, one is the average people per day, the
4	attempting to establish, without testifying, that the	4	retail stores, which is vastly different than Kensington
5	existing health report or analysis, whichever it is, is a	5	Heights, it has office within it, the hours of operation
6	very brief letter which was not called out as an exhibit by	6	within the mall area, the lighting within the mall area, and
7	the applicant in its original filing	7	it continues on to the top of page 8.
8	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Gentlemen, please, go on with your
9	DR. ADELMAN: and that, without testifying, it	9	cross-examination.
10	seems strange to me, given now the changes in the code that	10	BY DR. ADELMAN:
11	were introduced by ZTA 12-07, which essentially spoke to	11	Q The people who attend meetings in the mall, shop
12	health, that that is the extent of the health report or	12	at stores in the mall, some of them come from the Kensington
13	analysis or whatever you wish to call it.	13	Heights neighborhood, do they not?
14	MR. GROSSMAN: I mean, I'll let you proceed with	14	A I would say that's a fair assumption. Do I know
15	your next question about the neighborhood. I think I	15	that for a fact?
16	understand I understand the point you're making. I don't	16	Q You don't know that for a fact?
17	know why it was necessary to go into that distinction	17	A I would say it's a fair assumption they do attend
18	between report and analysis, which was the essence of one of	18 19	because it is their local shopping center and by definitions.
19 20	your questions, but okay, go ahead, sir. DR. ADELMAN: It was necessary because I don't	20	Q Thank you.
20	really know how to phrase the questions correctly. I'm	20	DR. ADELMAN: We have no further questions.
22	trying.	22	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. How about from
23	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You're doing great,	23	Kensington View Civic Association any questions?
24	though. Go ahead.	24	MS. DUCKETT: Yes, I have some questions, yes.
25	DR. ADELMAN: Okay. This microphone is not	25	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		C C
	Page 107		Page 109
1	Page 107 working properly. So it's	1	Page 109 MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been
1		1	Ű
	working properly. So it's		MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been
2	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback,	2	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear
2 3	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the	2 3	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl,
2 3 4 5	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day.	2 3 4	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT:
2 3 4 5	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it?	2 3 4 5	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, MS. DUCKETT. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition of neighborhood, has there been a discussion of the people, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition of neighborhood, has there been a discussion of the people, persons in the neighborhood? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8. MS. ROSENFELD: Of what? Page 28 of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood? A Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8. MS. ROSENFELD: Of what? Page 28 of what document?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition of neighborhood, has there been a discussion of the people, persons in the neighborhood? A Yes. Q Could you tell me where? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8. MS. ROSENFELD: Of what? Page 28 of what document? THE WITNESS: The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition of neighborhood, has there been a discussion of the people, persons in the neighborhood? A Yes. Q Could you tell me where? A Sure. I think it's in my, was in my testimony as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, Ms. Duckett. MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8. MS. ROSENFELD: Of what? Page 28 of what document? THE WITNESS: The MR. GROSSMAN: Sector plan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 working properly. So it's MR. GROSSMAN: I think you're getting feedback, but maybe that's because the speaker is too close to the microphone or the device. DR. ADELMAN: It's the same, it's the same place that it's been placed every day. MR. GROSSMAN: Has it? Was it? DR. ADELMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Hal right. BY DR. ADELMAN: Q Can you hear me? A I hear you perfectly. Can you hear me? Q Yes. Right. Okay. We can move right along now. A Right. Q There has been extensive discussion of the definition of neighborhood by various parties at the table. In your definition of neighborhood or Applicant's definition of neighborhood, has there been a discussion of the people, persons in the neighborhood? A Yes. Q Could you tell me where? A Sure. I think it's in my, was in my testimony as well as my planning report. If you turn to Page No I 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. DUCKETT: And I don't think they've been covered yet, but you know, I couldn't hear MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Give it a whirl, MS. DUCKETT: everything. Yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q I have a question about something that, Mr. Gang, you just said. You said the core area is where redevelopment will occur when you were showing a map of Veirs Mill Road. A One of the four other districts. There are, there are five districts within the sector plan. The core area is one of the other districts. So there are other districts in which redevelopment is planned for. All I was pointing out to is the core area is the adjoining property off of Veirs Mill Road which correlates to the map on page 28 Q Okay. A Map No. 8. MS. ROSENFELD: Of what? Page 28 of what document? THE WITNESS: The MR. GROSSMAN: Sector plan.

	Page 110		Page 112
1	current plans out there, or did you base it on what happened	1	A Well, it extends anywhere from, if I was to give
2	with the sector plan? I'm not sure what you based the	2	it a boundary, the eastern boundary is generally along
3	A Sure. Sure, fair enough.	3	Amherst. When you get to the northeast corner, it goes on
4	Q statement on.	4	the other side of Amherst and Blueridge, it goes all the way
5	A Yeah. If we go, if we turn to page 42 of the	5	over on the northern property to Grandview, also on the
6	sector plan, labeled Districts	6	opposite side of Grandview near Kensington Boulevard, and
7	Q Okay.	7	then it extends, why don't we call it, westward towards where the entrance into the mall is. So it's the area which
8 9	A in the right-hand corner, there are six colors identifying the five districts, which is an orange for the	8	is labeled CR Zones.
10	core, I would call it a very dark gray for price, a bluish	10	Q So you're expecting that redevelopment will only
11	purple for Blueridge, a red for Westfield, and a green for	11	occur where the, where the zoning changes have occurred?
12	Kensington View/Wheaton Hills. Those are the five districts	12	A Do I expect that's the only place? No. I think
13	as identified on top of page 43, which says there are five	13	if you go to the sector plan, the sector plan specifically
14	districts, each with their distinct character. So that's	14	talks about each of these districts and what is envisioned
15	how I came up with the districts.	15	in reference to, you know, zoning regarding heights, FAR,
16	Q Maybe I'm dense. I don't understand how that map	16	which I identified, you know, what floor area ratio is, what
17	shows where redevelopment will occur. Based on your	17	the mix of uses are, and some of the parcels, you know, they
18	statement, you said	18	say, conform to those specific zones. So I think the sector
19	A Sure.	19	plan specifically talks about what is envisioned in each of
20	Q core area is where redevelopment will occur.	20	those five, each of those five general districts and, also,
21	A Sure. We go to I want to go to some other	21	parcel by parcel.
22	exhibits. First, on the top of page 33, which says zoning	22	Q Okay. Is part of Westfield Mall rezoned as CR?
23 24	recommendations are based on five goals, those are zoning recommendations. The first four are within the CBD, you	23 24	A Yes, it is. Q And part of it isn't?
25	know, the central business district, which are the Class A	25	A That is correct.
	·····, ··· ···········, ··············		
	Page 111		Page 113
1	Page 111 office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail	1	Page 113 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield
1 2	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the	1 2	Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District?
2 3	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed	2 3	Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the WestfieldDistrict?A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield
2 3 4	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning	2 3 4	Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the WestfieldDistrict?A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the WestfieldDistrict? The answer is yes.
2 3 4 5	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to	2 3 4 5	Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the WestfieldDistrict?A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the WestfieldDistrict? The answer is yes.Q Yes?
2 3 4 5 6	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within,	2 3 4 5 6	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District?
2 3 4 5 6 7	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur? A Should occur.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q So that doesn't distinguish whether the area was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur? A Should occur. Q Should occur?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q So that doesn't distinguish whether the area was rezoned or not rezoned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur? A Should occur. Q Should occur?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q So that doesn't distinguish whether the area was rezoned or not rezoned A Yes, it does.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur? A Should occur. Q Should occur. It's where it's that's where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q So that doesn't distinguish whether the area was rezoned or not rezoned A Yes, it does.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	office, the retail, the housing mixed with retail surrounding, also CBD, and the highest density is in the center of the CBD. Then we go to page 39, which is proposed zoning, CR zoning CR is commercial residential zoning and that's where the highest densities are, if you turn to page 40, with the variety of proposed densities as within, within that area. And it goes Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Let him finish. THE WITNESS: Am I finished or MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q You could be. A did I answer your question already? If I answered your question, I'll stop. Q Well, when you said 39, you were answering you were saying that it was based on the zoning, is that correct, on the changed zoning, that you'd feel that's where redevelopment will occur? A Should occur. Q Should occur. I's envisioned within the sector plan, the areas in purple.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Is all of Westfield Mall in the Westfield District? A Is all of the Westfield Mall within the Westfield District? The answer is yes. Q Yes? A Yes. Q Okay. On the sector plan on page 43, does it mention a vision for the Westfield District? A If you're talking about a vision, there's a statement on the second sentence that says the Westfield District has the potential to evolve into a mixed-use district that enhances the mall as a retail destination. If that's what you're talking about Q Yes. A the answer is yes. MR. GROSSMAN: That's actually the third sentence. It's the second highlight. THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I, yeah, I correct. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q So that doesn't distinguish whether the area was rezoned or not rezoned A Yes, it does. Q it just talks about the Westfield District?

	Page 114		Page 116
1	it shows, prior to the sector plan, it shows the Westfield	1	A Sure. May I talk about the rezoning rewrite,
2	Mall completely being in the C-2 zone. Then if you turn to	2	because I thought we were not allowed to, but I'll be happy
3	page 39, which we just talked about, it shows that portion	3	to address it because
4	of the Westfield Mall which got rezoned through the sector	4	MR. GROSSMAN: I'll let you answer her question.
5	plan from C-2 to CR.	5	THE WITNESS: Sure. The rezoning rewrite is
6	Q Yes.	6	underway. The County, which was interesting, is, is,
7	MR. GROSSMAN: What are you getting at,	7	recently I'll just find out the
8	Ms. Duckett? What's your point?	8	MR. GROSSMAN: While he's looking, Ms. Duckett,
9	MS. DUCKETT: I'm asking him, and it does	9	I'm not sure I understand what what are you trying to
10	BY MS. DUCKETT:	10	establish here?
11	Q Does it distinguish, the sector plan distinguish	11	MS. DUCKETT: I'm trying to establish that the
12	between, when it talks about the Westfield District, talk	12	sector plan is stating that they could not rezone the whole
13	about whether it's only talking about the rezoned portion	13	mall, it wouldn't work effectively
14	or the portion that remained?	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
15	A Sure. If you turn to page 53, 53 has specifically	15	MS. DUCKETT: and I could ask him would it make
16	the area I'm sorry. If we go to page 52, 52 shows, first	16	it a non-conforming use. It's also saying that this could
17	of all, the area which has been rezoned to CR and the	17	change.
18	specific recommendations for the density and the heights	18	THE WITNESS: Sure.
19	within the Westfield District. On page 53 are the bullet	19	MS. DUCKETT: Now, my other questions will be
20	points which specifically describes the rezoning and	20	about the C-2 zoning itself, does it allow mixed-use in the
21	confirming, you know, the second bullet point is confirming	21	current state that it is. I don't want to get into that
22 23	the existing C-2 for the remaining portion of the site. The first bullet point is where the CR zone is. The second	22 23	rewrite because that's going to, that could change. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You asked the question,
23 24	bullet point is confirming the C-2 zone for the remainder of	23 24	though. That's
25	the property.	25	THE WITNESS: But you asked me
		-	
	Page 115		Page 117
1	Page 115 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third	1	Page 117 MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into
1 2		1 2	Ĵ
	Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third		MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into
2	Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work	2	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question?
2 3	Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53.	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could
2 3 4	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which 	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what
2 3 4 5	Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph?	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the 	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well THE WITNESS: Oh
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but Q And it goes on to say the main mall portion of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well THE WITNESS: Oh MR. GROSSMAN: what am I supposed to glean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but Q And it goes on to say the main mall portion of the property could be rezoned for mixed-use development as part 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well THE WITNESS: Oh MR. GROSSMAN: what am I supposed to glean from, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but Q And it goes on to say the main mall portion of the property could be rezoned for mixed-use development as part of the comprehensive rewrite of the County's zoning 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well THE WITNESS: Oh MR. GROSSMAN: what am I supposed to glean from, from MS. DUCKETT: Let me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Okay. On page 53, in the middle of the third paragraph, it says, however, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. Do you know why? A I'm sorry. You have to Q 53. A Yes, I know. I'm sorry. Which sentence and which paragraph? Q It's in the MR. GROSSMAN: Third paragraph, there's a sentence you highlighted. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Third paragraph. MS. DUCKETT: Is this their highlighted version? MS. ROSENFELD: That's their highlighted. THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q However, the CR zones would not work effectively with the existing mall. A I can't answer that, but Q And it goes on to say the main mall portion of the property could be rezoned for mixed-use development as part of the comprehensive rewrite of the County's zoning ordinance underway 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: so if you don't want to get into it, fine. So you withdraw your question? MS. DUCKETT: Not the zoning code rewrite itself because nobody knows what that will end up. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, anything could THE WITNESS: Right, but what MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. The Council can change, the Council has the power to change the zoning if it votes to change zoning. MS. DUCKETT: That's right. MR. GROSSMAN: So we know things can change, and it can do it as part of the rewrite or not. So I MS. DUCKETT: That's right. That's why I don't want to get into that. MR. GROSSMAN: I just don't understand. So what does this establish? What am I, what am I supposed to MS. DUCKETT: Well THE WITNESS: Oh MR. GROSSMAN: what am I supposed to glean from, from MS. DUCKETT: Let me MR. GROSSMAN: your line of questioning? I

	Page 118		Page 120
1	Q Is C-2, is C-2 different for the mall property	1	overemphasizing the fact that it's C-2 now, and you think
2	than it might be for other locations in the county?	2	that there could, at some point, this could change and there
3	A Okay.	3	could be other things there?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: No. Hold on a second. I want to	4	MS. DUCKETT: I think, I think the impression I
5	understand why we're going through this exercise. What is	5	got, based on the testimony that I heard from him
6	the point of your cross-examination?	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
7	MS. DUCKETT: The point is that when they, when	7	MS. DUCKETT: was that C-2 is for general
8	they said the Westfield District	8	retail and, you know, because they didn't change it to CR,
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	9	that somehow the vision for Wheaton might not apply to the
10	MS. DUCKETT: and they talked about, you know,	10	C-2 portion. That's the impression I have.
11	the vision for the Westfield District, my point is, even if	11	MR. GROSSMAN: I think that's the impression I got
12	it's C-2	12	too. I'm not saying that your impression is incorrect. I
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	13	think his, the sense of his testimony is that this area
14	MS. DUCKETT: or it's CR, they could have	14	where the, that's not in the CR zone was intended to remain
15	mixed-use based on the fact that Westfield Mall is a Metro	15	a C-2 unless it's rezoned at some point thereafter, and it's
16	station policy area, it's within so many feet, it's a	16	conceivable that will and that sentence implies that that's
17	regional shopping center based on the current	17	going to be looked at, but
18	MR. GROSSMAN: But what difference does it make to	18	MS. DUCKETT: Okay.
19	me in terms of my having to analyze this and make a	19	MR. GROSSMAN: that's, I have the same
20	recommendation? That's what I don't understand. Let's say	20	understanding. I'm just not sure that given that it's C-2
21	it could be, it could be mixed-use, it could be C-2, it	21	now and they left it C-2 in the sector plan, that I can
22	could be CR. What how does that affect what I have to	22	reach any other or project any other conclusion. I have to
23	analyze in terms of this request to have a special	23	go by what, what the sector plan recommended for it and what it is, not what it might be under a rewrite
24 25	exception? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he is	24 25	MS. DUCKETT: Oh, I agree. I'm just
25	NO. DOCKETT. Well, He IS	25	MO. DUCKETT. OII, Taglee. Thi just
	Page 119		Page 121
1	Page 119 MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a	1	Page 121 MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume.
1 2		1 2	, and the second s
	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a		MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect	2	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact
2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise,	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area
2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that, okay, it is C-2 now but it could be something else and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state economic development program that provides tax incentives to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that, okay, it is C-2 now but it could be something else and therefore a gas station might not be consistent with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state economic development program that provides tax incentives to eligible businesses locating or expanding in designated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that, okay, it is C-2 now but it could be something else and therefore a gas station might not be consistent with the sector plan? And you think that he's emphasizing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state economic development program that provides tax incentives to eligible businesses locating or expanding in designated zones. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: I have a C-2 zone. I don't have a CR zone. I have a C-2 zone. What how does that affect what I analyze? MS. DUCKETT: Well, he's indicating that the only place that change could occur were in the CR; otherwise, it's going to have to stay the way it is, when it said the vision for Westfield District is a mixed-use. Now, that my point is that mixed-use could be anywhere, who knows where it may be. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but so, and my question is, so what's the end result of that? Let's say you're correct. Let's say he's wrong and you're correct, assuming he means what you say he means. MS. DUCKETT: My point is, with the sector plan, a large gas station may not be what the vision for Wheaton is, and I have one more question about the redevelopment. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't want to first, I'm just trying to understand why it is that your questions pertain to what I have to analyze. So you're saying that, okay, it is C-2 now but it could be something else and therefore a gas station might not be consistent with the sector plan? And you think that he's emphasizing MS. DUCKETT: I believe it's not consistent with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: that's what I have to assume. MS. DUCKETT: I was just pointing out the fact that it is a Metro station policy area BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Well, I could ask you that. Is it? A Yes, it is. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Go ahead ask any other questions. MS. DUCKETT: Okay. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Is Westfield Wheaton Mall in the Wheaton Urban District and the Wheaton Enterprise Zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A Yes, it is. Q What's the purpose of the enterprise zone? A I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I know conceptually, but I'm not 100 percent sure to give an answer on the record. Q Well, it's on page 21 of the Wheaton Sector Plan. I'll read it: entire plan is an enterprise zone, a state economic development program that provides tax incentives to eligible businesses locating or expanding in designated zones. Correct? A That's what it says.

	Page 122		Page 124
1	A I don't know because it's related to the overall	1	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2	warehouse. So I don't know the answer to that.	2	BY MS. DUCKETT:
3	Q Okay. Does the zoning code define regional	3	Q Does 59-C-4.350, purpose, state, a further purpose
4	shopping malls by distance or by square footage?	4	
5	A The zoning ordinance? I do not know that.	5	within 500 feet of a business transit center, Metro station
6	Q Well, I know that you said that malls have a	6	policy area, and in close proximity to Metro stations
7	25-mile radius, but when you look at 59-C-4.351	7	located in the Wheaton central business district?
8	(Discussion off the record.)	8	A Yes, it does.
9	BY MS. DUCKETT:	9	Q So could Westfield, based on its location and
10	Q A regional shopping center is defined as a	10	having C-2 zoning, add mixed-use, a hotel or a movie
11	shopping center comprised of a minimum of 600,000 gross	11	complex, to their current C-2 zoned property?
12	leasable square feet and a minimum of 50 separate stores.	12	A I have to look up the housing, the answer is
13	Would you agree with that?	13	
14	A If you tell me that's what it says, I will agree.	14	Q I'm sorry?
15	Q Well oh, that, that's the definition, but	15	A The housing portion is no. And you're asking why?
16	59-C-4.351 states, differentiated uses within the center	16	Sure. There
17	that have more than 1.2 million square feet of retail space.	17	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't think she asked why,
18	Are you aware of that? Not offhand? You don't have the	18	-
19	zoning code there, but	19	BY MS. DUCKETT:
20	A No, I do not know that. No, I do not.	20	Q I didn't ask why.
21	Q uses are differentiated in that section	21	A Well, I'll tell you, for housing the answer is no.
22	A Okay.	22	Q Housing is not allowed on the C-2 portion?
23	Q of the code. So does the C-2 zone allow	23	A Not in this specific site.
24	different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or	24	MR. GROSSMAN: Now, Ms. Duckett, once again, I
25	regional malls other than C-2 zoned properties in the	25	have to ask, why is this relevant to what I have to
			·····
	Page 123		Page 125
1	-	1	
1	county?	1	consider? I don't understand. So
	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and		consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it
2	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer?	2	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they
2 3	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again.	2 3	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What
2 3 4	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again	2 3 4	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the
2 3 4 5	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get	2 3 4 5	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want
2 3 4 5 6	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT:	2 3 4 5 6	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability.
2 3 4 5 6 7	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT:	2 3 4 5 6 7	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than 	2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I	2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning ordinance?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's not changed to CR
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning ordinance? THE WITNESS: and the answer is yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's not changed to CR MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. DUCKETT: could be mixed-use. I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning ordinance? THE WITNESS: and the answer is yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Pardon me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's not changed to CR MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. DUCKETT: could be mixed-use. I'm not saying that this gas station is mixed-use. I'm just saying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning ordinance? THE WITNESS: and the answer is yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Pardon me?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's not changed to CR MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. DUCKETT: could be mixed-use. I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	county? A I'm sorry. Can you ask that question again and Q Oh, what was your answer? MR. GROSSMAN: No, no. Ask it again. THE WITNESS: I said, can you please ask it again because I will get BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Oh, I'm sorry. A I'll get the zone and Q Does the C-2 zone allow different uses for Metro station policy areas and/or regional shopping malls than from other C-2 zoned properties, say, like a C-2 zone in, I don't know, Colesville? I'm trying to think. Well, there is no MR. GROSSMAN: Why don't we say this: If you know. Do you know? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm reading it right now MR. GROSSMAN: You're reading it from the zoning ordinance? THE WITNESS: and the answer is yes. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Pardon me? A I think your answer is yes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	consider? I don't understand. So MS. DUCKETT: Well, it MR. GROSSMAN: let's say they can or they can't. What MS. DUCKETT: it just goes all back to the sector plan, that's all, and the point that they want mixed-use and walkability. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if the zone does or does not permit it, that's the zone will control, and I don't understand how that affects what I have to evaluate when I evaluate this special exception request. MS. DUCKETT: Well, if he had stated that general commercial does not, you know. He had stated C-2 was only general commercial. My point is, in a Metro station policy area, the type of development that could occur MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. MS. DUCKETT: even if it is C-2, even if it's not changed to CR MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. DUCKETT: could be mixed-use. I'm not saying that this gas station is mixed-use. I'm just saying that based on the sector plan and the vision of Wheaton, the

	Page 126		Page 128
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.	1	A Yes.
2	THE WITNESS: And can I answer why, because I	2	Q Okay. Now, the entrance to the gas station will
3	know	3	be on the mall property, is that correct?
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, she didn't ask the question,	4	A Yes.
5	sir.	5	Q Okay. How do you access the mall property?
6	THE WITNESS: I know.	6	A There are two access points off of University and
7	MR. GROSSMAN: You have to, let's, let's get	7	three off of Veirs Mill.
8	MS. DUCKETT: I wasn't asking.	8	Q All right. So the only way for all of these cars
9	THE WITNESS: It will be asked. So	9	to come in would be to go through the proposed redeveloped
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, not necessarily. Well, let's	10	areas, is that correct?
11	see what she asks.	11	A All the cars through the redevelopment area? No.
12	THE WITNESS: Right.	12	Q How would they access the gas station without
13	BY MS. DUCKETT:	13	traveling on University or Veirs Mill
14	Q Okay. When we go back to that little map that has	14	A I'm sorry.
15	the zoning changes on it, page 34, I guess	15	Q entrances?
16	MS. CORDRY: 38 and 39, Eleanor.	16	A There are two access points off of University
17	MS. ROSENFELD: 38 and 39.	17	which do not traverse the CR zone.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: See, if what you're trying to reach	18	Q So, you're saying that the fact that the other
19	is that I understand that the opposition's concept of,	19	side of the street is going to be, or has been up-zoned for
20	and perhaps I would say the Planning Board's concept, of the	20	redevelopment has no bearing on the entrances there?
21	sector plan is that the goals of a transit-oriented sector	21	A I can't answer that. I'm not a transportation
22	plan apply across the board to the whole of the plan and the	22	engineer.
23	nature of Mr. Gang's testimony was that it's different	23	Q All right. If the people from University
24	strokes for different folks within the	24	Boulevard is where my community is, behind the purple.
25	MS. DUCKETT: Right.	25	A Right.
	Page 127		Page 129
1	MR. GROSSMAN: the sector and they specifically	1	Q We're behind the purple. If we go back to the
2	allowed this commercial area C-2 and so not every goal is	2	blue arrows that everybody hates, how would the people in my
3	applicable to every little portion of it. I understand the	3	redeveloped proposed area get to the core or get to the
4	distinction. So I'm not sure	4	amenities in the mall
5	MS. DUCKETT: Okay.	5	A Sure
6		5	A Sure.
	MR. GROSSMAN: and that, that seems to be the	6	Q without going across the entrances?
7	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it		
8	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay.	6	Q without going across the entrances?A You know your community 10 times better than Ido
	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction.	6 7	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes.
8 9 10	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there?	6 7 8 9 10	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my
8 9 10 11	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No.	6 7 8 9 10	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right?
8 9 10 11 12	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you
8 9 10 11 12 13	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR 	6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've	6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because	6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally? A Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally? A Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down Veirs Mill Road, is that correct, where the purple is? 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot 13. All the other pedestrian ways outside the mall uses
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally? A Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down Veirs Mill Road, is that correct, where the purple is? A On the, where the purple northern side of 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot 13. All the other pedestrian ways outside the mall uses their streets and sidewalks along that area. So to answer
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down Veirs Mill Road, is that correct, where the purple is? A On the, where the purple northern side of University and coming down, right. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot 13. All the other pedestrian ways outside the mall uses their streets and sidewalks along that area. So to answer your question is, I would probably walk down one of the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally? A Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down Veirs Mill Road, is that correct, where the purple is? A On the, where the purple northern side of University and coming down, right. Q Yes. One the section I want to talk about is 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot 13. All the other pedestrian ways outside the mall uses their streets and sidewalks along that area. So to answer your question is, I would probably walk down one of the streets, you know, where there's a sidewalk and where
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 dichotomy between your view of it and his view of it MS. DUCKETT: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand that distinction. Is there something else that you wanted me to get at there? MS. DUCKETT: No. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q There's only one other thing with the, with Map, the map on page 39 where you said that, you know, the CR zone, that's where they have the proposed redevelopment. That's what you stated, what you've A Generally, because Q Generally. Q So it's all along University Boulevard and down Veirs Mill Road, is that correct, where the purple is? A On the, where the purple northern side of University and coming down, right. 	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q without going across the entrances? A You know your community 10 times better than I do Q Oh, yes. A all right? Well, I, you know, but you asked my opinion, all right? Q Yes, and because I'm telling you A And the point is sorry. Q the redeveloped areas. A Sure. You asked my opinion. Wheaton, as far as I know, every pedestrian way, except for one that I know of, and you'll correct me, uses a street as part of their pedestrian way. The only one I know is where the Chevy Chase Bank is; you know, crossing Georgia Avenue, there's a pedestrian way connecting Georgia Avenue down to Parking Lot 13. All the other pedestrian ways outside the mall uses their streets and sidewalks along that area. So to answer your question is, I would probably walk down one of the

	Page 130		Page 132
1	cross over there, which are the two locations on University	1	59-G-2.06(b)(2), which has to do with the buffer and ask you
2	Boulevard and the three along Veirs Mill Road.	2	a number of questions related to that.
3	Q Okay. So do you believe it makes sense to change	3	A Sure.
4	the zoning at every entrance to the mall to a zone that	4	Q Does the special exception property abut a
5	promotes economically, environmentally, and socially	5	residential zone?
6	sustainable development patterns where people can live,	6	A The special exception area does not abut a
7	work, play, and have access to services and amenities while	7	residential zone.
8	minimizing the need for automobiles and then add the first	8	Q And can you please describe the width of the
9	mega gas station in the county with its only access via	9	forest buffer that adjoins the mall parcel to
10	these rezoned areas?	10	A You mean along the whole periphery
11	MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, I would object to that.	11	Q Yes.
12	THE WITNESS: Yeah, right.	12	A from, from north
13	MS. DUCKETT: It sounds like a yes or no.	13	Q Yes. Do you know the width, the range of widths?
14	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I'm going to sustain	14	A You know, I don't remember, but it basically
15	that objection. First of all	15	ranged, like, from 30 feet to 70 feet in wide with the
16	THE WITNESS: Right.	16	widest point in the southwest corner of the mall of being
17	MR. GROSSMAN: it's a difficult mouthful to get	17	approximately 190 feet. It ranged in vertical height from
18	around	18	11 to 17 feet.
19	THE WITNESS: Right.	19	Q And are there currently planted trees in that
20	MR. GROSSMAN: but secondly, it seems to me it	20	area? Is there currently landscaping existing within that
21	goes well beyond what	21	buffer area?
22	THE WITNESS: Right.	22	A Are there existing trees within that area? The
23	MR. GROSSMAN: what is a reasonable assumption	23	Q Yes.
24	here of	24	A answer is yes.
25	BY MS. DUCKETT:	25	Q Okay. And what is the topographical difference
	Doro 121		
	Page 131		Page 133
1		1	
1 2	Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually.	1	
	Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the		between the subject special exception area and the
2	Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually.	2	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest
2 3	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: 	2 3	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet.
2 3 4	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't 	2 3 4	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just
2 3 4 5	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's 	2 3 4 5	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain
2 3 4 5 6	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services 	2 3 4 5 6	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? 	2 3 4 5 6 7	between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. Any redirect? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan? MS. HARRIS: Of the sector plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. Any redirect? MS. HARRIS: Yes, please. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan? MS. HARRIS: Of the sector plan. THE WITNESS: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. Any redirect? MS. HARRIS: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: You're sure? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan? MS. HARRIS: Of the sector plan. THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. Any redirect? MS. HARRIS: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: You're sure? REDIRECT EXAMINATION 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan? MS. HARRIS: Of the sector plan. THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q If one were looking for the specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q Okay. Let me ask this: Does the MR. GROSSMAN: where we are factually. BY MS. DUCKETT: Q Okay. Does the CR zone promote well, I don't need to ask you that. The purpose of the CR zone, it's where people can live or play and have access to services and amenities while minimizing the need for automobiles? A I don't know about the last piece, but you know, in reference to being mixed-use, when I've worked with CR zones, that is the goal. Q I'll have to I can find it. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, it says whatever it says. MS. DUCKETT: All right. That's all. MR. GROSSMAN: I think you did a great job highlighting the distinctions between your view of the sector plan and the applicant's. I just want you to know that. Okay. Is there anybody else, any other cross-examination questions in the audience? (No audible response.) MR. GROSSMAN: No. Okay. Any redirect? MS. HARRIS: Yes, please. Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: You're sure? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 between the subject special exception area and the A Sure. It generally ranges, you know, in closest proximity to the site, between 11 and 17 feet. Q So in your view, those factors that you just identified, do those constitute an effective natural terrain feature that would screen the special exception area from the residential area? A Yes, it would. Q And in your opinion, is the proposed wall necessary to meet the requirements of 59-B-2.06(b)(2)? A The wall is not necessary to meet that specific finding in the zoning ordinance. Q And is there any requirement in the zoning ordinance that a gas station cannot be visible from a residential property? A No, there is not. Q I want to turn now to pages I'm going to talk about two pages at the same time pages 28 and page 61. MR. GROSSMAN: Of the sector plan? MS. HARRIS: Of the sector plan. THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS:

Page 134		Page 136
the plan on page 61?	1	mall parcel.
A The specific connections, I would go to page 61.	2	Q And is there an easement or any legal right for
Q And referring to aerial, which is Exhibit 102,	3	that traversing of the mall parcel in that area that you're
which we see, can you identify where the I believe there	4	aware of?
are water towers immediately north of the Wheaton Mall	5	A I am not aware of any easement.
parcel.	6	Q Referring back to page 61 again, in terms of the
A Yeah, I can do that.	7	existing and proposed pedestrian connections, is there one
MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we can see them on the	8	shown for that informal path that currently exists?
MS. HARRIS: Okay.	9	A No, there is not.
THE WITNESS: Right.	10	Q Were you aware that the gas station, the existing
MR. GROSSMAN: thing. They're almost central	11	gas, the previously proposed special exception gas station
on the diagram but due north. Is that what you're talking	12	site, that that was within Costco's lease area of the mall
about?	13	parcel?
MS. HARRIS: Yes.	14	A I was not aware of that.
MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	15	Q Okay. Would it surprise you if I told you that it
BY MS. HARRIS:	16	was located within it?
Q And then can you relate the location of those	17	A No, it would not.
water towers to the gray arrow that appears on page 28?	18	MR. GROSSMAN: What difference does it make if it
A Well, I think it goes right through the center of	19	would surprise him or not?
the water towers.	20	MS. HARRIS: It wouldn't.
Q And	21	BY MS. HARRIS:
MR. SILVERMAN: Could you speak up?	22	Q Do you know where Costco's lease area is?
THE WITNESS: I think it goes right through the	23	A Do I know specifically? No, I do not.
center of the water towers.	24	Q Okay. The bicycle path that shows on page 67
BY MS. HARRIS:	25	A Yes.
Page 135		Page 137
Ω And so the plan on page 28 what can you again	1	Q and the chart on page 66, which is referred to
		as LB-5 and it says that it, a signed shared roadway or a
		A Right.
		Q can exist to accommodate bicycles
		A Right.
		Q is there anything in your opinion, is the gas
-	8	station in any way precluding a signed shared roadway bike
- · ·	9	path along the ring road?
see what those are intended to be?	10	A As identified as a Class 3, the answer is no.
A That would be correct.	11	Q And can you explain in a little more detail why
Q You testified that the sector plan does not	12	that, why you reached that conclusion?
recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in	13	A Sure. On the right-hand side, you know, there's a
recommendation to one of Ms. Rosenfeld's questions, is that	14	Class 1, Class 2, Class 3. Class 1 is a bike lane,
correct?	15	completely separated from the street. A Class 2 is a
A That is correct.	16	dedicated bike lane within the street; you've seen the bike
Q And is there anything in the sector plan that	17	arrows. The Class 3 is a bike lane within the street. And
precludes gas stations?	18	the reason I came to that conclusion is I've ridden my bike
A No, there is not.	19	around the ring road a number of times to see whether it
Q There was some discussion about an informal	20	works or not, and the answer, it works. Matter of fact, I
pedestrian path along Mount McComas that	21	feel safer in the ring road than the rest of Wheaton, mainly
A Yes, there was.	22	because of the way it's set up.
	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, hold on a second. I just
Q And does that informal path currently connect to	23	MIN. ONOOOMAN. Well, Hold On a Second. I Just
Q And does that informal path currently connect to the mall parcel, are you aware?	24	want to understand the class distinctions that you made.
	the plan on page 61? A The specific connections, I would go to page 61. Q And referring to aerial, which is Exhibit 102, which we see, can you identify where the I believe there are water towers immediately north of the Wheaton Mall parcel. A Yeah, I can do that. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we can see them on the MS. HARRIS: Okay. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: thing. They're almost central on the diagram but due north. Is that what you're talking about? MS. HARRIS: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And then can you relate the location of those water towers to the gray arrow that appears on page 28? A Well, I think it goes right through the center of the water towers. Q And MR. SILVERMAN: Could you speak up? THE WITNESS: I think it goes right through the center of the water towers. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And MR. SILVERMAN: Could you speak up? THE WITNESS: I think it goes right through the center of the water towers. BY MS. HARRIS: Page 135 Q And so the plan on page 28, what can you again summarize what the purpose of it is? A Again, it shows the overall concept of having connectivity, conceptual connectivity from the adjoining community, both inside and outside the sector plan area, to, I'm going to call it, the core area, which is highlighted in yellow. Q And then if one were focusing on the specific connections, it's correct that you would turn to page 61 to see what those are intended to be? A That would be correct. Q You testified that the sector plan does not recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in recommend more gas stations. I believe this	the plan on page 61? 1 A The specific connections, I would go to page 61. 2 Q And referring to aerial, which is Exhibit 102, 3 which we see, can you identify where the I believe there are water towers immediately north of the Wheaton Mall parcel. 6 A Yeah, I can do that. 6 MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we can see them on the MS. HARRIS: Okay. 7 THE WITNESS: Right. 10 MR. GROSSMAN: thing. They're almost central 11 on the diagram but due north. Is that what you're talking about? 13 MS. HARRIS: Yes. 14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 15 BY MS. HARRIS: Yes. 14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 15 BY MS. HARRIS: 16 Q And then can you relate the location of those 17 water towers to the gray arrow that appears on page 28? 18 MR. SILVERMAN: Could you speak up? 22 THE WITNESS: I think it goes right through the center of 19 the water towers. 20 Q And - 7 MR. SILVERMAN: Could you speak up? 22 THE WITNESS: I think it goes right through the 23 center of the water towers. 24 BY MS. HARRIS: 2 Q And so the plan on page 28, what can you again 3 summarize what the purpose of it is? 2 A Again, it shows the overall concept of having 3 connectivity, conceptual connectivity from the adjoining 3 connectivity, conceptual connectivity from the adjoining 4 community, both inside and outside the sector plan area, to, 1'm going to call it, the core area, which is highlighted in yellow. 7 Q And then if one were focusing on the specific 8 connections, it's correct that you would turn to page 61 to 3 see what those are intended to be? 10 A That would be correct. 11 Q You testified that the sector plan does not 12 recommend more gas stations. I believe this was in 13 recommendation to one of Ms. Rosenfeld's questions, is that 14 correct? A That is correct. 16 Q And is there anything in the sector plan that 17 precludes gas stations? 18 A No, there is not. 19 Q There was some discussion about an informal 20

	Page 138		Page 140
1	THE WITNESS: It's a bike path, completely	1	gas station would be memberships only but that was a
2	separated from the street.	2	non-inherent characteristic. In your opinion, is it an
3	MR. GROSSMAN: I see. So Class 1 is a bike path,	3	adverse non-inherent characteristic of the gas station that
4	separate from the street.	4	it's members only?
5	THE WITNESS: Off-road.	5	A It does not have an adverse effect.
6	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Class 2 is what now?	6	Q It's just
7	THE WITNESS: Is a dedicated bike lane within the	7	A It's a I'll call it neutral or whatever, but it
8	street. You've seen the bike lanes	8	has no negative impact.
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	9	Q Thank you. And then can you you're familiar
10	THE WITNESS: it says dedicated bike, you know,	10	with the originally proposed special exception, S, I believe
11	bike, you know	11	it was, 2742 and can you please explain why the special
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Dedicated bike lane.	12	exception, why that special exception was withdrawn and we,
13	THE WITNESS: it's on the road, but it's, it	13	and Costco filed a new special exception application?
14	has its own dedicated lane.	14	A It was to conform to the setback requirements of
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And Class 3?	15	the zone, new the zoning text amendment, which called for
16	THE WITNESS: They share it with the street, and	16	300-foot setbacks from certain types of uses.
17	there might be a sign up; like, for instance, I have seen	17	Q Thank you.
18	it, like, on New Hampshire Avenue, you know, you're just	18	MS. HARRIS: Just one moment. No other questions.
19	sharing the street, or on 16th Street.	19	MR. GROSSMAN: Any recross based solely on the
20	MR. GROSSMAN: So there's no separate lane or	20	questions asked on redirect? Ms. Rosenfeld?
21	anything. It's just	21	MS. ROSENFELD: Yes.
22	THE WITNESS: There's no separate lane. It just	22	RECROSS EXAMINATION
23	says you know, Georgia Avenue going down into Silver	23	BY MS. ROSENFELD:
24	Spring, it says, you know, bikes are allowed to share the	24	Q Mr. Gang, Ms. Harris asked about the prior special
25	full width of the travel lane.	25	exception, SE-2794, and you had prepared a supplemental land
	Page 139		Page 141
		_	
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so the particular one	1	use report referencing a nine-foot wide path. Do you recall that report?
2	that was indicated for the ring road was what class? THE WITNESS: Class 3.	2	that report?
3		2	A I do romombor the supplemental report. I do not
1		3	A I do remember the supplemental report. I do not
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	4	remember the pathway width.
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS:	4 5	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's
5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and	4 5 6	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory?
5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that	4 5 6 7	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes.
5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct?	4 5 6 7 8	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit
5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have
5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you.	4 5 7 8 9 10	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is
5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD:
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to ride, but as a Class 3 and being a bicyclist, it's a lot	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes, what's
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to ride, but as a Class 3 and being a bicyclist, it's a lot easier to ride on a street than on a sidewalk.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes, what's your objection?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to ride, but as a Class 3 and being a bicyclist, it's a lot easier to ride on a street than on a sidewalk. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Okay.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes, what's your objection? MS. HARRIS: It's beyond the scope of the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to ride, but as a Class 3 and being a bicyclist, it's a lot easier to ride on a street than on a sidewalk. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Okay. MS. HARRIS: Thank you.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes, what's your objection? MS. HARRIS: It's beyond the scope of the redirect.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MS. HARRIS: Q And, in fact, can you comment on the well, and that's based on the plan that's shown on page 67, is that correct? A Yes. Q Okay, thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: So do you make the assumption there that if there were a pedestrian path, that that would not be the bike path, that there would be a separate pedestrian path of, the proposed one is three feet wide, and then bikes would then not ride on that path, they would ride on the street with the cars and then the pedestrians would occupy the path? How do you THE WITNESS: I can't say where bikes are going to ride, but as a Class 3 and being a bicyclist, it's a lot easier to ride on a street than on a sidewalk. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Okay. MS. HARRIS: Thank you. BY MS. HARRIS:	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	remember the pathway width. Q I'd like to show you. Can you tell me if that's the report and does it refresh your memory? A It looks like it, yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Shall we mark that as an exhibit since it's not in the case, or do you have THE WITNESS: This is MS. ROSENFELD: I'm not going to use it as an exhibit. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: yeah, right. BY MS. ROSENFELD: Q Okay. And do you know why there is no nine-foot path proposed in the current project? MS. HARRIS: Objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes, what's your objection? MS. HARRIS: It's beyond the scope of the redirect. MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to give her a little

	Page 142		Page 144
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	1	gas station?
2	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	2	A Within the general vicinity of the filling
3	Q And Ms. Harris mentioned a specific pedestrian	3	station.
4	connection shown on page 61, Map 17, of the sector plan.	4	Q Now, how about if you were looking out the window
5	A Yes.	5	on the second floor of one of the homes, one of the
6	Q And I'm going to show you what had been marked in	6	residential homes would there, what would be the
7	Prior Special Exception Case SE-2794. Again, going to the	7	difference there?
8	specifics and I will ask that this be marked as an	8	A Sure. I would need to get Mr. Willard's plan
9	exhibit but can you take a look at the lower southwestern	9	because he has the elevations, as you, you know, as I
10	quadrant of that map? Do you see	10	mentioned during my original testimony, for, you know, the
11	MR. GROSSMAN: This will be, hold on, this will be	11	view out from the second floor. I
12	Exhibit find my exhibit list in this morass of paperwork	12	Q Well, when you said
13	here, hold on 171. And 171 is an aerial photo, 8 and a	13	A don't have that information in front of me.
14	half by 11, from prior application	14	Q Well, when you said 11 to 17 feet, you were
15	MS. ROSENFELD: It was	15	talking about the difference between the street and the
16	MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on S-2794.	16	residential areas and the, and the top of the hill?
17	(Exhibit No. 171 was marked	17	A No, the existing along the existing grade along
18	for identification.)	18	the common property line. From the ring road to the
19	MS. ROSENFELD: And it was Exhibit 37(e) from that	19	property line, abutting, you know, the Kensington Heights,
20	case.	20	you know, those residences abutting Kensington Heights.
21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Well, I'm not going to put	21	Q It's the property line. I understand it's the
22	the second exhibit number in because we'll just confuse the	22	property line, but the
23	issue. So, okay, so what's your question of him?	23	MR. GROSSMAN: It's ground level. Is that what
24	BY MS. ROSENFELD:	24	you're asking?
25	Q And looking at the southwestern corner of that	25	THE WITNESS: Ground level.
	Page 143		Dama 445
	age 143		Page 145
1	-	1	Page 145 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
1	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a	1	
	-		MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
2	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception	2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application?	2 3	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's
2 3 4	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do.	2 3 4	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes.
2 3 4 5	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it?	2 3 4 5	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. GROSSMAN: recross, rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: Recross.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: Recross. MR. GROSSMAN: based solely on the redirect?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls away from the mall. The mall is almost like the high point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. GROSSMAN: recross, rather MR. GROSSMAN: based solely on the redirect? MR. SILVERMAN: Based solely on the redirect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls away from the mall. The mall is almost like the high point. The adjoining properties are much lower, and as, even as you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: Recross. MR. GROSSMAN: based solely on the redirect? MR. SILVERMAN: Based solely on the redirect. BY MR. SILVERMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls away from the mall. The mall is almost like the high point. The adjoining properties are much lower, and as, even as you move further away from the mall, they even drop even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: Recross. MR. GROSSMAN: based solely on the redirect? MR. SILVERMAN: Based solely on the redirect. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q You indicated, Mr. Gang, that there's an 11- to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls away from the mall. The mall is almost like the high point. The adjoining properties are much lower, and as, even as you move further away from the mall, they even drop even further.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	exhibit, do you see anything that would indicate a pedestrian path connection as part of that special exception application? A Yes, I do. Q And how would you recognize it? A It's labeled Q And what does A as a four-foot wide pedestrian connection to neighborhood per the master plan. Q Okay, thank you. And there's no, just to clarify, there's no such connection proposed in the current application, is there? A That is correct. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I have no further questions. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Does the Coalition have any redirect MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: We do, just MR. SILVERMAN: Recross. MR. GROSSMAN: based solely on the redirect? MR. SILVERMAN: Based solely on the redirect. BY MR. SILVERMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q It's A Yes. Q ground level? Okay. Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Right. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q And when you testified that a natural buffer would be an effective screen, you were talking about an effective screen from ground level, is that correct? A No. The houses do fall off from even further down, you know, the hill, from both the adjoining, the southern and the eastern property line, and not only is there an effective hardwood buffer, there's even some evergreens along, you know, the common along the ring road where the guardrail is. Q When you say that the houses fall off, I assume they fall off from some point. You mean some houses are higher than other houses? A The whole topography the whole watershed falls away from the mall. The mall is almost like the high point. The adjoining properties are much lower, and as, even as you move further away from the mall, they even drop even

	Page 146		Page 148
1	are highest, is there a 11- to 17-foot buffer there, or do	1	THE WITNESS: Okay. Can I borrow the most recent
	you know?	2	one, please?
3	A If I had some plans in front of me, I could	3	MS. HARRIS: Yes.
4	probably answer that very specifically.	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that is.
5	Q Well, do you have the plans here?	5	MS. HARRIS: Was it Sheet No. 2?
6	A Yeah, I mean, there are plans here, and I'd be	6	THE WITNESS: This is Sheet 2 of 3, Revision
7	happy to answer that for you.	7	No. 7.
8	Q Want to take a look?	8	MS. HARRIS: Okay. So that is the most recent.
9	A I would love to.	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so
10	MR. BRANN: We don't have the full size of his	10	MR. GOECKE: It's Exhibit 152.
11	plans. You still can	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, 152 2? You said Sheet 2?
12	THE WITNESS: That's all right, whatever. I mean,	12	Sheet 2?
13	if I could	13	THE WITNESS: Sheet 2 of 3.
14	MR. BRANN: And this is probably	14	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that's (b), 152(b).
15	THE WITNESS: if I can answer it you know	15	THE WITNESS: This is not marked yet as an
16	what? There's no you don't have Mr. Willard's plans?	16	exhibit.
17	MR. BRANN: We don't have his full plans, no.	17	MR. GROSSMAN: No, but we have the exhibit here.
18	MS. HARRIS: Well, we have it somewhere.	18	THE WITNESS: May I write on this?
19	MR. GROSSMAN: What's the exhibit number? We can	19	MR. GROSSMAN: You may if you wish.
20	pull out the exhibit.	20	THE WITNESS: Okay, because I just
21	MS. HARRIS: The exhibit may be on the most	21	MR. GROSSMAN: 152(b).
22	revised	22	THE WITNESS: This way, if I'm
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Were they part of this fat pack of	23	MR. GROSSMAN: So if anybody else has cell phones,
24	11 by 17s in Exhibit 86(g)?	24	please have them turned off. Thank you.
25	MS. HARRIS: No. I think what, if I can	25	THE WITNESS: All right. Ready for my answer?
	Page 147		Page 149
1	-	1	
1	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there,	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but	1 2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the,
	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special
2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation,
2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one?	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot
2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date May 24, 2013.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a second floor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date May 24, 2013. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So that's page what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a second floor? A I think so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date May 24, 2013. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So that's page what page is that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a second floor? A I think so. Q Would it be seen from a first floor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date May 24, 2013. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So that's page what page is that? THE WITNESS: Two of three.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a second floor? A I think so. Q Would it be seen from a first floor? A I'm going to just clarify my answers. Again, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: I seem to remember them in there, but MS. HARRIS: Is this what you're looking for THE WITNESS: Let's, I mean, I could MS. HARRIS: the colored one? THE WITNESS: And if I could just spend two minutes evaluating. MS. HARRIS: This is MR. GROSSMAN: I thought you were referring to MS. HARRIS: Wait. Do you want that? THE WITNESS: I want to use this because this is very detailed MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: in reference to the grades. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So what exhibit are you looking at? THE WITNESS: This one is Special Exception Survey Plat/Existing Conditions, 2 of 3, but there is no exhibit number on here. This is from this is the revision date May 24, 2013. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So that's page what page is that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, we're ready. THE WITNESS: Okay. The existing street at the, along the flow line in the center of the designated special exception area for the filling station is 442; elevation, 442. It drops slightly one foot heading east and one foot heading westward. So at the westerly property line of the special exception area, it's around 442.7; as you head eastward, it's about 441. The eye level, according to Mr. Willard's plan, at the second floor for all three houses is at 440. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q So the difference between 440 and 441 is one foot. So would a person on the second floor see the gas station? A Yeah, you could look up, yeah. It's at the grade, so yes. If there was no vegetation per my exhibit, which I think I presented, it would be, you could potentially see it, if there was nothing there. Q And what about the trucks running through the ring road to fill up the gas station would that be seen from a second floor? A I think so. Q Would it be seen from a first floor?

	Page 150		Page 152
1	there. Again, I think I've testified to, when I go out	1	think we'll
2	there, I can't see anything during I'm sorry. You know,	2	A I was waiting for someone to invite me
3	generally, you know, during the six months when the	3	Q Right.
4	vegetation is out, it is a generally forested buffer. Can	4	A you know, during all of these exhibits we
5	you see through there? Yes, you know, you have to look	5	presented, but
6	through it. During the other six months, you do have	6	Q Right.
7	understory, you know, both the woods, et cetera; there are	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Anything else, Mr. Silverman?
8	some evergreens along the, you know, existing evergreens	8	MR. SILVERMAN: No. I think we'll have testimony
9	along the ring road. So I don't, I don't know for sure.	9	on what you can see and can't see, which I
10	Q Well, it would be	10	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Any recross from
11	A I don't know. All I'm saying is	11	Kensington View Civic Association?
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me ask you this question:	12	MS. DUCKETT: No.
13	Can you see, in the present existing condition, with the	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. Well, thank you.
14	present foresting, et cetera, can you see the rest of the	14	I think you've actually completed your testimony, Mr. Gang.
15	mall? Can you see Costco's warehouse? Can you see other	15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
16	features on the mall from	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you very much. And so I
17	THE WITNESS: Sure. Sure. If you were standing	17	guess we told them that we were going to be out of here at
18	I mean, I'm going to do the closest single-families along	18	1:00. Hopefully they'll come here and do whatever they have
19	Melvin Grove Court I was not able to see it, at least as	19	to do within the period of time of lunch, and we'll plan on
20	I recollect. You can see them for some of the townhouses	20	coming back here well, it's about seven minutes after
21	further east	21	1:00. So we'll come back here at 2 o'clock.
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	MR. GOECKE: Great.
23	THE WITNESS: you know, which are not, you	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Does that sound about right to
24	know, which are really not part of this viewshed, but you do	24	everybody?
25	see the Costco warehouse for the townhouses further to the	25	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.
	Page 151		Page 153
1	-	-	-
1	east.	1	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good.
2	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question	2	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with
2 3	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if	2 3	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan.
2 3 4	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the	2 3 4	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan.
2 3 4 5	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes?	2 3 4 5	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was
2 3 4 5 6	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it	2 3 4 5 6	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)
2 3 4 5 6 7	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Call your next witness,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Call your next witness, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Call your next witness, please. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Call your next witness, please. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your you know, the exact height.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to ask you some questions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your you know, the exact height. Q All right. Have you checked, have you gone up to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to ask you some questions about the environmental analysis you did for the Costco
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your you know, the exact height. Q All right. Have you checked, have you gone up to the second floor of any homes in Melvin Court to see what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to ask you some questions about the environmental analysis you did for the Costco proposed special exception, but first, would you please
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your you know, the exact height. Q All right. Have you checked, have you gone up to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Call your next witness, please. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to ask you some questions about the environmental analysis you did for the Costco proposed special exception, but first, would you please introduce yourself to Mr. Grossman and tell him where you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	east. MR. GROSSMAN: I guess the sense of my question is, would the gas station be, if erected as proposed and if there were no wall, would it be any more visible than the Costco warehouse to these homes? THE WITNESS: No, they would I mean, I think it would not. The Costco warehouse is higher, it's closer. The filling station is further back. Usually, you know, from a line of sight, when something is flat and further back and you're down low, you know, 17 or 18 feet MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: you know, if you're down a street level, you don't see it. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Silverman. MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. BY MR. SILVERMAN: Q Now, what's the height of the trucks that go by? A I mean, most trucks are in the 13 to 13-and-a-half-foot range. I don't know the answer to your you know, the exact height. Q All right. Have you checked, have you gone up to the second floor of any homes in Melvin Court to see what you could see?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. DUCKETT: Sounds good. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And we'll start out with MR. GOECKE: Mr. Sullivan. MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Sullivan. (Whereupon, at 1:07 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: We are back on the record. Are you ready for our next witness? MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Yes. MR. GOECKE: Our next witness is David Sullivan, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Mr. Sullivan, will you raise your right hand, please? (Witness sworn.) MR. GROSSMAN: You may proceed. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Sullivan, I'd like to ask you some questions about the environmental analysis you did for the Costco proposed special exception, but first, would you please

	Page 154		Page 156
1	president of Sullivan Environmental Consulting,	1	me was air quality modeling.
2	Incorporated. We're in our 26th year of operation in	2	Q The first one was dispersion modeling.
3	Alexandria, Virginia. Our practice is limited to air	3	A Yes. They're, they're, I consider them
4	quality-related issues, which includes meteorological data	4	synonymous
5	collection, air quality monitoring, air quality modeling	5	Q Okay.
6	analysis, noise, and odor. So that's the nature of our	6	A so the answer is yes.
7	practice. We work for a range of clients, including the	7	Q Okay. Have you been trained in doing noise
8	U.S. EPA, World Bank, environmental organizations, as well	8	analysis?
9	as state and federal agencies.	9	A Yes.
10	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	10	Q What about odor analysis?
11	BY MR. GOECKE:	11	A I have conducted a number of odor analysis, yes.
12	Q And going back to your education, where and when	12	Q Yes.
13	did you graduate from college and with what degree?	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he asked you if you were
14	A I was I had a B.S. degree in	14	trained in it.
15	meteorology/oceanography from New York University in 1972	15	THE WITNESS: Trained. I haven't gone I didn't
16	and a master's degree in meteorology from Penn State	16	study it in school, no
17	University in '74. After that time I became certified when	17	BY MR. GOECKE:
18	I was qualified to take the examination, certified by the	18	Q Yes.
19	American Meteorological Society as a certified consulting	19	A in that context.
20	meteorologist. I was awarded that in 1980. I have been	20	Q And in the course of your career as a
21	practicing as a certified meteorologist since that time. My	21	meteorologist, have you actually conducted noise analysis?
22	practice has another CCM as well, Dennis Hlinka, who has	22	A I have.
23	about the same number years of experience as I do, about	23	Q How many?
24	I have 38 years of experience in air quality. He has about	24	A Two or three.
25	the same.	25	Q Yes. And what about odor?
	Page 155		Page 157
1	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	1	A About the same number.
2	BY MR. GOECKE:	2	Q Yes. Have you ever testified as an expert before?
3	Q And you've been a certified meteorologist for 37	3	A Yes.
4	years, you said, or 38 years?	4	Q And where have you testified as an expert?
5	A I've been a, I've been my experience goes back	5	A I've testified as an expert about 20 times,
6	38 years	6	federal court, district court, and sometimes at hearings.
7	Q Yes.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: Expert in what?
8	A I've been certified for 33 years.	8	THE WITNESS: Expert in meteorology and
9	Q Okay. And when you become a certified	9	oceanography, I'm sorry, meteorology and air quality
10	meteorologist, how long is the certification good for?	10	analysis.
11	A It's lifetime. Well, it's lifetime. Of course,	11	BY MR. GOECKE:
12	there can be, it requires certain, upholding certain	12	Q Have you ever conducted air quality analysis to
13	standards. So there's a requirement for ethics, competency	13	assess levels of toxic air pollutants?
14	and, you know, good behavior. I mean, it is not, it's not	14	A Yes, I have.
15	you could have it revoked for not following those	15	Q And can you tell us a bit about your experience in
16	requirements.	16	that field?
17	Q And as a meteorologist, have you been trained in	17	A Back in the early '80s, I worked for EPA as a
18	air dispersion modeling?	18	contractor and that was a time when EPA was trying to
19	A Yes, I have.	19	determine how they were going to regulate toxic air
- 9		20	pollution. Toxic pollution are things other than
19 20	Q And have you actually employed those skills in the		
	Q And have you actually employed those skills in the course of your years as a meteorologist?	21	particulate matter, ozone, what they call, like, criteria
20		21 22	pollutants. And at that time, I worked for a company called
20 21	course of your years as a meteorologist?		
20 21 22	course of your years as a meteorologist? A Many times.	22	pollutants. And at that time, I worked for a company called
20 21 22 23	course of your years as a meteorologist? A Many times. Q Have you been trained in air quality modeling and	22 23	pollutants. And at that time, I worked for a company called Versar they're in Springfield, Virginia and I was the

	Page 158		Page 160
1	many of the early phases of what it ended up becoming	1	Q And can you give us some other, other examples
2	EPA's policies and procedures in air toxics, including two	2	that you can highlight that might be different from what
3	studies that are fairly well-known. One is the called the	3	you've already talked about?
4	six-month study or air toxics. The other is called the	4	A Well, one of the most publicized cases I've done
5	35-county study of air toxics. The first was national in	5	was after the Bhopal tragedy in India where many people died
6	scope, all counties in the United States. The second	6	because of methyl isocyanate poisoning. The administrator
7	focused on the most significant 35 counties. I served as	7	of EPA at the time was Lee Thomas, and Lee Thomas requested
8	principal investigator on both those, those projects and	8	that a special study be done in Charleston, West Virginia,
9	also worked for EPA on their urban-scale projects throughout	9	which had a heavy congregation of the chemical industry,
10	the United States, including Baltimore, Philadelphia,	10	including the process involved in India. And I worked in
11	Charleston, West Virginia, and other places. We would study	11	that particular valley for about three years, studying air
12	the entire metropolitan area, all the inventory sources of	12	toxic issues, identifying the dose to the people that lived
13	air toxics, all of the, what we call, area source, including	13	in those, in that valley in terms of both cancer-causing
14	gasoline marketing, mobile sources, dry cleaners, and things	14	chemicals as well as what's called non-cancer effects on
15	like that, and those studies were helpful to the EPA in developing their policies to address toxic air pollution.	15	acute and chronic exposures for toxic air pollution, and that study did identify some high pockets of high-risk
16 17	Q Have you ever done an air analysis that involved	16 17	areas, very high dose, that were voluntarily resolved by the
18	fine particulate matter?	18	industry due to that project. That project went through the
19	A I have.	19	EPA Science Advisory Board, was announced by the assistant
20	Q And tell us a bit about some of those studies.	20	administrator at a press conference when it was done, and
21	A Well, I mean, I've done, I've done a number of	21	was considered a successful project.
22	studies where we model particulate matter in various forms,	22	Q Thank you.
23	whether it be fine particulates, which are less than 2.5	23	MR. GOECKE: Mr. Grossman, at this time, I'd like
24	microns or less than 10 microns or less than 30, which is	24	to move for the admission of Mr. Sullivan as an expert
25	called total suspended particulates. In those studies, in	25	witness in the categories of meteorology, air quality
	D 150		
	Page 159		Page 161
1	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the	1	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis
1 2	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how	2	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second.
2 3	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by	2 3	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure.
2 3 4	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms	2 3 4	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say?
2 3 4 5	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models.	2 3 4 5	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling.
2 3 4 5 6	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience	2 3 4 5 6	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose	2 3 4 5 6 7	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: And?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: And? MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: And? MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: And? MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: And? MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment portion which does identify the dose that the person or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're offering him as an expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment portion which does identify the dose that the person or persons are exposed to. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're offering him as an expert in meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, noise and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment portion which does identify the dose that the person or persons are exposed to. Q And, again, this is something you've done over the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're offering him as an expert in meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis, determining potential exposure to toxic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment portion which does identify the dose that the person or persons are exposed to. Q And, again, this is something you've done over the course of your career? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're offering him as an expert in meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis, determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals, monitoring of air quality, which may be the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 terms of modeling, we will evaluate the emissions into the air, we'll identify the distribution of those particles, how heavy they are and various classes, and we'll remove them by gravitational settling and other, other removable mechanisms that are included in these dispersion models. Q Yes. As part of your analyses and your experience as a meteorologist, are you familiar with assessing the dose of a chemical or pollutant that might be exposed to a population? A Yes, I am. MR. GROSSMAN: What do you mean that might be exposed to a population? What's that mean? MR. GOECKE: Sure. Let me rephrase. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Do your analysis help determine the, or project what levels of exposure a population may have to a specific contaminate or chemical? A That typically is my role in a project, especially one that involves exposure as well as risk assessment. I will generally do what they call the exposure assessment portion which does identify the dose that the person or persons are exposed to. Q And, again, this is something you've done over the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on a second. MR. GOECKE: Sure. MR. GROSSMAN: Air quality modeling, did you say? MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GOECKE: Air quality modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: And analysis. MR. GOECKE: Noise and odor analysis, and determining potential exposures to a population of chemicals or contaminants. THE WITNESS: Could I also add that, you know, in terms of expertise, I also do have expertise in monitoring, involving air quality monitoring as well as meteorological monitoring. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat those last two? Monitoring of air quality? THE WITNESS: Air quality monitoring and meteorological monitoring. MR. GROSSMAN: So you're offering him as an expert in meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, noise and odor analysis, determining potential exposure to toxic

	Page 162		Page 164
1	fairly stated?	1	model. That's an example, and of course, we did noise
2	MR. GOECKE: I think it was just so	2	modeling for this study, as well as noise monitoring at the
3	meteorology, I agree with number one. I agree with number	3	Sterling facility.
4	two, air quality modeling and analysis, number two.	4	MS. ROSENFELD: And did you say you did or did not
5	MR. GROSSMAN: Right.	5	have training on noise issues?
6	MR. GOECKE: Number three I guess it's actually	6	THE WITNESS: Well, I haven't had formal training
7	3(a) and 3(b) noise, (a); and 3(b), odor analysis.	7	in noise issues, but I'm certainly qualified to use the
8	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	8	equipment that I've used. And my staff has conducted noise
9	MR. GOECKE: And then, four, determining exposure,	9	modeling on my behalf, and they have extensive training in
10	potential exposure.	10	modeling in general and had no difficulty in running the
11	MR. GROSSMAN: To toxic chemicals, I think you	11	noise models.
12	have.	12	MS. ROSENFELD: Is it your staff then who's been
13	MR. GOECKE: To toxic chemicals, and I think five	13	trained in noise modeling?
14	and six are redundant then.	14	THE WITNESS: We have not had formal training in
15	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Before I open this	15	noise modeling.
16	voir dire to further questioning, you mentioned that your	16	MR. GROSSMAN: We, meaning you?
17	certificate is good upon good behavior. With some	17	THE WITNESS: Myself included.
18	hesitation I ask, what constitutes bad behavior for a	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
19	meteorologist?	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. Have you ever testified as
20	THE WITNESS: Bad behavior would include dishonest	20	an expert on noise?
21	consulting practice, taking advantage of your clients	21	THE WITNESS: I have not.
22	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	22	MS. ROSENFELD: And with respect to odor, you
23	THE WITNESS: fraudulent work, things of that	23	mentioned three projects, one of which was at Sterling. Do
24 25	nature. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Questions from the	24 25	you have specific training in odor analysis? THE WITNESS: Well, much of odor analysis involves
25	WIR. GROSSWAN, AILIGHT. Questions from the	20	THE WITNESS. Well, much of odor analysis involves
	Dogo 162		Dama 405
	Page 163		Page 165
1	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the	1	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in
1 2	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for?	1 2	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is
	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or		modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor
2	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those	2	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting
2 3 4 5	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were?	2 3 4 5	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution.
2 3 4 5 6	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county	2 3 4 5 6	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples
2 3 4 5 6 7	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor	2 3 4 5 6 7	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you tell me what projects those were?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air quality.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you tell me what projects those were?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: Monitoring, okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: We worked on a project at a nearby computer facility that is part of the Internet system where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: Monitoring, okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorological monitoring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: We worked on a project at a nearby computer facility that is part of the Internet system where they have a number of chillers and so forth on their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: Monitoring, okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorological monitoring MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	opposition regarding this gentleman's credentials for the expertise that he has been offered for? MS. ROSENFELD: You mentioned you had done two or three studies on noise. Can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: I did a study in the county involving a trash-transfer facility and conducted an odor analysis for that particular study. We have done some odor analysis involving pesticide work; as part of our research activities on pesticide emission rates, have evaluated dilution ratios in that context. And, of course, the third example would be the project we did here at the Sterling gas station locally. MR. GROSSMAN: I might mention that Mr. Sullivan's résumé is included as Exhibit 17(f), F as in Frank, and he does include a list of areas in which he's testified as well as publications and presentations. MS. ROSENFELD: And on the issue of noise, can you tell me what projects those were? THE WITNESS: We worked on a project at a nearby computer facility that is part of the Internet system where they have a number of chillers and so forth on their rooftops and at ground level, and it was a study of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 modeling dilution ratios, and I have extensive training in doing dilution ratios. The other part of odor monitoring is collecting samples and sending the samples off to an odor laboratory, and I have extensive experience in conducting many research studies that involve sampling of pollution. MS. ROSENFELD: And so the analysis of the samples is done by a third party? THE WITNESS: Correct. It's done by a laboratory. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, I would accept Mr. Sullivan as an expert on the air quality modeling and analysis topics that were listed initially, and MR. GROSSMAN: Presumably, meteorology as well. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, those. I think there were about six different categories. MR. GROSSMAN: Determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals. MS. ROSENFELD: That's correct, monitoring of air quality. MR. GROSSMAN: Monitoring, okay. MS. ROSENFELD: Meteorological monitoring MR. GROSSMAN: Right. MS. ROSENFELD: and on odor, and we would

	Page 166		Page 168
1	MS. ROSENFELD: on the grounds of lack of	1	like for Mr. Sullivan to have a complete copy of his
2	training, lack of experience, and the fact that he's never	2	testimony so that in the future, should a portion of it be
3	testified as an expert on that subject before.	3	used for anything, we have the complete sample to
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Do we have any questions,	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Is Blue Lagoon agreeable to that?
5	voir dire questions, from the Stop Costco Gas Coalition on	5	MR. ESHAVE: I'd have to talk to my dad about
6	this person's expertise?	6	that.
7	MR. SILVERMAN: No.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: He'd have to talk to his dad about
8	MR. GROSSMAN: How about from Kensington View	8	it. So here's the thing: There is a rule, a Board of
9	Civic Association?	9	Appeals rule which specifies, unless it would be disruptive,
10	MS. DUCKETT: No.	10	it should be permitted.
11	MR. GROSSMAN: Anybody else?	11	MR. GOECKE: I understand.
12	(No audible response.)	12	MR. GROSSMAN: And so based on that, I, we
13	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. An expert doesn't have to be	13	generally try to follow the Board of Appeals rules, even
14	specifically certified or have testified as an expert	14	though we're an independent agency that is, Office of
15	before. It has to be somebody who can offer a level of	15	Zoning and Administrative Hearings when we're conducting
16	information beyond the ken of laymen which will be useful to	16	a Board of Appeals proceeding, and so we'll follow that
17	the finder of fact. And certainly in those areas in which	17	rule. And I would request that the request to get a copy of
18	Mr. Sullivan has been conceded by Kensington Heights Civic	18	Mr. Sullivan's video testimony be provided, but I'm not
19	Association to qualify as an expert, I would agree in	19	going to require it on penalty of not allowing them to video
20	meteorology, air quality modeling and analysis, odor	20	it because the rule provides for me to allow it unless it's
21	analysis, determining potential exposure to toxic chemicals,	21	disruptive.
22	and then monitoring of air quality and meteorological	22	MR. GOECKE: Understood. Thank you.
23	monitoring.	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
24	It's certainly a closer question on noise, but I'm	24	BY MR. GOECKE:
25	going to qualify him as an expert for that based on his	25	Q And, Mr. Sullivan, I understand that you've
	Page 167		Page 169
1	Page 167 experience in testing of it, and I will and the question	1	Page 169 prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today
1 2	-	1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the		prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions
2	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the	2	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of
2 3	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be	2 3	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing.
2 3 4 5 6	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence.	2 3 4 5 6	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get
2 3 4 5 6 7	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we	2 3 4 5 6 7	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay.	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean you want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean you want MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean you want MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean preclude them from not testifying.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the proposed green wall slash screen wall and intervening trees
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GROSSMAN: You mean you want MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean preclude them from not testifying. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, not testifying, recording,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the proposed green wall slash screen wall and intervening trees affect those homes. Can you talk about the volume of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean preclude them from not testifying. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, not testifying, recording, I'm sorry. I misspoke.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the proposed green wall slash screen wall and intervening trees affect those homes. Can you talk about the volume of gasoline that's anticipated to be sold at Costco and how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean preclude them from not testifying. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, not testifying, recording, I'm sorry. I misspoke. MR. GROSSMAN: Recording, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the proposed green wall slash screen wall and intervening trees affect those homes. Can you talk about the volume of gasoline that's anticipated to be sold at Costco and how that may affect, generally, the residential neighbors?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	experience in testing of it, and I will and the question of how much weight his testimony is to be given in that area I'll have to determine later based on the nature of the examination, the evidence he produces, and the cross-examination, but I'll leave that to the weight to be given to his evidence. MS. ROSENFELD: Okay. We just, for the record, we object to his acceptance on that point. MR. GROSSMAN: Your objection is certainly noted. Okay. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. And before we proceed, Mr. Grossman, I just would like to make one request to our friends from Blue Lagoon: If we could get a copy of Mr. Sullivan's testimony after they've finished with this segment? MR. GOECKE: My understanding is that we cannot preclude them from testifying here, and you've already ruled that because it's not disruptive MR. GROSSMAN: Preclude them from, you mean preclude them from not testifying. MR. GOECKE: I'm sorry, not testifying, recording, I'm sorry. I misspoke.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	prepared a PowerPoint presentation of your testimony today that is, can be found in the record at Exhibit 95(c), but before we get to that, I'd like to address a few questions to you that Mr. Grossman actually raised on the first day of our hearing. MR. GROSSMAN: You're going to make me wait to get to the hamburgers versus diesel trucks, aren't you? MR. GOECKE: Well, I am going to make you wait for that, yes. I have to MR. GROSSMAN: My area of great curiosity. All right. MR. GOECKE: I have to keep your interest. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Mr. Grossman listed 20 questions, some of which are legal questions, some of which are fact questions, some of which, I think, fall under your category of testimony. I think it would be helpful for everyone if you address those before we get into the details. Question 10(c) on his list says what is the impact of pumping 10 to 12 million gallons of gasoline to the neighboring homes and how does the proposed green wall slash screen wall and intervening trees affect those homes. Can you talk about the volume of gasoline that's anticipated to be sold at Costco and how

	Page 170		Page 172
1	gallons per year, and Costco believes it will be somewhat	1	emissions you would have It would be proportional if the
1	gallons per year, and Costco believes it will be somewhat less than that, but let's assume for the sake of discussion	1	emissions you would have. It would be proportional if the controls are the same
3	it's 12 million gallons per year. Our analysis, which was	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4	quite extensive, showed that there were not any violations	4	THE WITNESS: because the emission factors are
5	of any standards of any kind or risk thresholds associated	5	based upon throughput, how many gallons you're selling.
6	with that.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So your statement in the
7	Now, the question is, did we take into account the	7	paperwork was based on the fact that there are antipollution
8	trees in terms of our analysis. The answer is no, we did	8	devices included by Costco, including the Arid Permeator?
9	not. If we had, there would have been a small reduction in	9	THE WITNESS: There's the Arid Permeator. There's
10	concentration. Typically, the rule of thumb that I've seen	10	also the fact, maybe a little bit more difficult to
11	is, if you have a forested area, that will filter out some	11	quantify, but unlike many gas stations, Costco has a
12	of the particles. It'll filter, remove them from the plume	12	full-time attendant that's outside with people that are
13	of pollution, but it's not a large factor. It could be 10	13	pumping the gas. So if they have a small, a small spill,
14	or 15 percent, I've seen in the literature.	14	they can respond more quickly, which would tend to have, you
15	The wall itself under certain conditions could	15	know, a minor effect on further reducing emissions per
16	potentially deflect the flow, especially at potentially	16	gallon sold
17	at night, not very much in the daytime. Based upon the	17	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
18	study we have done of the meteorology at the mall, it	18	THE WITNESS: but primarily, it's the Arid
19	appears unlikely the wall is going to have much of an effect	19	Permeator that makes the biggest difference.
20	on deflection. So I think, basically, the wall is sort of a	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. But I do understand from you
21	neutral factor. The trees will reduce things slightly,	21	that the fact that you pump more gasoline, if you're not
22	maybe 10 or 15 percent. We assumed they didn't reduce	22	without referencing any other factors, would mean that you
23	things at all.	23	have a potential for higher pollution?
24	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I think the first part of my	24	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
25	question went to your statement in some document you filed	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. There were any number of
	Page 171		Page 173
	Page 171	_	Page 173
	that there was not a direct relationship between the	1	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your
2	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions	2	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and
2	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact	2 3	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering
2 3 4	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the	2 3 4	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area.
2 3 4 5	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well,	2 3 4 5	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped	2 3 4 5 6	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well,	2 3 4 5	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released.	2 3 4 5 6 7	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants released in a bare, without referencing any of the devices	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate it. I think that's what I was getting at in the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants released in a bare, without referencing any of the devices that are used, just a ratio of gasoline pumped to pollutants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate it. I think that's what I was getting at in the question. So go ahead and answer that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants released in a bare, without referencing any of the devices that are used, just a ratio of gasoline pumped to pollutants released.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate it. I think that's what I was getting at in the question. So go ahead and answer that. THE WITNESS: Well, obviously, it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants released in a bare, without referencing any of the devices that are used, just a ratio of gasoline pumped to pollutants released. THE WITNESS: If all else is equal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate it. I think that's what I was getting at in the question. So go ahead and answer that. THE WITNESS: Well, obviously, it would be patently unfair for an applicant for any air permit or any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that there was not a direct relationship between the quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of emissions impact on the community, and I think you cited to the fact that you had various environmental controls, including the Arid Permeator and so on. So my question went to, well, what is the relationship between quantity of gasoline pumped and the amount of pollutants that would be released. THE WITNESS: I have some slides in my presentation that do address that MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: and it shows on a relative basis, if it was \$12 million 12 million gallons obviously that didn't have the controls that Costco had, what would be the emissions from that compared to what you'd expect to have from Costco, if that addresses your question. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I guess what, I guess what I'm getting at, the first part of this question is whether or not the increase in volume yields an increase in volume pumped yields an increase in the amount of pollutants released in a bare, without referencing any of the devices that are used, just a ratio of gasoline pumped to pollutants released.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	other questions. I didn't want to interrupt your presentation, but I thought he went off on the forest and the trees, and I just wanted to make sure we were covering that area. MR. GOECKE: Thank you. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Question 11(a) was, is there a separate federal standard for ultrafine particles as distinguished from fine particles. A There is not. Q Okay. And then, if not, would it be arbitrary or at least unfair for Mr. Grossman to hold Costco to a standard based on the expert evidence presented by the opposition? MR. SILVERMAN: Objection. He's not really a judge of fairness. He's a judge of standards, is all. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, that's true in a sense, but I guess you could take my word on fair and say would that be an inappropriate way from an expert's standpoint to evaluate it. I think that's what I was getting at in the question. So go ahead and answer that. THE WITNESS: Well, obviously, it would be patently unfair for an applicant for any air permit or any permit that has an undefined standard. In other words, if

	Page 174		Page 176
1	if they're above or below the standard. If they're above	1	very small source.
2	the standard, they'll install more controls to get below the	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Even if they're continually idling
3	standard. That's how the air emission business works, but	3	while they're waiting?
4	if there's no standard, it would have to be arbitrary	4	THE WITNESS: Correct.
5	because there's no basis on a quantifiable benchmark for a	5	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
6	decision.	6	THE WITNESS: As of you know, we're talking
7	MR. SILVERMAN: I would just renew the objection.	7	about fleet mix in 2013. The EPA has made tremendous
8	First of all, there's no permit in this case. I don't quite understand the relevance.	8	advancements in tailpipe control technology, and the cars of today are so different than the cars that, you know, I
10	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, by permit, I think he means	10	learned to drive how many years ago and that needs to be
11	by a grant of an authority. In this case, the grant of	11	considered in making many, this queue has been discussed
12	authority would be a special exception, and the question	12	for two to three years now, and I've said this every time I
13		13	had an opportunity, that the emissions are very, very small.
14	MR. SILVERMAN: That's not what I understood, sir.	14	That statement still is true.
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, then did I misunderstand what	15	MR. GROSSMAN: And what about the deliveries to
16	you said?	16	the fuel tanks from the trucks?
17	THE WITNESS: No, I was no, you did not. I	17	THE WITNESS: They, of course, they do, they do
18	mean, I was referring to any decision made at the county,	18	add to some volatile organic emissions. We have quantified
19	state, or federal level on ultrafine particles, as an	19	all those emissions, the delivery of the gas trucks, the
20 21	example, that doesn't have a standard would, by definition, be arbitrary.	20 21	fueling, the minor spills, the more major spills, looked into the tailpipe exhaust, cars driving there, and the
21	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Let's move to something	22	comparison to the national standards shows they're well
23	else.	23	within the standards. And looking at risk assessment,
24	MR. GOECKE: Okay.	24	cancer risk assessment and compare it to any guidelines that
25	BY MR. GOECKE:	25	exist, it's low; it's at de minimis or lower levels. So
	Page 175		Dega 177
	Taye 173		Page 177
1	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually	1	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the
2	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended	2	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem.
2 3	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in	2 3	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the
2 3 4	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is	2 3 4	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health
2 3 4 5	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be	2 3 4 5	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem.
2 3 4 5 6	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer	2 3 4 5 6	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of	2 3 4 5 6 7	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was
2 3 4 5 6	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer	2 3 4 5 6	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those. The queuing the cars, you know, if we're talking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a health expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those. The queuing the cars, you know, if we're talking about the 1970s or '60s, that would be a big source.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a health expert MR. GROSSMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those. The queuing the cars, you know, if we're talking about the 1970s or '60s, that would be a big source. Queuing of cars in 2013 or 2014, when this station is built,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a health expert MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: and I can fully agree to that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q And then, finally, would the gas station actually be a very small part of the air quality problem as contended by Costco? And I believe what Mr. Grossman is asking, in contributing to the air pollution in the area generally, is the Costco contribution going to be MR. GROSSMAN: Right, and include in that answer not just the volume of gas being pumped but the impact of queuing vehicles and in this case that's part of the business model for Costco gas as we understand it, that they have queuing vehicles to, at the pumps and the fact that there will be a significant amount of time during the day that fuel tanks are pumping, I mean, fuel trucks are pumping gasoline into tanks, underground tanks. So that's the overall question. THE WITNESS: Well, the gas station operations, of course, will emit volatile organics that's associated with the gasoline pumping process and the delivery process as will, any gas station will do that. This gas station is larger than most; so it will have somewhat more of those. The queuing the cars, you know, if we're talking about the 1970s or '60s, that would be a big source. Queuing of cars in 2013 or 2014, when this station is built, is a very tiny source. It can be quantified, there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there is no, there's no basis in fact to conclude that the operation of this gas station will cause a health problem. MR. GROSSMAN: Will cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity? You said it won't cause a health problem. THE WITNESS: It won't cause a health problem in the immediate vicinity of the gas station, which was evaluated in great detail; and, frankly, will tend to reduce, to some extent, the regional emissions because MS. ROSENFELD: Objection. I don't believe that Mr. Sullivan was qualified as an expert on health. He was qualified for purposes of air quality and air emissions and air modeling MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MS. ROSENFELD: but not as an expert in what effect it would have on the health of individuals. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I should air quality is what I'm really talking about. THE WITNESS: Well, if I could clarify, I'm not a health expert MR. GROSSMAN: Right. THE WITNESS: and I can fully agree to that, but I don't have to be a health expert to determine that the

	Page 178		Page 180
1	doing risk assessment, I'm using EPA cancer potency scores	1	MS. ROSENFELD: Could he repeat that?
2	from their experts, but my modeling doesn't require	2	MR. SILVERMAN: Yes. He's
3	expertise	3	MR. GROSSMAN: His statement was you would not
4	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	4	find any regulator in the United States, given his findings
5	THE WITNESS: in health to make that	5	about fine particles of PM 2.5, that would find a problem
6	assessment.	6	with the volume of ultrafine particles likely to be admitted
7	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	7	here, emitted here. Is that
8	MR. GOECKE: Okay.	8	THE WITNESS: Correct.
9	BY MR. GOECKE:	9	MR. GROSSMAN: a fair summary of it? Can I ask
10	Q And, Mr. Sullivan, let's turn now to your	10	you to divorce that from what you think other people might
11	PowerPoint presentation, which, again	11	find and tell me what, in your expert opinion, you would be
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he didn't quite finish my	12	able to opine would be the likely level of ultrafine
13	question. So if you want to, since we're, since you have	13	particles emitted by this proposed gas station given your
14	started down that road a bit	14	findings about the likely level of PM 2.5 particles?
15	MR. GOECKE: Sure.	15	THE WITNESS: I can probably best answer it on a
16	MR. GROSSMAN: let's go back for a second to	16	relative basis rather than give you particle counts. The
17	what part the gas station plan would play in the, in the	17	issue is, if you were concerned about ultrafine particles in
18	overall pollution of the atmosphere in the area. That is,	18	the Wheaton area, your concern is more regional. It's a
19	assuming that this gas station were approved and operated	19	regional issue. A lot of the fine particles are created in
20	fully as it is proposed, is there a way to determine what	20	the atmosphere from the gases, a lot of it from mobile
21	proportion of air pollutants would be caused, let's call	21	source emissions that cook over time and transform into
22	them dangerous air pollutants, would be caused by this gas	22	particles. That study the literature clearly shows that
23	station versus the overall area level of pollutants?	23	that's a major factor that affects air pollution in any
24	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, we can, and our analysis	24	metropolitan area, including, including here, and the
25	did that assessment for each criteria pollutant. And what	25	contribution from Costco to that is clearly trivial.
	Dege 170		Dage 191
	Page 179		Page 181
1	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine	1	The other issue is, if you are concerned
1 2	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine	1 2	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas
2 3	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we	2 3	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed?
2 3 4	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model,	2 3 4	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from
2 3 4 5	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about	2 3 4 5	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you
2 3 4 5 6	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background	2 3 4 5 6	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have
2 3 4 5 6 7	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change,	2 3 4 5 6 7	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that could be higher than other areas based on this, this I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we can't compare our numbers, but I can say that if a facility	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we can't compare our numbers, but I can say that if a facility has a maximum impact for PM 2.5 or less or .01 micrograms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that could be higher than other areas based on this, this I don't know how you propose to proceed, but that was one of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we can't compare our numbers, but I can say that if a facility	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that could be higher than other areas based on this, this I don't know how you propose to proceed, but that was one of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we can't compare our numbers, but I can say that if a facility has a maximum impact for PM 2.5 or less or .01 micrograms per cubic meter, you would not find any regulator in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that could be higher than other areas based on this, this I don't know how you propose to proceed, but that was one of the MR. GOECKE: One of the questions that you had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we've discussed the most so far on this matter has been fine particulates. So if we use that as an example, fine particulate modeling of this facility shows, even if we scale up for the most recent mobile source emission model, the annual concentration at the maximum location is about .01 micrograms per cubic meter. The background concentration as of 2013 is approximately 10 and change, 10.8 micrograms per cubic meter; so it's approximately thousandths. So Costco's contribution at the most effective location is approximately one thousandths of the background. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what's been called in this case ultra I presume what you're talking about is PM sub 2.5? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: What about what has been characterized as ultrafine particulate matter did you do any analysis of that? THE WITNESS: We certainly looked into the literature on that topic. Where there's no standard, we can't compare our numbers, but I can say that if a facility has a maximum impact for PM 2.5 or less or .01 micrograms per cubic meter, you would not find any regulator in the United States at the state or federal level that would have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The other issue is, if you are concerned MR. GROSSMAN: By Costco, you mean the Costco gas station proposed? THE WITNESS: Correct, the incremental source from Costco gas station. The other issue to consider, if you want to put it in context, is that, as, as my reports have shown, that the indoor or, actually, my PowerPoints have shown the indoor contribution from ultrafine particles and from fast food restaurants is much higher than you typically see, even if you're near a freeway. Inside your home, if you're frying onions and frying chicken and using incense and burning candles and, heaven forbid, smoking, you're going to have a lot higher particle counts than you're going to get in the typical ambient air. MR. GROSSMAN: I don't want to jump too far ahead of what you planned, Mr. Goecke. Are you going to also address the assertion by the opposition about micro-areas of exposure, in other words, areas that they suggested that could be higher than other areas based on this, this I don't know how you propose to proceed, but that was one of the MR. GOECKE: One of the questions that you had addressed to us or to the other side?

	Page 182		Page 184
-		-	ů –
1	MR. GOECKE: Yes.	1	THE WITNESS: Volatile organic compounds.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: but it is a question that I want	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
3	to know if you're going to have this gentleman testifying	3	THE WITNESS: So the issue is, I agree that that
4	about.	4	concept is real, it's been reported, that that's true, but
5	MR. GOECKE: I don't think we have slides that	5	in the context of this application, it really doesn't have
6	specifically address that, but I think that we're we	6	any bearing.
7	probably could get to that.	7	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Also, there was an
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll leave that up to you	8	assertion made in some of the opposition papers that you
9	MR. GOECKE: Yes.	9	used the incorrect model; you used the model, the MOBILE6
10	MR. GROSSMAN: as you want to get into that.	10	model versus the MOVES simulator, M-O-V-E-S. I don't know
11	There was another point in my Question 13	11	if it's called the MOVES simulator or not.
12	THE WITNESS: Mr. Grossman, I could answer	12	THE WITNESS: Right.
13	that	13	MR. GROSSMAN: What about that allegation?
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay. Go ahead.	14	THE WITNESS: Well, that's false.
15	THE WITNESS: I could address it, if you want	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Why is that false?
16	me to, now	16	THE WITNESS: First of all, when we, when we did
17	MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead.	17	the, had our meeting about modeling, we agreed we'd look
18	BY MR. GOECKE:	18	into MOVES, if you recall, and during that time, we
19	Q Sure.	19	approached the Washington Council of Governments, who's the
20	A in some context. Q Please.	20	one that would have the requirements of what input should go
21		21	into a model like that, and we asked, we spent two weeks
22	A The concept of the personal cloud that was brought	22	trying to get those inputs. They weren't available. We
23	up by Dr. Dyson MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.	23	tried again in January, same response. We tried last week
24	THE WITNESS: I agree, that is, that happens.	24	and told the same thing: sometime this summer they'll get those guidelines out.
25	THE WITNESS Lagree, that is, that happens.	25	nose guidelines out.
	Page 183		Page 185
-	I mean that's been well established in literature. What	-	They we received one application as far. One
	I mean, that's been well established in literature. What	1	They've received one application so far. One
2	that means, if you're inside your home and you're walking around on your carpets and various surfaces and, as you move	2	organization has done a MOVES model in the Washington, D.C.,
3	through your environment, you're kicking up some dust as you	3	area. That's a total of one. I believe the one they're referring to is, the Sierra Club was questioning the HOT
5	walk around, you, of course, breathe that dust. So if we	5	lanes project over in Duke Street, Alexandria. And I spoke
	were to put a personal monitor on you, attached to your side	6	to the modeler that did that, and she told me that they ran
7	and up to your breathing level, you'd have a higher amount	7	it and they had used the defaults. And my experience
8	of particulate matter than a fixed monitor would receive.	8	I've probably done 20, 25 traffic studies in D.C we
9	But, first of all, there's no standard for air	9	always follow what the Washington Council of Governments
10	quality inside a home. There's no EPA standard for that; so	10	wants, they have used for fleet mix, options, and so forth.
11	you don't have any benchmark to compare it to. And, number	11	That's the standard, but it's not available. Furthermore
12	two, it was talked a long time about particulate loadings.	12	MR. GROSSMAN: What's not available?
13	The particulate loadings are really, really small. I mean,	13	THE WITNESS: The guidance on how to run the
14		14	model. You have a model that's very complex. There's no
1	we're talking about .01 at one house. The standard is	1	
15	we're talking about .01 at one house. The standard is the background is 10.	15	guidance available. There still is no guidance available of
	we're talking about .01 at one house. The standard is the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE:	15 16	guidance available. There still is no guidance available of how they want to see it run.
15 16 17	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE:		guidance available. There still is no guidance available of how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE:
16	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE:	16	how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE:
16 17	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean?	16 17	how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you,
16 17 18	 the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're 	16 17 18	how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE:
16 17 18 19	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere	16 17 18 19 20	how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means?
16 17 18 19 20	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere of particles are small from a gas station. I mean,	16 17 18 19	 how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means? A They used the Fairfax County default inputs to
16 17 18 19 20 21	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere of particles are small from a gas station. I mean, generally, you would not worry about particles from a gas	16 17 18 19 20 21	 how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means? A They used the Fairfax County default inputs to MOVES. That's, it's not clear at this point in time if
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere of particles are small from a gas station. I mean,	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means? A They used the Fairfax County default inputs to MOVES. That's, it's not clear at this point in time if those will be consistent with what will be run ultimately
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere of particles are small from a gas station. I mean, generally, you would not worry about particles from a gas station; you worry about the gas phase, the VOCs and so	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means? A They used the Fairfax County default inputs to MOVES. That's, it's not clear at this point in time if those will be consistent with what will be run ultimately when the guidance comes out at the Metro level, but they
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the background is 10. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And when you say particulate loading, what does that mean? A Well, we're talking about how much we're talking about the fact that the emissions to the atmosphere of particles are small from a gas station. I mean, generally, you would not worry about particles from a gas station; you worry about the gas phase, the VOCs and so forth.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	how they want to see it run. BY MR. GOECKE: Q So, Mr. Sullivan, if I could just interrupt you, you said the Sierra Club used the defaults. Can you explain what that means? A They used the Fairfax County default inputs to MOVES. That's, it's not clear at this point in time if those will be consistent with what will be run ultimately when the guidance comes out at the Metro level, but they

	Page 186		Page 188
1	2.5 right next to the HOT lanes of 395. They didn't see a	1	Standards, those are the benchmark?
	violation. Right next to the roadway, exactly in maybe, in	2	A Correct.
3	the breakdown lane, it may be above the standard. By the	3	Q And why are they the benchmark?
4	time you go to ambient air locations, the standards were	4	A Those, those are the national standards that apply
5	even in that setting, those cars were not hitting those PM	5	throughout the United States, including Maryland, designed
6	2.5 levels.	6	to be protective of public health, with a reasonable margin
7	So, clearly, we were not in a position to run	7	of safety, including for asthmatics and at-risk individuals.
8	MOVES. We wanted to run it, we tried very hard to run it,	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Now, when you say below, use the
9	but frankly, it's not being run now except that one case,	9	term below, I take it you mean are less than the toxic
10	and the transition didn't happen until March 2nd, 2013.	10	level?
11	Modeling was long done way before that time. I'll, in my,	11	THE WITNESS: Less than the threshold as defined
12	in my testimony, I'll describe the significance of it. We	12	by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, correct.
13	even our reports say, well, if we had used MOVES, based	13	MR. GROSSMAN: The thresholds being above the
14	on the literature, would have had some higher numbers, not	14	level it would be adverse; is that what you're saying?
15	much higher, but we can show it, you know, I can describe	15	THE WITNESS: Well
16	that in greater detail.	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let me put it differently.
17	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right. Just one	17	When you say below, it means you are, you're on the better
18	last question. I notice you have a club-like device on the	18	side of the breakdown rather than on the worse side?
19	counter there. That's not to control unruly hearing	19	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
20	examiners, is it?	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
21	THE WITNESS: No, sir. No, sir, but it would be	21	THE WITNESS: If the standard is 12 and you're at
22	effective for that. We'll talk about this later. This is a	22	10.8, you're in the speed limit
23	sonic anemometer.	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Right. Okay.
24	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	24	THE WITNESS: you're under the level.
25	BY MR. GOECKE:	25	MR. GROSSMAN: I just want to make sure the record
	Page 187		Page 189
1		1	-
1	Page 187 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes.	1	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were
1 2 3	Q And we'll get to that later, correct?A Yes.	1 2 3	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below?
2	Q And we'll get to that later, correct?	2	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were
2 3	Q And we'll get to that later, correct?A Yes.MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes
2 3 4	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. 	2 3 4	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. 	2 3 4 5	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying.
2 3 4 5 6	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. 	2 3 4 5 6	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: 	2 3 4 5 6 7	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below all EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards. That's the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Vou're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below all EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards. That's the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Those standards don't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below all EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards. That's the benchmark used to evaluate air quality projects. Are they above or below the standards? If you're below the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Those standards don't have applicability in the U.S., but I can discuss that further if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Vou're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below all EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards. That's the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Those standards don't have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q And we'll get to that later, correct? A Yes. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: Okay. MR. GOECKE: You're going to put me out a job. BY MR. GOECKE: Q All right. Let's move on to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Sullivan. A My PowerPoint basically summarizes the work we've done on this project. I can't say it covers every single thing we've done, but it certainly covers the, the high points of what the work that's gone into this since September of 2010. I'm going to start with the conclusions and then work my way backwards. Q Please do. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The most important point is, based upon standard EPA methods, air quality impacts are far below all EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards. That's the benchmark used to evaluate air quality projects. Are they above or below the standards? If you're below the standards, you're below the standards. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 was clear that you weren't saying it's worse than; you were saying it's better than, right, when you say below? THE WITNESS: Thank you. Yes MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: that's what I was saying. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: And I would want to say that let's just say for the sake of argument you're at 12.1 and the standard is 12. Does that mean individuals are at risk? The answer is, very unlikely that would be the case because the standards are built with a margin of safety. So if you walk onto an elevator, it may say no more than 2,000 pounds, but if you're at 2,001, that cable is not going to break, and the EPA has the same kind of a philosophy. They build in a margin of safety, which is required by the Clean Air Act. MR. GROSSMAN: Did you also compare to standards from the World Health Organization? THE WITNESS: We did not, but we certainly can. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: Those standards don't have applicability in the U.S., but I can discuss that further if you'd like.

	Page 190		Page 192
1	Health Organization's standards as well?	1	Noise is an issue. Noise can be measured, also
2	THE WITNESS: If you looked at trend lines for the	2	can be modeled. We measured noise levels at Sterling, at a
3	measured, measured particulate loadings, measured fine	3	very similar gas station, same basic design. We measured
4	particulates in this area and you project them on to, I was	4	background levels in the Kensington Heights neighborhood.
5	projecting to 2014 at this point, assuming the station were	5	They were, they were low. They were on the order of 53
6	to start in 2014, the projection shows it's substantially	6	decibels, not a high value, certainly below the county
7	below those standards, even with the impact from Costco	7	requirements.
8	added on.	8	And in terms of odors
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, before you move to that, on
10	BY MR. GOECKE:	10	the noise, you measured the decibels on an average or impact
11	Q And when we refer to the World Health	11	on sudden decibel levels?
12	Organization, Mr. Grossman called them standards. Are they	12	THE WITNESS: We did it on an average. There were
13	standards?	13	no impact issues at these sites to deal with. Those are
14	A They're guidelines.	14	A-weighted measurements.
15	Q And what's the difference?	15	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
16	A They have no rule of law. They're not applicable	16	THE WITNESS: In terms of odor, as I mentioned, we
17	anywhere in the world, actually. They're put out as	17	took, we took samples, sent it to St. Croix laboratory, an
18	benchmarks with the idea that the local jurisdictions would	18	odor laboratory. They had a panel review those samples from
19	use those for consideration and use their own, their own	19	both the neighborhood of Kensington Heights as well as the
20	judgments, judgments to determine what the optimal level	20	Sterling gas station samples we collected, and they were,
21	would be for their area. Some countries have much lower	21	they were both sets were fairly neutral; they were not in
22	numbers than the United States; some have higher. The	22	a particularly high range. And we also did some field
23	Soviet Union had, the Soviet Union had very restrictive air	23	measurements using what's called a field olfactometer, which
24	quality standards. They weren't enforced.	24	allows you to dilute the air to see how many dilutions you
25	So it's kind of what does the country want to do.	25	have to have until you can't smell any more in this case,
	Page 191		Page 193
1	Page 191 The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin	1	
1 2	-	1 2	° °
	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin		the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling,
2	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety.	2	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and
2 3	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be	2 3	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be
2 3 4	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO	2 3 4 5	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed,
2 3 4 5 6	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you have to report to the Air Resources Board and they may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping area, but if you applied that, reduced emissions by a factor of two, which is the same thing as a dilution factor of two, we couldn't smell anything and did it repeatedly. That was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you have to report to the Air Resources Board and they may require you to use additional controls. In this case, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping area, but if you applied that, reduced emissions by a factor of two, which is the same thing as a dilution factor of two, we couldn't smell anything and did it repeatedly. That was in the winter, that was that study. In the summer we did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you have to report to the Air Resources Board and they may require you to use additional controls. In this case, the highest, the most the highest risk was less than one in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping area, but if you applied that, reduced emissions by a factor of two, which is the same thing as a dilution factor of two, we couldn't smell anything and did it repeatedly. That was in the winter, that was that study. In the summer we did a study, and the furthest that we could detect the odors was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you have to report to the Air Resources Board and they may require you to use additional controls. In this case, the highest, the most the highest risk was less than one in a million and far below, below what we would be calling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping area, but if you applied that, reduced emissions by a factor of two, which is the same thing as a dilution factor of two, we couldn't smell anything and did it repeatedly. That was in the winter, that was that study. In the summer we did a study, and the furthest that we could detect the odors was 73 feet. That was also and Sterling did not have an Arid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The U.S. tries to set reasonable numbers that have a margin of safety. The level is set ultimately by the administrator of EPA. It's their judgment of what's, what needs to be protective and the adequate margin of safety. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q To your knowledge, did the EPA consider the WHO guidelines in formulating the National Air Ambient Quality Standards? A They did. They did, among many other things Q Sure. A they did a very exhaustive review of the literature. We looked at risk, and risk doesn't have a standard in the sense of a national ambient standard cancer risk. There is no such threshold. So the only jurisdiction that really has guidelines that I'm aware of in the U.S. is California. They have guidelines to deal with cancer risk assessment. Their reporting level is 10 in a million. So if your incremental risk is 10 in a million or more, you have to report to the Air Resources Board and they may require you to use additional controls. In this case, the highest, the most the highest risk was less than one in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the gas fumes. And we conducted that analysis in Sterling, and where they did not even have an Arid Permeator and based upon that analysis, we, I expect that it would be fairly rare there would be detectable odors beyond the ring road. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Would the green screen wall that's been proposed, would that affect the traveled odor at all? A I would say no, not significantly. Q No. What about the wooded terrain in between the ring road and the residential neighborhood? A Like I mentioned before, it could produce a small amount of additional dilution, maybe 10 or 15 percent, not on a big factor. But the big factor is, the Arid Permeator approximately reduces the emissions of odoriferous chemicals by about a factor of two. So when we were at the Sterling station, we were at about 320 feet. That's the furthest. We could smell odor at one point 320 feet from the pumping area, but if you applied that, reduced emissions by a factor of two, which is the same thing as a dilution factor of two, we couldn't smell anything and did it repeatedly. That was in the winter, that was that study. In the summer we did a study, and the furthest that we could detect the odors was

	Page 194		Page 196
1	So putting that together, I won't say odors will	1	standards, what are we going to do? We have to come up with
2	never happen past the ring road, but I'm saying it's going	2	control methods that will reduce those emissions so it is
3	to be it'll be rare and, as time goes on, even less of a	3	acceptable, but if we don't know what the standard is, how
4	chance because, as the fleet turns over and more and more		can we approach that problem?
5	cars have on-board canisters, the canisters reduce the	5	So if the position is, well, EPA standards aren't
6	amount of gases released when you fill up the car, and it's	6	acceptable enough, well, what's Costco supposed to do? What
7	in about probably three or four years, most of the cars	7	are they supposed to look at for guidance to try to further
8	will have that on there, and the emissions of odor as well	8	reduce their emissions? There's nothing they can do. So
9	as other risk-causing chemicals will further drop by fairly	9	decisions that are made absent any kind of objective
10	a large percentage, and it's going to go down steadily over	10	standards, as I mentioned earlier, would seem to me to be
11	time.	11	arbitrary. It could be different from one application to
12	Q And when you say the fleet, you mean the cars that	12	another because there's no standard or objective benchmark
13	are on the road right now?	13	to compare the numbers to.
14	A Correct.	14	To be clear, modeling estimates the expected
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Mr. Goecke, I'm curious. I thought	15	concentration after the facility is built, and the real
16	that all Costco gas stations had Arid Permeators. That was	16	question is, is that acceptable or not. It's a quantifiable
17	my understanding, this is a model that it's always used in.	17	number. What are you going to compare it to? It would be
18	I'm understanding from this witness that the Sterling	18	like a policeman pulling you over and, you know, you say I'm
19	station, which is a large station, if I understand	19	following the standard, why did you pull me over; he says,
20	correctly	20	well, I think it's, I think the speed limit is too high, I
21	MR. GOECKE: Yes.	21	think it should be 20, not 25 miles an hour. Well, that's
22	MR. GROSSMAN: has no Arid Permeator. How is	22	arbitrary. That's not going to stand up in court. Well,
23	that?	23	it's the same thing here. If Costco is meeting the
24	MR. GOECKE: That's a good question, and Mr. Brann	24	standards and the position is, well, those aren't protective
25	has just stepped out. I think I need to consult with him	25	enough, I don't see any way to objectively go through the
	Page 195		Page 197
1	Page 195 before I can respond.	1	Page 197 process.
1 2	-	1	
	before I can respond.		process.
2	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question.	2	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming.	2 3	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to
2 3 4	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well	2 3 4	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions.
2 3 4 5 6	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you.	2 3 4 5	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my
2 3 4 5 6	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people	2 3 4 5 6	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my
2 3 4 5 6 7	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned	2 3 4 5 6 7	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use decisions, in my judgment, need to be based upon objective	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of the stations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use decisions, in my judgment, need to be based upon objective facts and standards. I can't hit a target I can't see. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of the stations MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use decisions, in my judgment, need to be based upon objective facts and standards. I can't hit a target I can't see. And when I work for industry which I do, I work for industry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of the stations MR. GOECKE: that were built before. So that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use decisions, in my judgment, need to be based upon objective facts and standards. I can't hit a target I can't see. And when I work for industry which I do, I work for industry as well as environmental groups we're working for a, like	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of the stations MR. GOECKE: that were built before. So that's why Sterling does not have it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	before I can respond. MR. GROSSMAN: He ran in advance of my question. MR. GOECKE: He saw you coming. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Well MR. GOECKE: Thank you. THE WITNESS: The top point, I think that it's been very clear from the record that what has been happening over the last couple of years, obviously there are people who do not support this gas station. They are concerned about the health effects of it. You know, we respect their opinion, we've met with them, but the reality is that, as I read the record and you can disagree if you like the opposition is taking a position that the EPA's air quality standards are not sufficiently protective, at least in this case, in their judgment. My, my point is that, well, first of all, they are. EPA makes decisions to protect the country. They don't delineate different regions. You're trying to have air quality that's safe nationally. If it's safe nationally, it's safe in Montgomery County as well. But as I mentioned earlier, regulatory in land use decisions, in my judgment, need to be based upon objective facts and standards. I can't hit a target I can't see. And when I work for industry which I do, I work for industry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	process. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: I'd like to raise an objection to the legal opinions. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. It's a question he's raising the same question I have raised earlier in my questions: If we don't have a government standard to apply, how do I establish the appropriate standard in fairness to all the parties? So he's just raising the same question I've raised, but I agree with you, it's not really his bailiwick to determine what the land use standards are. MR. GOECKE: And before we go on, Mr. Grossman, I do have an answer to your question. Thanks for your patience. MR. GOECKE: So the Arid Permeator is a relatively recent invention. It's only been around for about a year and a half. Sterling has been around for many, many years. Every Costco station going forward will have the Arid Permeator, but they're not necessarily retrofitting all of the stations MR. GOECKE: that were built before. So that's

	Page 198		Page 200
1	THE WITNESS: We're evaluating the impacts for	1	place, it's definitely not unprecedented.
2	Costco in 2013 that's what our most recent report did	2	Q And so, Mr. Sullivan, we're on Slide 8 now, and I
3	which is when we projected the station would be opening.	3	just want to point out in your chart, the green line that
4	Maybe it's going to be then, maybe it's going to be 2014,	4	shows the proposed Wheaton Costco station, it continues to
5	but the issue is that those impacts that we modeled in terms	5	decrease after it begins, so that by the year 2020, which is
6	of air quality were low. The point I want to make here is,	6	the last year on your chart, the gap between a
7	as time goes forward and the fleet continues to turn over,	7	1-and-a-half-million-gallon station and the Costco proposed
8	with newer cars going on the road and older cars going off	8	station continues to narrow. Why do you have that there and
9	the road, that evaporative losses will continue to go down	9	how can you be so sure about that?
10	as well as tailpipe controls such that, projecting to the	10	A Well, the requirements are that the canisters have
11	future, the impacts will be less, substantially less.	11	to go on the cars, for example, and the nozzles are being,
12	And the last point on this slide is Costco	12	are improving when they deliver the gasoline.
13	Wheaton, it is a large gas station. There's no question	13	Q And when you say the canisters, you mean?
14	about that. It's large in terms of sales, but in terms of	14	A On-board canisters. There's on-board charcoal
15	emissions I'm going to show some trend lines here it's	15	canisters on the cars starting, I believe it was 2006/2007
16	not an unprecedented gas station. Gas stations producing	16	or so time frame, and that as those cars come on the market,
17	the emissions that Costco is producing have been around for	17	the emissions from gasoline marketing will continue to drop.
18	many, many years.	18	There'll be a certain time, of course, when it may level,
19	This slide is showing comparisons, and let me get	19	will level off, I assume, but we're still in a downward
20	my pointer. We're looking from 1970 out to 2020.	20	curve and will be for some time.
21	BY MR. GOECKE:	21	Q Thank you.
22	Q And this is Slide 6.	22	A This is just doing a comparison where on the left
23	A Slide 6. Slide numbers are shown on top. And the	23	I'm showing, this is showing a 1-and-a-half-million-gallon-
24	first, I'm looking at a 1-and-a-half-million-gallon-a-year	24	per-year gas station in terms of gasoline sold, and here's
25	station in gray, in brown I'm looking at a	25	12 million. So it's certainly, in terms of sales, it's a
	Page 199		Page 201
1	3-million-gallon-per-year gas station, and the green is	1	5 5 , , , , 5
2	Costco, and I'm just projecting from 2013. I'm showing that	2	But if we compare your typical gas station to, well, where
3	going forward to 2020. This slide, the assumptions are	3	would we be in terms of emissions, well, if I had a
4	defined and we're describing how controls have changed over	4	5 5 5
5	time. If you go, and if you go back, even on a	5	5 5
6	1-and-a-half million dollar, 1-and-a-half-million-gallon gas	6	your typical gas station. But with Wheaton, with the Arid
7	station, back in the mid, early 1990s, you would have	.7	Permeator, it's approximately five times larger in 2013, and
8	similar emissions as Costco would have when it opens now.	8	if I extend it to 2025 compared to today's, it will be on
9	If you go to a 3-million-gallon-per-year gas station, that	9	the order of two, two-and-a-half times larger. That's
10	goes back to, let's say, the early, the early 2000 time	10	really just for perspective.
11	frame, and back in time, emissions were a lot higher than they are today. And to further make that point, when I say	11 12	And in terms of the trends in air quality, I mean, this is I give a lot of credit to EPA. If you look at
12 13	it's not unprecedented, this is showing when Costco opens.	13	each of these criteria pollutants and look at the trends
14	This is assuming 2013, but you can see if you go across	14	from 1980 to 2010, 1990 to 2010, and 2000 to 2010, you see a
15	you know, the late, maybe the mid to late 1980s, the	15	tremendous percent reduction in emissions. A lot of this is
16	1-and-a-half-million-gallon gas station; around the	16	due to tailpipe controls on the cars, plus other steps the
17	mid-1990s, mid to late 1990s for the 3-million that,	17	EPA has taken to remove lead and various other initiatives
18	yeah, it's a big gas station, but compared to the trend	18	going on, but our air quality is improving for all of these
19	lines, where things have been and where things are going,	19	different pollutants.
20	it's not so large. And this is projecting to 2020, and as	20	Q And where did you get this data from?
21	you can see, with that projection, if I go back, now it's	21	A That was from the EPA Web page
22	more like the 2005 or so for the 3-million gas station and	22	Q Yes.
	late 1990s for the 1-and-a-half. So my point again is, it's	23	A air trends. Now to discuss methods and results
1	not unpresedented use it's a large station but if you	~ 4	of what was done for this analysis, in terms of an even iow

24 not unprecedented; yes, it's a large station, but if you

25 consider the controls that are in place and will be in

24 of what was done for this analysis, in terms of an overview,

25 as I mentioned before, all air quality impacts are within

applicable national and state standards and guidelines, and	1	Q And that meeting in September of 2012, that was a
	_	
these are the chemicals that were evaluated: fine	2	face-to-face meeting?
particulates, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and	3	A It was a face-to-face meeting. It involved
volatile organic compounds.	4	Dr. Cole, CCM Dennis Hlinka, myself, Erich Brann, Howard
Q Why did you analyze those particular chemicals?	5	Nussbaum, and Mr. Silverman.
A The first three have National Ambient Air Quality	6	MR. GROSSMAN: Is that Dr. Cole at counsel table?
Standards that we could have compared it to, and VOCs were	7	MR. SILVERMAN: This is Dr. Henry Cole, sir.
done to support a risk assessment for cancer effects.	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Hello, Dr. Cole.
Q Are these contaminants known to be associated with	9	MR. COLE: Hello.
gas stations?	10	THE WITNESS: Now, I, I certainly had hoped that
A They are. I mean, particulate matters, as I	11	we would come to this proceeding with consensus on how to
mentioned, is not particularly a trademark pollutant of gas	12	determine the concentrations, and my feeling was and I
stations, not usually the primary focus, like it has been	13	had made this statement at the County Council if we could
here. Volatile organic carbon compounds are generally	14	do that, the process would be much easier for the finder of
what's emphasized at gas stations in review. So it's an air	15	fact in this case, Mr. Grossman.
quality analysis, and also, odor and noise impacts were	16	We don't have full consensus in terms of the
evaluated.	17	meaning of the results. I'll let Dr. Cole speak for himself
Q Are there any other contaminants or toxics	18	in terms of how he ran the model, but I will say that we are
associated with gas stations that you did not analyze?	19	at the point now where the Hearing $\ensuremath{Examiner}$ can just look at
A Well, we certainly didn't analyze all of the	20	the results and say I concur with the standards, now I see
particulate species that are emitted or all of the organic	21	you have consensus. We don't have consensus. We tried, and
chemicals that are emitted from, from gas station	22	I could describe the process at some point, but we didn't
operations. In terms of risk, we evaluated all of the	23	quite get there. I think we all made an honest effort to do
volatile organic compounds that had quantifiable	24	so. We don't have consensus. And I guess I should say that
EPA-approved cancer potency scores as contained in the EPA	25	I've done this sort of a project, this is my fourth or fifth
		Page 205
-		
		one of these in the last 10 years, and each of the other
		times I worked as a consultant to the community. And in
		that context, the first step that I, that I would do every
-		time was to meet with their consultants and their management and to see if we could have an agreement on three points.
		If we could agree on these three points
		MS. ROSENFELD: Objection, Mr. Grossman. I truly
		don't see the relevance of this to the standards or the
		modeling or today's proceeding.
		MR. GROSSMAN: All right. I would tend to agree.
		I guess what he's trying to say is how he ordinarily reaches
	12	consensus, and it's
-	13	MS. ROSENFELD: Which hasn't occurred here. So I
	14	really don't see the relevance.
understand that and we can discuss in a few minutes where we	15	MR. GROSSMAN: I'll let him testify as to it for
diverged, but in terms of how to model Costco sources,	16	whatever weight it's worth.
whether it be the queuing, the gasoline marketing and so	17	THE WITNESS: Well, I think it might be helpful in
forth, we met, discussed different ways to proceed. My	18	the context that the way the process generally works is the
opinion is we had consensus on those aspects.	19	consultants get together and they agree, number one, we'll
Interpretations do differ, there's no question,	20	follow EPA standard methods EPA has a guideline of how to
and you'll hear, you'll hear some conflicting testimony, I	21	run the models Point No. 2, got to meet, you have to meet
expect, but the basis for identifying the concentrations	22	the national standards; Point No. 3, both sides live with
produced from the gas station operations is based upon	23	the results. We didn't achieve that, and I think in
	1	
running the EPA AERMOD dispersion model in a manner that	24	fairness, I don't think that the opposition fully agreed
	Q Why did you analyze those particular chemicals? A The first three have National Ambient Air Quality Standards that we could have compared it to, and VOCs were done to support a risk assessment for cancer effects. Q Are these contaminants known to be associated with gas stations? A They are. I mean, particulate matters, as I mentioned, is not particularly a trademark pollutant of gas stations, not usually the primary focus, like it has been here. Volatile organic carbon compounds are generally what's emphasized at gas stations in review. So it's an air quality analysis, and also, odor and noise impacts were evaluated. Q Are there any other contaminants or toxics associated with gas stations that you did not analyze? A Well, we certainly didn't analyze all of the particulate species that are emitted or all of the organic chemicals that are emitted from, from gas station operations. In terms of risk, we evaluated all of the volatile organic compounds that had quantifiable EPA-approved cancer potency scores as contained in the EPA Page 203 IRIS, I-R-I-S, database, those four of them. Those were all considered in here. So in terms of how we got to we are right now, we conducted our first environmental report I believe this was the first in July of 2012. Between that point in time and September, Kensington Heights hired a consultant, Dr. Henry Cole; that, you know, he and I have met and worked together to some capacity on a protocol. And Dr. Cole, Dennis Hlinka from my staff, and myself collaborated on a protocol to model the Costco operations. I want to say that the final report shows the modeling of Costco sources based upon that consensus approach. I'm not going to put words in Dr. Cole's mouth. He doesn't agree with everything that's in the analysis. I understand that and we can discuss in a few minutes where we diverged, but in terms of how to model Costco sources, whether it be the queuing, the gasoline marketing and so forth, we met, discussed different ways to proceed. My opinion is we had consensus o	Q Why did you analyze those particular chemicals? 5 A The first three have National Ambient Air Quality 6 Standards that we could have compared it to, and VOCs were done to support a risk assessment for cancer effects. 8 Q Are these contaminants known to be associated with gas stations? 10 A They are. I mean, particulate matters, as I 11 mentioned, is not particularly a trademark pollutant of gas stations, not usually the primary focus, like it has been here. Volatile organic carbon compounds are generally 14 what's emphasized at gas stations in review. So it's an air quality analysis, and also, odor and noise impacts were evaluated. 17 Q Are there any other contaminants or toxics 18 associated with gas stations that you did not analyze? 19 A Well, we certainly didn't analyze all of the particulate species that are emitted from from gas station operations. In terms of risk, we evaluated all of the volatile organic compounds that had quantifiable 22 Page 203 IRIS, I-R-I-S, database, those four of them. Those were all tonsidered in here. 1 So in terms of how we got to we are right now, we conducted our first environmental report1 believe this was the first in July of 2012. Between that point in time and September, Kensington Heights hired a consultant, for Henry Cole; that, you know, he and I have met and worked together to some capacity on a pr

1come out during discussion and nor did they agree to the1that measured out?2EPA methodology, and we can discuss that further. Dr. Cole2THE WITNESS: Well, what the3had a number of things he wanted the, Costco to do that are3if you looked at each loading dock and4very non-standard, and you know, so we could not get there.4trucks that go to the mall, looked at each	
2EPA methodology, and we can discuss that further. Dr. Cole2THE WITNESS: Well, what the3had a number of things he wanted the, Costco to do that are3if you looked at each loading dock and4very non-standard, and you know, so we could not get there.4trucks that go to the mall, looked at all	
 3 had a number of things he wanted the, Costco to do that are 4 very non-standard, and you know, so we could not get there. 3 if you looked at each loading dock and trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall, looked at all trucks that go to the mall trucks that go to the	v're referrina to is
4 very non-standard, and you know, so we could not get there. 4 trucks that go to the mall, looked at al	
	-
5 Everyone went in good faith, but we didn't quite make it. 5 exhausts and evaluate those, too, and	then what about the
6 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. 6 gas stations that are not too far away	and the fast food
7 BY MR. GOECKE: 7 restaurants on the other side of the st	reet. There's no
8 Q Slide 15. 8 defined ending to that kind of an appr	oach, and in fact, in
9 A On Slide 15, one of the areas we differed in quite 9 the end we did model all the loading d	ocks. And ultimately
10a bit was the interpretation of fine particulates. Our10I can describe, but a factor I think was	s missed during the
11 position is, even applying a scale up to the MOVES model, 11 review is that we built in tremendous em	
12 the modeling of Costco's particulate emissions is 30 times 12 that overstated the impacts from the ma	all anyway, and I can
13 lower, 30 times lower than what EPA defines as 13 describe that in detail.	
14 insignificant. EPA defines significance for incremental 14 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	
15 emissions. It's .3 on an annual basis. Costco is at .01. 15 THE WITNESS: The way we m	
16 So my position is, if you're 30 times less in significance, 17 it's clear you don't have a problem. Dr. Colo will testify	•
 17 it's clear you don't have a problem. Dr. Cole will testify 17 clean diesels, and other factors. So, 18 about ultrafine particulates. He doesn't agree. I respect 18 that, respect the right for the opposition 	•
 18 about ultrafine particulates. He doesn't agree. I respect 19 his opinion, but I don't agree with it. 19 interpretation of this, use their own ba 	
20 Secondly, this is the other major point we didn't 20 own interpretation of fine particulates.	
21 agree upon, was how to treat background. When you do 21 the modeling was based upon a consensu	
 22 dispersion modeling, you're modeling certain sources. 22 model Costco, and we did our very be 	
23 You're not modeling an entire county. You're not modeling 23 suggestions in for Costco. And we'll g	
24 Northern Virginia and D.C. and so forth. The normal 24 Now, this is still related to the m	
25 procedure that EPA follows is you model your facility and 25 in terms of trying to achieve consensu	-
Page 207	Page 209
1 you add to that a conservative representation of all other 1 describe here the changes that we mad	e and the agreements
2 sources. They have a procedure to do that. Using available 2 that we made to do additional analysis	based upon meeting
3 regional-measured data, you add the highest values on to 3 with Dr. Cole. First, Dr. Cole had the	
4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 4 use minute-resolved meteorological d	ata rather than
4what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure.4use minute-resolved meteorological d5QSo let's be clear about that. You say you use the5hourly-resolved data. We thought that we	ata rather than vas a good idea. We
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 4 use minute-resolved meteorological d 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that we found that. It didn't make a 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 4 use minute-resolved meteorological d 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that w 6 agreed. We did that. It didn't make a 7 results but that was a good suggestion 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n.
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 4 use minute-resolved meteorological d 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion 8 The second suggestion, Dr. Comparison of the region. So let's say 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 4 use minute-resolved meteorological descent to the region and the region. 8 a Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 4 use minute-resolved meteorological descent to the region and the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 4 use minute-resolved meteorological descent to the test of hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 4 use minute-resolved meteorological descent to the test of hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the approximation of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the approximation of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generative data for the region. 10 towards Kensington Heights, and the approximative data for the region. 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 4 use minute-resolved meteorological double that was a good suggestion. 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion. 6 agreed. We did that. It didn't make a results but that was a good suggestion. 8 D The second suggestion. 9 about the issue of the hill behind the grant the agreed. 10 towards Kensington Heights, and the agreed. 11 Turn a model that could do terrain analyse. 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 4 use minute-resolved meteorological de hourly-resolved data. We thought that we hought that we houg	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 4 use minute-resolved meteorological do hourly-resolved data. We thought that we agreed. We did that. It didn't make a results but that was a good suggestion 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 about the issue of the hill behind the generation that 10 towards Kensington Heights, and the agrits a higher level model than AERMOD to the source of the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 4 use minute-resolved meteorological double that was a good suggestion. 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion. 6 agreed. We did that. It didn't make a results but that was a good suggestion. 8 The second suggestion, Dr. Co 9 about the issue of the hill behind the grant the issue of the hill behind the grant analys. 12 it's a higher level model than AERMOD to the issue of the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 4 use minute-resolved meteorological double. 4 use minute-resolved meteorological double. 6 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion. 8 The second suggestion, Dr. Co 9 about the issue of the hill behind the grant the issue of the hill behind t	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 15 and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA 4 use minute-resolved meteorological does the standard procedure. 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion. 6 agreed. We did that. It didn't make a results but that was a good suggestion. 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 9 about the issue of the hill behind the graph of the second suggestion. 10 towards Kensington Heights, and the agraph of the second suggestion. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 it's a higher level model than AERMOD to the second securately will tend to go, much more accurately that particular model as requested. 14 will tend to go, much more accurately that particular model as requested. 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally felds, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD.
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 15 and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA 16 standard guideline approach. 4 use minute-resolved meteorological double that was a good suggestion. 5 hourly-resolved data. We thought that was a good suggestion. 6 agreed. We did that. It didn't make a results but that was a good suggestion. 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 it's a higher level model than AERMOD to the securate of the s	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally felds, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD.
 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the highest average background concentrations from a particular county or particular what's the region? A Representative data for the region. So let's say it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard Q Right. A you would look at the last three years of data, and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that occurred in any one of those locations over the three years and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA standard guideline approach. Dr. Cole requested we more broadly model the mall sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the local gas stations to get a more direct indication of their 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally fields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results,
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 15 and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA 16 standard guideline approach. 17 Dr. Cole requested we more broadly model the mall 18 sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the 19 local gas stations to get a more direct indication of their 20 contribution to Kensington Heights and other places. That's 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results,
 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the highest average background concentrations from a particular county or particular what's the region? A Representative data for the region. So let's say it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard Q Right. A you would look at the last three years of data, and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that occurred in any one of those locations over the three years and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the contribution to Kensington Heights and other places. That's not standard. We didn't agree to do that part, but 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally felds, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results, odel that you ran probably negated the
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 15 and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA 16 standard guideline approach. 17 Dr. Cole requested we more broadly model the mall 18 sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the 19 local gas stations to get a more direct indication of their 20 contribution to Kensington Heights and other places. That's 21 not standard. We didn't agree to do that part, but 22 certainly 	ata rather than vas a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally felds, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results, odel that you ran probably negated the
4what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure.5QSo let's be clear about that. You say you use the6highest average background concentrations from a particular7county or particular what's the region?8ARepresentative data for the region. So let's say9it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard10QRight.11A you would look at the last three years of data,12and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and13we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that14occurred in any one of those locations over the three years15and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA16standard guideline approach.17Dr. Cole requested we more broadly model the mall18sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the19local gas stations to get a more direct indication of their20certainly23MR. GROSSMAN: Why not? It does seem like a	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results, odel that you ran probably negated the itoring.
 4 what you're modeling. That's the standard procedure. 5 Q So let's be clear about that. You say you use the 6 highest average background concentrations from a particular 7 county or particular what's the region? 8 A Representative data for the region. So let's say 9 it's carbon monoxide, eight-hour standard 10 Q Right. 11 A you would look at the last three years of data, 12 and we looked at Beltsville, Rockville, and Arlington, and 13 we took the highest eight-hour CO concentration that 14 occurred in any one of those locations over the three years 15 and we added that to all our modeled values. That is EPA 16 standard guideline approach. 17 Dr. Cole requested we more broadly model the mall 18 sources and, I'm not sure, maybe beyond, maybe some of the 19 local gas stations to get a more direct indication of their 20 contribution to Kensington Heights and other places. That's 21 not standard. We didn't agree to do that part, but 22 certainly 	ata rather than was a good idea. We big difference in n. le was concerned as station that goes eement was we would is called CALPUFF hat we used generally ields, where the wind . So we ran, we ran can say that the y similar to AERMOD. e with the results, odel that you ran probably negated the itoring.

	Page 210		Page 212
1	THE WITNESS: running a dispersion model, a	1	count on the number of cars that were queued over some
2	computer program that	2	period of time and decided that the average, based on that,
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	3	was 10?
4	THE WITNESS: considers the terrain, the	4	THE WITNESS: Correct. I, we didn't, my firm
5	heating and various factors, and it computes how the wind	5	didn't do it, but another firm did, Mr. Guckert. Guckert's
6	will tend to follow that terrain.	6	firm did, and they counted the cars on a representative
7	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	7	weekday and weekend.
8	THE WITNESS: And it did not show a significant	8	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
9	difference from AERMOD, but by doing that step, we had hoped	9	BY MR. GOECKE:
10	that we'd come closer to achieving consensus. That was	10	Q Do you know where they counted the cars at?
11	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	11	A In Sterling.
12	THE WITNESS: the objective. Dr. Cole	12	Q Yes.
13	requested that we add in major spills. In modeling a gas	13	A So that increased the impacts to some degree. We
14	station, you know, every time you fill up your car and you	14	also, I made a change in what's called the surface
15	put the nozzle back into the tank area, you spill a drop or	15	roughness. I modified the surface roughness term, made it
16	two and that's in the emission factors themselves. But his	16	more applicable to the airport conditions, and it basically
17	point was, which is accepted, is that sometimes people spill	17	increased the impacts by about a factor of two. That was a
18	more than just a little bit. Maybe they spill a gallon of	18	voluntary change that we made. We noticed that was too
19	it once in a while. That happens. And we checked with	19	high, my feeling was too high. We made that adjustment.
20	Costco. I got the history, operational history for that	20	And that wasn't part of the discussions here, but we
21	issue, and incorporated that into our analysis. We call it	21	increased the impacts on that basis.
22	major spills. Like, a gallon is a major spill, in that	22	MR. GROSSMAN: Why does surface roughness have an
23	context, but we worked it into our emissions analysis. So,	23 24	impact?
24 25	so far, so good. We increased the queuing assumptions. We I	24 25	THE WITNESS: The model we're using, AERMOD, has a meteorological processor called AERMET, and AERMET
2.5		25	
	Page 211		Page 213
1	, and the second s	1	° °
1	Page 211 certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too	1	
	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed		determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the
2	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too	2	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially,
2 3	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too	2 3	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been
2 3 4	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was	2 3 4	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport
2 3 4 5	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be	2 3 4 5	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall for all pumps or 10 cars for an individual set of pumps?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: But as I understand it, that's only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall for all pumps or 10 cars for an individual set of pumps? THE WITNESS: All pumps.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: But as I understand it, that's only from that's the emissions from the underground tanks that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall for all pumps or 10 cars for an individual set of pumps? THE WITNESS: All pumps. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: But as I understand it, that's only from that's the emissions from the underground tanks that it's removing because that's where the Arid Permeator is, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall for all pumps or 10 cars for an individual set of pumps? THE WITNESS: All pumps. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And that was confirmed in January.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: But as I understand it, that's only from that's the emissions from the underground tanks that it's removing because that's where the Arid Permeator is, is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	certainly had an earful from the community, and I agreed with them that the queuing numbers in this report were too low. We had data from another study. I agree, it was too low. We increased those to match reality, which was subsequently tested in January of this year and found to be quite reasonable, but we did increase the queuing. This is a Costco refinement that was made. MR. GROSSMAN: And when you talk about increasing the queuing, what was your initial assumption of the number of vehicles that would be queuing versus what you increased it to? THE WITNESS: Right now, in the annual the annual average, which is the most critical averaging time here, we're assuming 10 cars queued on average during the operational time. It was much lower. I believe it was two before, which was from a different gas station, and it was too low. MR. GROSSMAN: And that's 10 cars queued overall for all pumps or 10 cars for an individual set of pumps? THE WITNESS: All pumps. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And that was confirmed in January. That number was confirmed during the testing done in January	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	determines the wind speed, the wind data that goes in the model, and we had a fairly rough surface we used initially, and it should have been much more lower, should have been more like the airport. So it wasn't matched to the airport as well as they should have been, and because of that, we had, we had too much dispersion in the model and it tended to lower the concentrations more than it should. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So that, I think we all can agree, the modelers can agree that that was a constructive change. And, lastly, we updated the vehicle emissions. Initially we didn't take any credit for some things. In the initial report, we didn't take credit for the canister, the technology that's on cars that made a very big difference and we didn't take any credit for the Arid Permeator, which we should have. The Arid Permeator takes out 99.27 percent of the VOCs. So we put those two refinements into the, this analysis. MR. GROSSMAN: But as I understand it, that's only from that's the emissions from the underground tanks that it's removing because that's where the Arid Permeator is, is that correct? THE WITNESS: It's on the vent, the vent that's

	Page 214		Page 216
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 214 MR. GROSSMAN: underground tanks? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: It doesn't affect, at all, any leakage as a result of filling at the individual cars, is that correct? THE WITNESS: The loss at the queuing area is not affected by that. So the bottom line of these changes is they were, some were based on the meeting, they're all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 216 THE WITNESS: that's what's going on. So that, that is extremely conservative right there. Point No. 2, Intersection 16 and 20 on Mr. Guckert's analysis 16 is to the west and 20 is to the east we assumed that 90 percent of the cars that were coming in on those locations were going to the Costco parking lots. That clearly is not the case. That's an overstatement. I could also add, in terms of parking lots,
9 10	with the intent of refining the analysis, making it more accurate.	9 10	we assumed that it, that it took five minutes of driving time to park your car and then drive away when you were
11 12 13	Now, in terms of the conservatism, the modeling that is done even now substantially overstates the impacts, and just to give a few examples of why, the maximum peak	11 12 13	done. It clearly doesn't take five minutes to do that. So we're overstating parking lot emissions by a tremendous factor.
14	traffic counts were used for all averaging times from the	14	BY MR. GOECKE:
15	ring road in. I'm not sure that point was really grasped by	15	Q And when you say the Costco lots, which specific
16 17	folks. In other words, we're taking the hour of the day that has the highest number of cars and using that all the	16 17	lots are you referring to or which lots do you attribute to being the Costco parking lots?
18	time, all year long. So the ring road is substantially	18	A Let me, let me find that. I have a slide with
19	overstated by about 84 percent. It was done we did that	19	that in here. Okay. The Costco lots, the west lots, we're
20 21	to be conservative. BY MR. GOECKE:	20 21	referring to these areas here in yellow. Q And I'm sorry. We're on slide 59 now, is that
22	Q So just	22	A Slide 58.
23	A Number two	23	Q Fifty-eight? Okay. And you're pointing to the
24	Q I'm sorry. Just to be clear on that, so you took	24	area highlighted in yellow, to the
25	the hour of the day that has the highest amount of	25	A The west lot of Costco.
	D 015		
	Page 215		Page 217
1	Page 215 concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the	1	Page 217 Q southwest quadrant.
1 2	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a	1 2	Q southwest quadrant.A South and west. This is the surface parking lot.
2 3	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year?	2 3	Q southwest quadrant.A South and west. This is the surface parking lot.On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a
2 3 4	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall	2 3 4	Q southwest quadrant.A South and west. This is the surface parking lot.On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into
2 3	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year?	2 3	Q southwest quadrant.A South and west. This is the surface parking lot.On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a
2 3 4 5	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We	2 3 4 5	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them
2 3 4 5 6 7	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct that you didn't add
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct that you didn't add them in?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall traffic, either going to Costco or other places to the mall,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct that you didn't add them in? THE WITNESS: It's incorrect to say that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct that you didn't add them in?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall traffic, either going to Costco or other places to the mall, but our analysis did consider cars just going to the gas station. That's included in our analysis, but most of these emissions are, yes; they're not incremental gas station	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct to say that we underestimated the overall model emissions, because we did not, and to clarify it, let me start with the parking lots. Do we have a may I use this board over here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall traffic, either going to Costco or other places to the mall, but our analysis did consider cars just going to the gas station. That's included in our analysis, but most of these emissions are, yes; they're not incremental gas station emissions. We're modeling them and Costco and adding all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct to say that we underestimated the overall model emissions, because we did not, and to clarify it, let me start with the parking lots. Do we have a may I use this board over here? MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concentration on the ring road and then assumed that the emissions from the ring road were at that level 24 hours a day, 365 days a year? A During the operation of the mall Q During the operation A so at least 15 hours a day. We used that all the time. We MR. GROSSMAN: That's for determining background? THE WITNESS: No. It's actually modeling. We modeled those emissions in our explicitly modeled those emissions, added it to background. MR. GROSSMAN: Right, but I'm but that particular conservative assumption is one used towards determining the amount of background pollution, is that correct, not the amount of pollution that will be created by the gas station itself? THE WITNESS: It's actually a little bit of both. To answer your question, yes, most of this is general mall traffic, either going to Costco or other places to the mall, but our analysis did consider cars just going to the gas station. That's included in our analysis, but most of these emissions are, yes; they're not incremental gas station	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q southwest quadrant. A South and west. This is the surface parking lot. On the east side, I'm pointing to the yellow area, that's a parking garage. So we assumed that all the cars coming into the area to this, from this side as well as from this side here MR. GROSSMAN: From the west and from the east. THE WITNESS: From the east, 90 percent of them will go to the Costco, these two lots. Now, the point's been made that we're understating mall sources, that we understated that and, if you added them in, it would be higher. That is not correct. And basically, I can BY MR. GOECKE: Q Why not? A basically, I'll show two, for two reasons. MR. GROSSMAN: It's not correct that you, that it would be higher, or it's not correct to say that we underestimated the overall model emissions, because we did not, and to clarify it, let me start with the parking lots. Do we have a may I use this board over here?

	Page 218		Page 220
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	through those two intersections, and we're assuming that, you know, 90 percent, .9, are coming to Costco's lots. That's the first assumption. Then we're assuming that people drive around for five minutes to park the car and then, when they're done shopping, to go away. The next time you go to a parking lot, any parking lot, try to drive five miles an hour. The lowest you'll be able to drive your car in a parking lot, try it, is about seven-and-a-half miles an hour. If you drive your car seven-and-a-half miles an hour, which is really, really slow I mean, I jog faster than that; I'm 63 years old you'll find that it would really take you two minutes. You can work out the math. If you went to the center of the second-level parking lot, the parking lot on this side and drove to the middle of this parking lot on this side and drove to the middle of this parking lot here, it'll take you two minutes, not five. It'll take you two, not five. So there's a conservatism here of five over two. And then you look at the fact that we're using, we're assuming that these cars, if you take the worst hour in Mr. Guckert's analysis he assumed it happens all day long his analysis is 84 percent high. So that number, you can multiply it times 1.84. So if you scale this all up, you come up with 157 percent. We took more than, more than the cars that go into the mall and we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we're going to increase our impacts by a factor of two and a half of idling vehicles. We made it more conservative by a factor of two and a half. So if you take your 100 miles we modeled, divide it by the factor of two and a half that we had put into all of our analysis, you're left with 40 miles. If you have 40 miles in there, it's only, it's 10, it's 10 trucks. So it's happening four hours four miles, I should say, per truck. The trucks are going to have to idle for two to go two-and-a-half miles, they have to idle for an hour. So if you divide four by two and a half, I'll work out the math, it ends up being 96 minutes per truck. Costco is going to be 10 minutes. That's their policy. Actually, the county standard is five minutes. So we have a, we have built-in embedded conservatism, a factor of 10x into idling trucks. So when the statement is made that we're underestimating the impacts from Target, Giant, and the rest, we 10x'd this particular point 10 times the idling they will have. And so I'll argue, this tremendously overstates any of the other loading docks around the entire mall. So we're conservatism, a factor of 10x on idling, it's embedded conservatism, a factor of 157 percent shown previously for the parking lots. We put more cars than they actually have into these two lots
24	more than, more than the cars that go into the mall and we	24	We put more cars than they actually have into these two lots right near Kensington Heights and still showed a minor
25	put them into these two parking lots right here, right next	25	
	Page 219		Page 221
	to Kensington Heights. We had embedded conservatism in this analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	1	impact. So then to finish it, we went through and we said
1	to Kensington Heights. We had embedded conservatism in this	1	impact.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
2 3 4 5 6	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the	2 3 4 5 6	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
2 3 4 5 6	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	2 3 4 5 6	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest corner of the Costco warehouse building. THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest corner of the Costco warehouse building. THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest corner of the Costco warehouse building. THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take your 100	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my place again here. MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide number? THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
17	Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling?	17	going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
17	Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling?	17	going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this.
18	A Well, the emission factors are by mile. So we,	18	THE WITNESS: That's true. They're watching us.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
17	Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling?	17	going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest corner of the Costco warehouse building. THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take your 100 BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling? A Well, the emission factors are by mile. So we, you know, using two-and-a-half miles an hour as the reference for the MOBILE6 and we say, okay, we're running, we're going to have to, we're going to run two-and-a-half	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my place again here. MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide number? THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this. THE WITNESS: That's true. They're watching us. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I could just ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point. The second point is, did we underestimate the loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading dock MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest corner of the Costco warehouse building. THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take your 100 BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling? A Well, the emission factors are by mile. So we, you know, using two-and-a-half miles an hour as the reference for the MOBILE6 and we say, okay, we're running, we're going to have to, we're going to run two-and-a-half miles would take one hour of idling. So I'm assuming 100	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So then to finish it, we went through and we said what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my place again here. MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide number? THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you. MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this. THE WITNESS: That's true. They're watching us. MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I could just ask a point of clarification. Is this the same PowerPoint that is, I believe, Hearing Examiner Exhibit 95 or MR. GROSSMAN: That was my understanding.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
17	Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling?	17	going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this.
18	A Well, the emission factors are by mile. So we,	18	THE WITNESS: That's true. They're watching us.
19	you know, using two-and-a-half miles an hour as the	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I could just ask
20	reference for the MOBILE6 and we say, okay, we're running,	20	a point of clarification. Is this the same PowerPoint that
21	we're going to have to, we're going to run two-and-a-half	21	is, I believe, Hearing Examiner Exhibit 95 or
22	miles would take one hour of idling. So I'm assuming 100	22	MR. GROSSMAN: That was my understanding.
23	hours of idling. It's shown right in our Excel files. We	23	MR. GOECKE: Yes, 95(c), I think.
2	analysis. We did not underestimate any of the parking lot	2	So then to finish it, we went through and we said
3	emissions whatsoever. Now, that's the first point.	3	what if we did our analysis at the same high-loading in the
4	The second point is, did we underestimate the	4	parking lots and the same high-loading in the loading docks
5	loading docks? Costco has a loading dock, and their loading	5	and applied it to Target's lot and the one over here, and it
6	dock is, is right here. Well, in terms of the loading	6	made less than a one percent difference in fine particulate
7	dock	7	impacts at the locations in Kensington Heights. So my point
8	MR. GROSSMAN: Right here being the southwest	8	being that, in terms of did we underestimate the loadings
9	corner of the Costco warehouse building.	9	from the mall sources, the answer is we clearly did not. We
10	THE WITNESS: Yes. For the loading dock, if you	10	overstated those impacts by quite a bit. Let me find my
11	look at our actual files, you find out that we assumed each	11	place again here.
12	day that the heavy-duty diesel delivery trucks, that they	12	MR. SILVERMAN: Excuse me. What was the slide
13	have an equivalent of 100 miles of idling. That's a lot of	13	number?
14	idling. So if you look at 100 miles of idling, you take	14	THE WITNESS: Fifty-eight.
15	your 100	15	MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you.
16	BY MR. GOECKE:	16	MR. GROSSMAN: Don't go too fast because you're
17	Q And what does that mean, 100 miles of idling?	17	going to confuse the NSA, and they monitor this.
18	A Well, the emission factors are by mile. So we,	18	THE WITNESS: That's true. They're watching us.
19	you know, using two-and-a-half miles an hour as the	19	MS. ROSENFELD: Mr. Grossman, if I could just ask
20	reference for the MOBILE6 and we say, okay, we're running,	20	a point of clarification. Is this the same PowerPoint that
21	we're going to have to, we're going to run two-and-a-half	21	is, I believe, Hearing Examiner Exhibit 95 or
22	miles would take one hour of idling. So I'm assuming 100	22	MR. GROSSMAN: That was my understanding.

	Page 222		Page 224
1	THE WITNESS: The only, the only text change was	1	understanding his testimony
2	the it's like in here, I showed in red I added the	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
3	line in red to try to clarify it, but I don't believe any	3	MS. ROSENFELD: and cross-examination
4	slides have been modified except some clarifying clauses	4	MR. GROSSMAN: Absolutely.
5	added to make it more readable.	5	MS. ROSENFELD: it's helpful to see it.
6	MS. ROSENFELD: And I believe there might have	6	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I added, I added the red
7	been clarifying clauses on earlier slides referencing	7	because I thought it might make it added additional
8	Dr. Cole perhaps. Was there additional text?	8	information to be helpful. I didn't, I wasn't trying to
9	THE WITNESS: There could be. Do you want me to	9	make it difficult, but that was the reason why I made those
10	go back to the beginning and look?	10	changes.
11	MS. CORDRY: Excuse me. Are we going to get an	11	We've talked a bit about the EPA conservative
12	exhibit that actually has this being shown?	12	background method. I think it might be helpful to put that
13	MS. ROSENFELD: I thought we would have everything	13	in context. You know, there's 8100 receptors in this model.
14	in advance.	14	That means there's 8100 places that the model is estimating
15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I think that's fair	15	concentration. And in every one of those 8100 places
16	MR. GOECKE: If there are differences	16	let's use CO eight-hour, as an example it's assuming that
17	MR. GROSSMAN: but if he did add, if it's just	17	the worst-case measured air pollution in the region happened
18	clarifying, but I'm going to let you raise that on	18	the same time that receptor happened to have its highest
19	cross-examination on any	19	concentration.
20	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	20	So this is the highest over three years. So if
21	MR. GROSSMAN: rather than making him go back	21	you think of the math on that, basically I'll get a new
22	to each slide now	22	page here trust my math on this, there's 195 1,095
23	MS. ROSENFELD: Okay.	23	eight-hour periods per year, okay, and there's three years
24	MR. GROSSMAN: on cross-examination you can	24	being evaluated. We're assuming that, okay, once out of all
25	raise any changes that were made.	25	this number, so out of about 3,000 possible numbers,
	, ,		
	Page 223		Page 225
1	Page 223 MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we	1	Page 225 possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case
1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1 2	ů
	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we		possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case
2	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have	2	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's
2 3	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a	2 3	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007,
2 3 4	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available?	2 3 4	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly
2 3 4 5	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find	2 3 4 5	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It	2 3 4 5 6	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but	2 3 4 5 6 7	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GOECKE: Absolutely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GOECKE: Absolutely. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth of monitoring to get background. So they have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if there's any problem, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if there's any problem, as you go along if it's just added-on clarification and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth of monitoring to get background. So they have a conservative approach that overstates and everybody knows it overstates but it avoids the problem of what do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if there's any problem, as you go along if it's just added-on clarification and nothing changed or, you know, removed, then it seems to me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth of monitoring to get background. So they have a conservative approach that overstates and everybody knows it overstates but it avoids the problem of what do you do. Do you make an applicant get three years' worth of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GOECKE: Absolutely. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if there's any problem, as you go along if it's just added-on clarification and nothing changed or, you know, removed, then it seems to me that it ought to be okay for him to go forward with this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth of monitoring to get background. So they have a conservative approach that overstates and everybody knows it overstates but it avoids the problem of what do you do. Do you make an applicant get three years' worth of measured data before they do anything? Well, the answer is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. ROSENFELD: Well, it would be helpful if we had a copy of what's being shown here because I don't have a MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Is that available? THE WITNESS: I can use I can see if I can find the one that doesn't have the clarifying clauses in it. It makes it more readable, but MR. GROSSMAN: Well, did you remove any language? THE WITNESS: No. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So why don't we do it MS. ROSENFELD: If we could have a copy e-mailed? MR. GROSSMAN: let's just go through his, what he's got now, and for anything that's added on that creates any confusion, you can stop us and MS. ROSENFELD: If they could certainly e-mail a copy to us at the close of today's hearing MR. GROSSMAN: Certainly. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay, yes. MS. ROSENFELD: so we can see it before next MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, but if there's any problem, as you go along if it's just added-on clarification and nothing changed or, you know, removed, then it seems to me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	possible time periods, we're assuming that the worst-case hour, worst eight hours for that receptor, let's say it's the closest home, let's say it happened in June 5th, 2007, first eight hours of the day, we're assuming that's exactly the same time that the worst case occurred at the monitor. Now, what are the odds of that happening? Well, the odds are do the math. It's about one in 10 million. If you assume they're independent, which is a reasonable assumption, one in 10 million. We've seen that happen 8100 times. So is it conservative? Yes. If we were to model the entire county, would we get a lower answer? The answer is yes, we would. If we could model every gas station and every road, every driveway, and every source of pollution, which we can't, but if we could, you'd have a lower concentration because there's inherent conservatism in EPA's approach. The EPA recognizes that you can't go out and monitor for every gas station or specialty, every factory that's built. They can't go out and do three years' worth of monitoring to get background. So they have a conservative approach that overstates and everybody knows it overstates but it avoids the problem of what do you do. Do you make an applicant get three years' worth of

	Page 226		Page 228
1	available data so that decisions can be made in a	1	and Planning staff suggested, you know, you better refine
2	conservative way, but you know, it's manageable, it works.	2	your, your your background is not, is too high, first of
3	You can't use a short data set to try to evaluate these kind	3	all, and it's not consistent with the Washington Council of
4	of background values. It's not stable enough to give you	4	Governments, which is using 10.8. So we went back and
5	reliable data.		reassessed and did the three-year running average and
6	And, frankly, the question has come up, well, what		brought it up to 2012, and we came up with 10.8 also. And
7	if we put, had put monitors at the mall and we had measured		so we modified and refined our value to be more realistic
8	what the lowest of concentration right there at the mall,		and used 10.8.
9 10	did it for, did it for three years. Well, then we go ahead and we model the ring road and we model University and Veirs	9 10	So some of these, these other assumptions here we have I think we've discussed this probably enough we
11	Mill and Georgia Avenue, add it on to that. We're		made a number of steps that acted to increase the
12	double-counting. It's not what distinguishes the Wheaton		conservatism. We did refine the background term.
13	area from a less-traveled area, it's those three roadways.	13	And this is just showing an example I mean,
14	Those are the defining areas that have 100,000 cars a day.		this is the kind of information that's in our spreadsheets,
15	We're modeling those. If we measured two and added it on,		the emission spreadsheets. This is showing the mall, that
16	it's clearly unfair; it's double-counting, completely. So	16	we are looking at the two, those two intersections, adding
17	the process followed here of using regional data is done all	17	up the cars that are coming towards the south, subtracting
18	the time. That's the standard procedure. Even for large	18	the gas station-only operations, then multiplying times 90
19	industrial operations, that's the standard.		percent this is how we assume that 90 percent of the
20	MR. GROSSMAN: What if you didn't add them		vehicles coming down those roads are going to be going to
21 22	together, you just did your model based on the specific mall area?		the parking lots and did that morning and evening and took the higher of the two. These are all on our
22	THE WITNESS: Well, if you had the data, you could		spreadsheets. This is nothing this has been available.
24	do that. It probably, but you, it's still then you		The conservatism that we've put in here has been clearly
25	wouldn't model any of the cars. You wouldn't, you really		documented.
	Page 227		Page 229
1	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well,	1	Page 229 Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this
1 2	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do	2	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done
2 3	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations	2 3	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas
2 3 4	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the	2 3 4	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may
2 3 4 5	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly,	2 3 4 5	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe
2 3 4 5 6	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number.	2 3 4 5 6	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but
2 3 4 5	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	2 3 4 5	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe
2 3 4 5 6 7	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. SILVERMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic meter? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there THE WITNESS: I don't have a reference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic meter? A Per cubic meter on an annual basis. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there THE WITNESS: I don't have a reference MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's ask it this way: When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic meter? A Per cubic meter on an annual basis. Q On an annual basis. And that applies to how large 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there THE WITNESS: I don't have a reference MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's ask it this way: When you say that EPA knows that, are you saying that that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic meter? A Per cubic meter on an annual basis. Q On an annual basis. And that applies to how large of an area? A That's, that's the national standard that applies to any ambient area in the country. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there THE WITNESS: I don't have a reference MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's ask it this way: When you say that EPA knows that, are you saying that that's the practice of EPA is not to model gas stations? Is that what you're THE WITNESS: Well, what I'm referring to is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 wouldn't model the cars, if you modeled the cars in well, the cars wouldn't be in queue then. You could, you could do that, but you would be, probably have similar concentrations in the end than we have right now because, once you take the cars away you're modeling, you account for that directly, you're going to have the conservative number. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: Now, a lot of discussion has come up, and this is important I think we spend a little bit of time on this, that originally when we started this project, actually in September when we had our meeting, the EPA standard for fine particulates was 15. That was the annual standard, and in December/January time frame they modified the standard to 12. So we were using a very conservative background value of 12.1 originally BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that 15 to 12, that's micrograms per cubic meter? A Per cubic meter on an annual basis. Q On an annual basis. And that applies to how large of an area? A That's, that's the national standard that applies 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Now, in terms of our mission in modeling this particular operation, we did a lot more than would be done for a gas station. First of all, I don't know of a gas station that's been modeled in this detail anywhere. It may be a record. It certainly would be for this area. Maybe California has done more on a few of those stations, but Q And why do you say that? A Well, you don't usually model a gas station. Q Why not? A Because EPA and MDE know that the concentrations aren't high from any particular gas station. I mean, we're modeling a 12-million-gallon-a-year gas station here MR. SILVERMAN: I've got to object to that. THE WITNESS: the impacts are MR. GROSSMAN: Hold on one second. Yes. MR. SILVERMAN: That's hearsay. EPA and the states know? I mean, do you have a reference or is there THE WITNESS: I don't have a reference MR. GROSSMAN: Well, let's ask it this way: When you say that EPA knows that, are you saying that that's the practice of EPA is not to model gas stations? Is that what you're

	Page 230		Page 232
1	sources are best evaluated on a source-category basis. So	1	we're using the EPA standard emission factors based upon
2	they install requirements like Stage I, Stage II canisters	2	what's called AP 42. That's a standard EPA reference text.
3	to control them, but my position is that the modelers at EPA	3	Also, we're following EPA procedures. We're running
4	certainly do and I can't give you a reference but the	4	dispersion models in accordance with how EPA wants to have
5	reason that they don't model or require permits is that gas	5	dispersion models run.
6	stations do not put out a high level of air pollution. We	6	This is showing Georgia Avenue and University. We
7	showed it in this analysis here.	7	have free-flow traffic that goes through here based on the
8	MS. ROSENFELD: And I join the objection	8	traffic counts, and we have the queuing areas, which we've
9	MR. SILVERMAN: I really, I really, I think	9	identified in here, where we have cars that are at traffic
10	it's	10	lights. We're including both the queues as well as the
11	MS. ROSENFELD: he said that there's no source	11	free-flow traffic.
12	and no reference.	12	Now, queuing assumptions, as I mentioned, we've
13	MR. GROSSMAN: I'm going to overrule that	13	refined these as time has gone on. These are the numbers
14	objection because he's essentially stating his expert	14	we're using right now in this column right here. So for one
15	opinion that his expert opinion is that gas stations do	15	hour we're using 40 cars. The January testing showed 39
16	not, are not serious polluters in this sense and it's for	16	cars from Sterling, January of this year.
17	that reason, based on his experience as an expert, that	17	Q Yes.
18	they're not individually modeled by the EPA. You can	18	A Eight-hour, we modeled 20. We're a little bit
19 20	cross-examine him on the point if you want to challenge it, but that's his expert opinion based on his experience.	19 20	low. They had 32. For 24 hours we modeled 10, a little bit low; they had 18. For annual we modeled 10; they had 10.
20	THE WITNESS: I also did the work for the agency	20	The weekend traffic put these numbers up a little bit, and
22	back in the early '80s that evaluated gasoline marketing	22	if you consider the impacts of this, it makes a very small
23	nationally and looked at the exposures and so forth. That's	23	difference. There's no issue with eight- or 24-hour
24	in the studies I mentioned earlier. So I do have some	24	averages. If we scaled up by this amount, the analysis
25	direct experience with it, but that's the reality. The gas	25	would go up by possibly a couple percent.
	Page 231		Page 233
1	Page 231 stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or	1	Page 233 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend
1	-	1 2	-
	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact		Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling?
2	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very	2	Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling?A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm
2 3	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse	2 3	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday
2 3 4 5 6	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the	2 3 4 5 6	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday Q Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday Q Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our loading dock emissions as a centralized point source right	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday Q Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it was a typical range of what they usually sell, and we used
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our loading dock emissions as a centralized point source right here, heavy-duty and light-duty vehicle trucks, 10 of each	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday Q Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it was a typical range of what they usually sell, and we used that as an average. We figured five days would be at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our loading dock emissions as a centralized point source right here, heavy-duty and light-duty vehicle trucks, 10 of each per day. We have the filling operations for the underground	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a SaturdayQ Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and SaturdayQ Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it was a typical range of what they usually sell, and we used that as an average. We figured five days would be at the Friday
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our loading dock emissions as a centralized point source right here, heavy-duty and light-duty vehicle trucks, 10 of each per day. We have the filling operations for the underground tanks, that's modeled, as well as the vent emissions from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a Saturday Q Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and Saturday Q Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it was a typical range of what they usually sell, and we used that as an average. We figured five days would be at the Friday Q Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	stations do not create high impacts as of 2013 for risk or for the standards and that's been shown through the model we've done here. But my point is, putting aside the fact they don't usually model gas stations, we've done a very extensive analysis here where we're modeling the warehouse parking lots, we're modeling the ring road, modeling the cars queuing to get their gasoline, we're modeling where they pump their gas, where they exit the gas station, enter the gas station, Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, and University. We're modeling all those things that had the background. So it's a very extensive analysis for a gas station, very atypical. As we mentioned earlier, the east parking lot is a, is a parking garage. That's considered in our modeling as one of the sources. BY MR. GOECKE: Q I'm sorry. So that is considered or A That is considered. And then here's the loading dock again over here at the warehouse. We're treating our loading dock emissions as a centralized point source right here, heavy-duty and light-duty vehicle trucks, 10 of each per day. We have the filling operations for the underground	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q So let's back up a second. You said the weekend data affected your results. What days of the week did you count cars at Sterling? A Wes Guckert's staff did counts on a Wednesday, I'm sorry, a Friday and a SaturdayQ Okay. A and the Saturday there's more, the queues are larger, and so we did get higher numbers. During the Friday was most similar to these numbers here, but my point is, these averaging times and the emissions and the queues are so small that even if we scaled up by a factor of two in here, it makes a very, very insignificant difference in the results. Q Okay. So taking the Friday and Saturday car counts, how did you then compute the annual average? A We considered, we looked at the amount of gasoline sold on a Friday and SaturdayQ Yes. A and it was typical of a Friday and Saturday; it was a typical range of what they usually sell, and we used that as an average. We figured five days would be at the FridayQ Okay. A values, and two days being at the Saturday

	Page 234		Page 236
1	Q So you took the Friday sampling to represent	1	times below the standard. Either way, we're far below the
2	Monday through Friday?	2	standard. I'm just saying that for these two categories,
3	A Correct.	3	the updated data made a small difference in the results, but
4	Q And then you took the Saturday data to represent	4	it was quite small.
5	Saturday and Sunday?	5	Q Thank you.
6	A Yes.	6	MR. GROSSMAN: And the standard is the level at
7	Q And then you extrapolated that throughout the	7	which, above which you would have a problem with emissions?
8	course of the year?	8	THE WITNESS: If you're over the standard, there
9	A Correct.	9	would be a concern that you're above the standard, you may
10	Q Okay.	10	be having health effects.
11	A That correct.	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And are you
12	Q And so is that why your annual average is	12	MS. ROSENFELD: I'm sorry
13 14	consistent with your model assumptions, even though the eight-hour and 24-hour queuing data model assumptions are	13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: adding this? This, I take it, is from the queuing results. So that's carbon monoxide.
15	not consistent?	15	That's that first figure there
16	A Well, we made, I made these assumptions because I,	16	THE WITNESS: Right.
17	as I mentioned, I agree with the community that our initial	17	MR. GROSSMAN: is carbon monoxide from queuing,
18	numbers were too low. And I made, I used some judgment and	18	and you're saying it's 32 percent. What about, do you then
19	I estimated 40 and 10 here. I happened to get it right.	19	add in the amount of carbon monoxide from pumping and then
20	There's some luck involved perhaps there, but it was an	20	add in the amount of carbon monoxide from venting?
21	estimate and it ended up being pretty accurate. But I'm	21	THE WITNESS: This is total. This is including
22	showing an example here that, if I scaled up the CO	22	all sources.
23	eight-hour right now we're at 28 percent of the standard;	23	MR. GROSSMAN: Oh, okay.
24	we're four times under the standard if we had used the 32	24	THE WITNESS: It goes from 28 to 32.
25	instead of 20, it would have been a factor of three under	25	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Because your top part, I
	Dogo 225		
	Page 235		Page 237
1		1	
1	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard.	1	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what
	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard.	1 2 3	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to.
2	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard.	2	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what
2 3	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to	2 3	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing
2 3 4	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what?	2 3 4	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total
2 3 4 5	the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard.Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what?A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard.	2 3 4 5	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. 	2 3 4 5 6	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not 	2 3 6 7 8 9 10	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. 	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, because I think we're all confused here. When you say 28 percent of the standard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled this Q Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you, because I think we're all confused here. When you say 28 percent of the standard and you're talking when you say all sources, you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled this Q Yes. A using 20 cars in queue, the modeled value is 28 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you, because I think we're all confused here. When you say 28 percent of the standard and you're talking when you say all sources, you're talking about the queuing cars and the gas pumps and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled this Q Yes. A using 20 cars in queue, the modeled value is 28 percent of the standard. It's, you know, 28 percent of the standard. It's almost four times below the standard where, if we use the updated queuing value, if we factored that in, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, because I think we're all confused here. When you say 28 percent of the standard and you're talking when you say all sources, you're talking about the queuing cars and the gas pumps and the tank emissions and so forth; the only thing the gas station itself and associated queuing is responsible for 28 percent?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the standard, so would have gone from 28 to 32 percent of the standard. Q And when you say the standard, you're referring to what? A The eight-hour carbon monoxide standard. Q The National Ambient Air Quality Standard? A Correct. Q Okay. A My last point is we could increase queuing assumptions fourfold above these values and it would not threaten any standard. The queuing emissions are very, very small. Q And I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan. Just to be clear, so the 28 percent and the 30 percent mean what? That means that the, you anticipate that the emissions will be at 28 percent of the standard or 28 percent below the standard, or what do they mean? A In the first case, I'm saying, the way we modeled this Q Yes. A using 20 cars in queue, the modeled value is 28 percent of the standard. It's almost four times below the standard where, if we use the updated queuing value, if we factored that in, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	thought, was the cars in the queue. I thought that's what these were referring to. THE WITNESS: No. This is totals. I'm showing total MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: the total effect down here. I'm sorry. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. All right. THE WITNESS: Because queuing is a small source, even if you double it, it doesn't make a big difference in the ultimate result. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. I understand now. MR. SILVERMAN: Mr. Grossman, I'm a little confused. I guess we can wait until cross-examination, but it's such a long wait. I wonder if I could just ask one question now, just MR. GROSSMAN: Go ahead. MR. SILVERMAN: Thank you, because I think we're all confused here. When you say 28 percent of the standard and you're talking when you say all sources, you're talking about the queuing cars and the gas pumps and the tank emissions and so forth; the only thing the gas station itself and associated queuing is responsible for 28

	Page 238		Page 240
1	station I believe that includes background in that 32	1	I, I'm really confused.
2	percent. I can check on it, Mr. Silverman, if you'd like,	2	MS. CORDRY: Yes, I mean, are any of these numbers
3	but that's the total, as I recall. I'll double-check it.	3	ones that are in his report anywhere? I mean, we're just
4	Okay. Let's see. Okay. In terms of carbon monoxide to	4	sort of throwing out numbers at random here?
5	closest home and let me use urban the standard is	5	THE WITNESS: The numbers are in Table 1-12 of the
6	10,000; the total modeled was, I'm showing here, 530;	6	report, and so
7	background, 1145. The model plus background is 1675. So	7	MS. CORDRY: Okay. Well, then why don't we stick
8	it's, it would include both. It would include both. It	8	with those numbers then and
9	includes background, and actually, this urban value is even	9	THE WITNESS: Well, that's fine.
10	lower than that.	10	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. This is a slide that
11	BY MR. GOECKE:	11	he's already produced. The question is, where did the
12	Q What are you referring to, Mr. Sullivan?	12	numbers come from? And I agree with, with the comments that
13	A I'm referring, I'm looking at Table 1-12 in	13	it it is somewhat concerning that, that those numbers
14		14	don't seem to correspond to the numbers, the raw data that
15	Q From what?	15	you're referencing now.
16	A November 2012 report, November 19th, 2012	16	THE WITNESS: I can, I can double-check on that
17	report.	17	too, and I can
18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Give me again, what was	18	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
19	the standard?	19	THE WITNESS: I can replicate it
20	THE WITNESS: The standard is, is 10,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Ten thousand is the CO standard.	20	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. THE WITNESS: or refer to Table I can make
21 22	THE WITNESS: Correct.	21 22	the point from Table 1-12 the same way. If you take, look
22	MR. GROSSMAN: And you said that your figure	22	at the urban values in the eight-hour CO column for home and
23 24	showed what numbers then for your model?	23 24	you see the 530, scale it up by 32 over 20, and you'll see,
25	THE WITNESS: I'm showing total modeled of 530 and	25	
2.5		2.5	
	Page 239		
	Fage 239		Page 241
1	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675.	1	Page 241 than 17 percent of the standard.
1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1 2	
	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675.		than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from
2	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come	2	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide.
2 3	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from?	2 3	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed.
2 3 4	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I	2 3 4 5 6	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and
2 3 4 5 6 7	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural.	2 3 4 5 6 7	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So I add the background, 1145, and come up with a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide DR. ADELMAN: Could you say what exhibit number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So I add the background, 1145, and come up with a number of 1675. It's about 17 percent of the standard. If I were to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide DR. ADELMAN: Could you say what exhibit number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So I add the background, 1145, and come up with a number of 1675. It's about 17 percent of the standard. If I were to double the 530, it would go to about 1,000. I'd have about,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide DR. ADELMAN: Could you say what exhibit number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So I add the background, 1145, and come up with a number of 1675. It's about 17 percent of the standard. If I were to double the 530, it would go to about 1,000. I'd have about, approximately a 2,000 value. So it would go from about 17	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide DR. ADELMAN: Could you say what exhibit number that is? MR. GROSSMAN: 112, I think he said. Is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a background of 1145, and I'm showing a total here of 1675. So that's actually even less than 28 percent. That's more like 17 percent for the urban values. MR. GROSSMAN: So where does the 32 percent come from? THE WITNESS: Well, I'm trying to see. I mean, I may have used the it's 39 percent if I used the rural. We modeled two different ways, and I can, I can digress and talk about that, but modeled two different ways. The number I'm the 32 percent seems to be between the urban and the rural analysis. One way I'm coming up with a total of 39 percent. The other way, over here, I'm coming up with 17 percent. MR. GROSSMAN: They still don't average out to THE WITNESS: They don't, they don't average out to 32, I agree. My point is, let's take the value shown for urban, which is most representative. If I the total modeled is 530, is what I show. The standard is 10,000. So I add the background, 1145, and come up with a number of 1675. It's about 17 percent of the standard. If I were to double the 530, it would go to about 1,000. I'd have about, approximately a 2,000 value. So it would go from about 17 to 20 percent. So those numbers are a little bit on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	than 17 percent of the standard. MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I still don't know where those numbers came from. So they must have come from somewhere because you put them up on your slide. THE WITNESS: Agreed. MR. GROSSMAN: So when you get a break and maybe we'll take that break now MR. GOECKE: That's a good idea. MR. GROSSMAN: you can figure out where those numbers came from. And it's about six minutes to 4:00. We'll come back at about 4 o'clock. THE WITNESS: All right. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) MR. GROSSMAN: Back on the record we go. And, Mr. Sullivan, were you able to figure out the discrepancy in the numbers? THE WITNESS: I came closer. Basically, if you turn to page 112 of my November 2012 report and look at eight-hour carbon monoxide DR. ADELMAN: Could you say what exhibit number that is? MR. GROSSMAN: 112, I think he said. Is that correct? THE WITNESS: I don't know the exhibit number.

1	Page 242		Page 244
1	MS. CORDRY: November 19th, 2012?	1	Parks and Planning requested the change. We made the
2	THE WITNESS: November 19th, 2012.	2	change, and the 10.8 is
3	MR. GOECKE: Yes, 15(a).	3	MR. SILVERMAN: I want to object to that. That's
4	MR. GROSSMAN: 15(a).	4	hearsay and we don't have any documentation of it, that
5	DR. ADELMAN: Thank you.	5	Parks
6	THE WITNESS: And it's Table 1-12. It should be	6	MR. GROSSMAN: What's hearsay, sir?
7	at page 67. And if you look at the carbon monoxide	7	MR. SILVERMAN: that Parks and Planning said
8	eight-hour, the bottom table, which says urban, and you look	8	one thing or another.
9	at the home, what I've done, I've replicated it. If I take	9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, he's saying Parks and Park
10	the urban and rural and average those, initially it was	10	and Planning requested a change. It would be, well
11	about 28 percent for the standard, and after I adjusted the	11	MS. CORDRY: Well, that's what we're saying is
12	queue according to the 32 versus 20, it only went up to like	12	hearsay.
13	29 percent. It didn't go up to 32, but what I'd like to	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Well
14	suggest, if you agree, is to give an updated version of	14	MR. SILVERMAN: I mean, do they have a letter or
15	this, showing the actual calculations in writing so it can	15	do they have some
16	be replicated.	16	MR. GROSSMAN: It's all right. You know, it
17	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. Are you talking about	17	technically is hearsay if you are using it to prove the
18	doing that now or doing that	18	truth of what is asserted; that is, it's a statement made
19	THE WITNESS: When I, in our next the next	19	outside this room, offering to prove that they requested a
20	hearing.	20	change. However, let's find out if there's a, if they
21	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	21	requested it by document or not. Did they give you an oral
22	MR. GOECKE: We'll bring it on Wednesday.	22	request to change it, or did they give you something in
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, make sure in advance of that,	23	writing that said to change it?
24	why don't you, Tuesday	24	THE WITNESS: We had a meeting on I could get,
25	MR. GOECKE: Circulate it.	25	identify the date we had a meeting at Parks and Planning,
	Page 243		Page 245
1	MR. GROSSMAN: circulate it by e-mail. Thank	1	and it was done orally, as I recall.
2	you.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. You're shaking your
3			
5	MS. CORDRY: Thank you.	3	head. Does that mean you don't like the idea that he got
4	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still	3 4	head. Does that mean you don't like the idea that he got instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would
	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I	_	
4	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be	4	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park
4 5	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten	4 5	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with
4 5 6 7 8	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source	4 5 6 7 8	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and
4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013.	4 5 6 7 8 9	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay.
4 5 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to	4 5 6 7 8 9	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE:	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations over a three-year period?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's exactly the reason
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations over a three-year period? A Correct.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's exactly the reason MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know. He hasn't said
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations over a three-year period? A Correct. Q And then used those as the background level for	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's exactly the reason MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know. He hasn't said that yet. He said that Park and Planning requested a
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations over a three-year period? A Correct. Q And then used those as the background level for your air modeling analysis here?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's exactly the reason MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know. He hasn't said that yet. He said that Park and Planning requested a change. I don't know what exactly they requested yet. I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: But the statement I made here still stands, that as shown in this slide plus the adjustment I just made, is that these queue assumptions could be increased fourfold or more and it still would not threaten standards. The queue is the queues are not a big source at this gas station, not 2013. So background treatments, we have used 2009 to 2011 as a basis for our background with the exception of fine particulates for the annual value that changed. And so if it's less than an annual period, we took the highest value that occurred, Arlington, Beltsville or Rockville, and as I mentioned before, this is going to tend to overstate. It's designed by EPA to overstate. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so let's clarify that. So you took the highest levels found at one of three different locations over a three-year period? A Correct. Q And then used those as the background level for your air modeling analysis here?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	instructed orally, or you don't like the idea that it would be admitted? MS. CORDRY: Well, I have a concern because Park and Planning had huge concerns with the EPA, I mean, with the environmental numbers here and MR. GROSSMAN: Now, that's hearsay. MS. CORDRY: Well, no. I mean, no, no. No, that is in their no, no. That's in their staff report. The MR. GROSSMAN: You see MS. CORDRY: staff report makes very clear that they have enormous concerns with that, and MR. GROSSMAN: I understand. I understand. MS. CORDRY: and the notion that he's saying that they told him to use less conservative things, maybe it's true, maybe it's not, maybe he misinterpreted. That's exactly the reason MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't know. He hasn't said that yet. He said that Park and Planning requested a change. I don't know what exactly they requested yet. I guess we're going to find that out. The reason I'm going to

	Page 246		Page 248
1	considering it for the point of what Park and Planning said,	1	that's on what slide is this? Thirty-one?
2	because whatever Park and Planning's opinion is, is going to	2	THE WITNESS: Slide 31.
3	be, I'm going to take from their report, which is a formal	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4	document.	4	THE WITNESS: And it goes from around the turn of
5	MS. CORDRY: Then what's	5	the century to 2011.
6	MR. GROSSMAN: The reason I want to hear what he	6	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
7	has to say is the reason he changed something. So it's a	7	THE WITNESS: So, in terms of the treatment of
8	different kind of thing. I'm not, I'm not asking for it to	8	background, as I mentioned before, EPA has a very specific
9	be introduced for the purpose of saying what Park and	9	procedure that's followed in dispersion modeling. The EPA
10	Planning believes because I'm going to take that from the	10	has what's called the Guideline on Air Quality Modeling.
11	MS. CORDRY: Well, I guess the question is	11	It's the standard of care, basically. And the guideline
12	MR. GROSSMAN: from the thing, but it would be	12	specifies under what conditions you should model other
13	why did he make a change in something. Well, he's saying	13	sources, and they're referring to, all sources expected to
14	Park and Planning asked him to do it, and so for that	14	cause a significant concentration gradient in the vicinity
15	purpose I'm going to allow it in. So what did Park and	15	of the source or sources should be explicitly modeled. Now,
16	Planning tell you to do and why?	16	we've done that. We've modeled all the major roadways.
17	THE WITNESS: Park and Planning made the	17	We've modeled the parking lots. We overstated the Costco
18	recommendation that we reconsider our background PM trend in	18	warehouse. So we have done what EPA requires, and we
19	annual value because the standard changed, number one; and,	19	followed their procedures. There are no significant
20	number two, they had made, they had made contact to	20	gradients caused by more distant sources that we should be
21	Washington Council of Governments and were provided with	21	modeling here.
22	this figure, Figure No. 31, I jump to here, that shows the	22	So this is the set of what was modeled explicitly.
23	trend in annual PM 2.5 concentrations, and by 2011 they're	23	That takes care of EPA's requirements, in our judgment. And
24	showing a 10.8 as the background and we were using 12.1.	24	we pulled the data ourselves on Rockville, Beltsville, and
25	MR. GROSSMAN: And who was it in Park and Planning	25	Arlington, and these are three-year running averages. So,
			3,
	Page 247		Page 249
1		1	-
1	who told you to do that?	1	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07,
	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey.		you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how
2	who told you to do that?	2	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07,
2 3	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide	2 3	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012.
2 3 4	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she	2 3 4	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking
2 3 4 5	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's	2 3 4 5	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012.
2 3 4 5 6	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she	2 3 4 5 6	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter?
2 3 4 5 6 7	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen.	2 3 4 5 6 7	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph that shows the trend line of the concentrations dropping, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around, around 10. We can have that data available in the future if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph that shows the trend line of the concentrations dropping, steadily dropping as a function of time, from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around, around 10. We can have that data available in the future if that's required, but the trend is continuing to drop, and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph that shows the trend line of the concentrations dropping, steadily dropping as a function of time, from MR. GROSSMAN: And when you say they, you mean 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around, around 10. We can have that data available in the future if that's required, but the trend is continuing to drop, and we just have three months into 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph that shows the trend line of the concentrations dropping, steadily dropping as a function of time, from MR. GROSSMAN: And when you say they, you mean technical staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around, around 10. We can have that data available in the future if that's required, but the trend is continuing to drop, and we just have three months into 2013.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 who told you to do that? THE WITNESS: Amy Lindsey. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: And as this slide MR. GROSSMAN: I don't know Amy Lindsey, who she is. Is there a particular part of Park and Planning she's in, because the person who is handling this is Renee Kamen. So I'm not sure MS. HARRIS: It was a meeting with Renee Kamen and Amy Lindsey, who's part of the Environmental Division. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so it was your understanding, at least, from this conversation that Park and Planning wanted you to use the revised standard which is more in the area of 10 rather than 12? Is that the idea? THE WITNESS: That's correct. They felt we should be consistent where, with where the Washington Council of Governments was at, at they were at 10.8 in the most recent finding they've had, and they provided me this graph that shows the trend line of the concentrations dropping, steadily dropping as a function of time, from MR. GROSSMAN: And when you say they, you mean technical staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 you know, 2007 would be the average of 2005, '06, and '07, and we're showing the trends, the smooth trends of how, how concentration is dropping from, this case, from 2005 to 2012. MR. GROSSMAN: For the record, you're talking about concentrations of fine particulate matter? THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: The y-axis is showing micrograms per cubic meter. The x-axis is showing 2005 to 2012. I'm showing Arlington in green, Beltsville in red, and Rockville in blue. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And why these three locations, Mr. Sullivan? A These are the closest regional stations available that have measured the fine particulate data. It makes a triangle, more or less, around the Wheaton area. We data has become available for 2013. The number is down around, around 10. We can have that data available in the future if that's required, but the trend is continuing to drop, and we just have three months into 2013. This shows how the standard has changed. It was at 15. It's dropped down to 12, and the concentrations

	Page 250		Page 252
1	THE WITNESS: This is the EPA standard right here.	1	the Washington Council of Governments that I showed earlier.
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2	DR. ADELMAN: Could you read that y-axis for me?
3	THE WITNESS: The annual PM 2.5 standard went from	3	l just can't see it.
4	15 down to 12 end of 2012. So if you extend these trend	4	THE WITNESS: This one right here, sir?
5	lines into 2014, even 2013, you find it's continuing to	5	MR. GROSSMAN: No, the y-axis.
6	drop. Our projection is that by 2014, that the trend lines	6	DR. ADELMAN: No, the y-axis.
7	will be less than 10. Time will show if that's true or not,	7	THE WITNESS: Oh, y-axis, I'm sorry. Design
8	but the trend is certainly going in that direction.	8	value, micrograms per cubic meter.
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, Rockville seems to have taken	9	DR. ADELMAN: No, I mean the numbers.
10	a turn for the worst.	10	THE WITNESS: It's going from 10.0 to 18.0.
11	THE WITNESS: There, actually	11	DR. ADELMAN: Oh.
12	MS. CORDRY: And so had Beltsville.	12	THE WITNESS: The first value shown here is 17.3.
13	THE WITNESS: it did, but you know, in that one	13	DR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
14	time here, but you'll see it dropped after that point,	14	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. Now, just to show another
15	and	15	example, this is LA, but just to show that, yeah, trends have dropped from 2001. You can see, this is a national
16	MS. CORDRY: No, we don't see.	16	trend, the fact it's the fleet issue. EPA is addressing
17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I don't see it dropped after that point on the graph.	17 18	fine particulates, mostly through fleet changes in cars and
18	THE WITNESS: You don't, no. I'm saying in 2013.	19	controls, and you know, it's not a steady change all the
20	We only have the first quarter right now	20	time, you get some flattening and dropping, but the trend is
21	MR. GROSSMAN: I see.	21	going, going down and clearly moving in the right direction.
22	THE WITNESS: but it has, it has dropped.	22	MR. GROSSMAN: I see Los Angeles at the top. Why
23	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	23	do you say it's a national trend?
24	THE WITNESS: Beltsville had a slight uptake right	24	THE WITNESS: National trend because it's the same
25	here.	25	fleet of cars, basically, throughout the country and the
	Page 251		Page 253
	1 490 201		Page 253
1	-	1	
1	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that.	1	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in
1 2 3	-	1 2 3	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of
2	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They	2	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in
2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's	2 3	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the	2 3 4	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are
2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased	2 3 4 5	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference	2 3 4 5 6	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong	2 3 6 7 8 9	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Could you spell TEOM?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is dropping down below the standard. That's a 24-hour, 98th
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Could you spell TEOM? MR. GROSSMAN: Spell the word TEOM you used.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is dropping down below the standard. That's a 24-hour, 98th percentile. That's how you judge the standard. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Could you spell TEOM? MR. GROSSMAN: Spell the word TEOM you used. THE WITNESS: T-E-O-M. MR. GROSSMAN: Does that stand for something? Is it some kind of an acronym?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is dropping down below the standard. That's a 24-hour, 98th percentile. That's how you judge the standard. That's dropped below. This is showing the annual average relative to the standard in green. They're right about at the standard in this case, in 2011.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. GROSSMAN: Spell the word TEOM you used. THE WITNESS: T-E-O-M. MR. GROSSMAN: Does that stand for something? Is it some kind of an acronym? THE WITNESS: I'm sure it does. I don't remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is dropping down below the standard. That's a 24-hour, 98th percentile. That's how you judge the standard. That's dropped below. This is showing the annual average relative to the standard in green. They're right about at the standard in this case, in 2011. MR. GROSSMAN: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, I saw that. THE WITNESS: Beltsville has three monitors. They have two what's called reference monitors and one that's called a TEOM. The TEOM is not, is not as definitive as the reference monitors. The TEOM was, in 2010 or '11, I think it was '11, one of these years it became way higher than the other two monitors, and Beltsville, this value is biased because of that particular monitor. If a, if two reference monitors are reading 8.4 and your TEOM is reading 11.3, which is what happened, you know there's something wrong with that sensor. So, like I say, there's bias in this Beltsville number for certain, but the trend is going down, and looking at the car turnover rate, there's no reason why it won't continue to drop over time. But anything past this point, yes, except for the first quarter of 2013; we don't have the data yet. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. MR. SILVERMAN: Could you spell TEOM? MR. GROSSMAN: Spell the word TEOM you used. THE WITNESS: T-E-O-M. MR. GROSSMAN: Does that stand for something? Is it some kind of an acronym?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	cars have to meet EPA requirements. So whether they be in Chicago, Los Angeles, or Washington, the amount of particulates emitted from the cars each year will tend to drop as the old cars find a junkyard and new cars are purchased. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And what's the significance of Los Angeles? A I just showed that as an example. We could have pulled other cities and shown those as well. Some of these changes are due to the fact that the clean diesel technology is taking over. Some is due to tailpipe technology. MR. GROSSMAN: I see a straight line across there labeled, what's that say, 24-hour? What does that say? THE WITNESS: This is showing the the 35 is the 24-hour fine particulate standard shown right here. MR. GROSSMAN: So that's the standard? THE WITNESS: Right, and showing that this is dropping down below the standard. That's a 24-hour, 98th percentile. That's how you judge the standard. That's dropped below. This is showing the annual average relative to the standard in green. They're right about at the standard in this case, in 2011.

	Page 254		Page 256
1	concentrations we're talking about, we all can agree on	1	it's a low amount compared to the standard. I mean, that's
2	certain things. We all can agree that fine particulates,	2	perfectly within his purview, but to the extent that it has
3	for example, aren't healthy, they're an air pollutant, you	3	a health aspect to it, the witness is not, does not claim to
4 5	want to have them low, but it's very important to consider the dose. Air pollution does not create adverse health	4	be qualified as a health expert. So I think it's a fair objection in that regard.
6	effects at all concentrations. So if a medical doctor gets	6	THE WITNESS: Well, as I'm saying here, EPA
7	up on the stand and says that fine particulates are bad, we	7	defines acceptable concentrations or dose with a reasonable
8	agree. Fine particulates are not healthy, but it does	8	margin of safety to protect the most sensitive members of
9	matter what the dose is. And to give you an analogy, let's	9	the population, including asthmatics and children. The
10	say we're talking about your home. If you have a water	10	Clean Air Act specifically identifies them as sensitive
11 12	leak MS. ROSENFELD: Objection, Mr. Grossman. We're	11 12	subpopulations to be protected. So my point is, if the background is 10.8 and we go to 10.81, that's below the
13	wandering beyond standards and what air quality standards	13	standard. If they're all to the standard, there is not a
14	have or have not been met and into the health consequences	14	point of concern.
15	of air quality.	15	BY MR. GOECKE:
16	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, I'll allow him to elaborate	16	Q So is it your contention that the EPA standards
17	to the extent it's within his purview. If he goes beyond	17	take into consideration the health of the population?
18	it, you can object. Right now, he	18	A They do. They take into account the sensitive
19	MS. ROSENFELD: I just did.	19	subjects. The asthmatics and the young children are the
20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: I knew you were going to say that. He hasn't really said anything yet. He said, for example,	20 21	most susceptible, according to EPA's, you know, Clean Air Act.
22	in the home, and then you objected. So we don't know what	22	Q And their standards are designed to protect those
23	he's about to say yet. Let's hear that and then you can	23	folks in the population?
24	raise your objection.	24	A With an adequate margin with a reasonable
25	THE WITNESS: And in my practice I compare model	25	margin of safety.
	Page 255		Page 257
1	concentrations to national standards and, in that case,	1	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to
2	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems	2	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago?
2 3	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated,	2 3	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago?A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81,
2	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the	2	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago?A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern.
2 3 4	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated,	2 3 4	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago?A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81,
2 3 4 5	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know,	2 3 4 5	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco	2 3 6 7 8 9	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco	2 3 6 7 8 9	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on the model, or are these concentration plots based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy, at that level, whether you're talking about ultrafines or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on the model, or are these concentration plots based on actual tests in those areas?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on the model, or are these concentration plots based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy, at that level, whether you're talking about ultrafines or just PM 2.5, you haven't achieved a dose that's unhealthy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on the model, or are these concentration plots based on actual tests in those areas? THE WITNESS: Based upon the model.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy, at that level, whether you're talking about ultrafines or just PM 2.5, you haven't achieved a dose that's unhealthy. MS. ROSENFELD: And I renew my objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm going to sustain it as far as the conclusion about whether or not it's unhealthy,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on actual tests in those areas? THE WITNESS: Based upon the model. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Were there any tests in those areas?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concentrations to national standards and, in that case, dose. And my point is, in this particular matter, it seems to me that the significance of dose has been underestimated, understated, and my point is dose is important. And the example I was going to give to try to make it more concrete is that if you have a water leak in your home, water leaks are bad. If your 50-gallon water tank ruptures, you know, Servpro is in, tearing up your carpets, ripping up your floors, but we're talking about fine particulates. In this example, we have shown that the concentrations from Costco are 1,000 times less than the standard. So my analogy of the 50-gallon water tank, if it was, you know, Costco, Costco would be a cup. This is six ounces. A cup is eight ounces. You have this much water. If that spilled on your floor, you could wipe it up. When we're talking about particulates relative to a standard, the standard the background is 10, is 10, and the modeling of Costco is .01, there is not a concern for fine particulates from Costco. Even though fine particulates are unhealthy, at that level, whether you're talking about ultrafines or just PM 2.5, you haven't achieved a dose that's unhealthy. MS. ROSENFELD: And I renew my objection. MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. I'm going to sustain it as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q And that's based on the dose you were referring to a moment ago? A Correct. My point is, to go from 10.80 to 10.81, according to EPA, that would not be a cause for concern. Now, I'm not going to show all the plots and tables from my report, the November 2012 report, which was supplemented on January 16th of 2013. We have a lot of plots in there, and if you, anyone that wants if you want to see some of the plots, I'll be happy to put them up, but I'm showing a smaller subset in this presentation, and I'm basically showing what we're calling as the key locations. We're showing the closest home in Kensington Heights, and we're showing the Kenmont Swim & Tennis facility and the Stephen Knolls School because these are facilities that the neighborhood has expressed as being of concern. We've highlighted those in our report. I'm highlighting them here now. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, are these concentration plots based on the model, or are these concentration plots based on actual tests in those areas? THE WITNESS: Based upon the model. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Were there any tests in those areas?

	Page 258		Page 260
1	THE WITNESS: There were no air quality	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2	measurements made in Kensington Heights	2	THE WITNESS: Later on I show it both ways.
3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And what about	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
4	THE WITNESS: or Wheaton Mall.	4	THE WITNESS: So I'm showing the pool and the
5	MR. GROSSMAN: the other places, Kenmont Swim	5	school in these examples, and for example, carbon monoxide
6	Club or, or Stephen Knolls School?	6	one-hour, the pool has 12,646. The standard is 40,000. All
7	THE WITNESS: There were no, there were no air	7	these numbers are below the standard. If I go to
8	quality measures taken at any of these locations.	8	eight-hour, the highest one I'd see is 4500. Again, the
9	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	9	standard is 10,000.
10	BY MR. GOECKE:	10	MR. GROSSMAN: Before you go on now, these numbers
11	Q And why didn't you take air measurements there?	11	are based on the model of the background or the model of the
12	A Well, I mean, we in order to take measurements	12	background plus the proposed gas station?
13	for background, for example, to really have a definitive	13	THE WITNESS: It's the model of background plus
14	data set, you need three years of data, and it's not	14	the gas station
15	standard procedure to do so.	15	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
16	Q And by standard procedure, whose, what standard	16	THE WITNESS: plus everything we modeled
17	procedure?	17	exclusively. So it would be the ring road, Georgia Avenue, University, Veirs Mill, the parking lots for Costco, the
18 19	A The EPA typically requires three years to assess background.	18 19	queues, the various gas station sources, plus background.
20	Q So you couldn't have gone out, taken a sample from	20	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
20	these locations for purposes of the Costco study, and had	20	THE WITNESS: Nitrogen oxide one-hour annual
22	data that was reliable under the EPA protocol?	22	standard, it's a factor of two or so below the one-hour.
23	A Correct. That's correct. So this summary table	23	It's quite a ways below the annual, in fact, shows seven or
24	is showing the, it's showing the rural values at the pool,	24	eight. PM 2.5 24-hour, EPA maintained the
25	the school, and it's comparing the various standards we have	25	35-microgram/cubic meter standard. It's under those values.
	Page 259		Page 261
1	Page 259 down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide,	1	
1 2		1 2	Ĵ
	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural		The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here.
2	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean?	2	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are
2 3 4 5	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has	2 3 4 5	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and
2 3 4 5 6	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and	2 3 4 5 6	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall
2 3 4 5 6 7	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will	2 3 4 5 6 7	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall region, I'm using EPA's rural designations.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row the first row is showing the incremental concentrations from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall region, I'm using EPA's rural designations. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you said you're showing urban	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row the first row is showing the incremental concentrations from the Costco gas station to the pool and the school. Here's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall region, I'm using EPA's rural designations. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you said you're showing urban here, but it says up there you're showing rural.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row the first row is showing the incremental concentrations from the Costco gas station to the pool and the school. Here's the background that applies to both of them. Then we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall region, I'm using EPA's rural designations. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you said you're showing urban here, but it says up there you're showing rural. THE WITNESS: Well, I, in this example here, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row the first row is showing the incremental concentrations from the Costco gas station to the pool and the school. Here's the background that applies to both of them. Then we're showing the totals, which include the background plus the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	down in the bottom row. For example, carbon monoxide, one-hour maximum, the standard is 40,000. MR. GROSSMAN: Why does it say rural concentrations? What does that mean? THE WITNESS: Well, basically, when EPA has modeling, they refer to areas as being urban or rural, and it's not the same as common usage of the word. Rural will typically mean locations that have if you have lawns and you have driveways or you have your natural surfaces, that would be considered rural. Locations such as the mall, concrete and asphalt, and so forth, would be will be considered urban. And according to EPA's standard procedure, you look at a three-kilometer radius when you're making this definition. If you do that, it comes out as being rural, but if the concern is the closest home, the school, and the pool, they're right next to the mall, and so the preponderance of the flow is over urban conditions. Urban has greater dilution. So I'm showing urban here because for these receptors it's the most applicable, but when I do the overall concentration plots for the overall region, I'm using EPA's rural designations. MR. GROSSMAN: Well, you said you're showing urban here, but it says up there you're showing rural.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The contribution is fairly small, but it's, you know, these are the, these are the values. This is showing the background in this column, and the total is shown down here. And, lastly, PM 2.5 annual average, again, these rows are showing the contribution from the gas station sources, and here it's showing where we're at in terms of the overall values. So it's BY MR. GOECKE: Q And MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. THE WITNESS: under the standard of 12. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And so MR. GROSSMAN: Now I'm a little confused here. The last column is what? It says background. THE WITNESS: This, this includes the 10.8-microgram background right here. I just clarified that we used the updated background value. MR. GROSSMAN: I see. THE WITNESS: This row, the row right, the row the first row is showing the incremental concentrations from the Costco gas station to the pool and the school. Here's the background that applies to both of them. Then we're

	Page 262		Page 264
1	MR. GROSSMAN: I see, okay.	1	the ring road, Veirs Mill, University, and Georgia Avenue.
2	THE WITNESS: The standards are all down here. So	2	Q It doesn't include background?
3	the PM 2.5 annual comes the closest to the standard. You	3	A And it includes the background of 1488.
4	know, we're at with this rural one, we're at around 11,	4	Q Thank you.
5	right here. It's very small for the urban, but the standard	5	A For carbon monoxide eight-hour, the standard is
6	is 12. It's less than the standard. The contribution is	6	10,000; highest values are in the range of 4500 to 4700
7	relatively small even in the rural approach.	7	micrograms per cubic meter. It's based upon a background of
8	So the main point is, it's not threatening any of	8	1145 micrograms per cubic meter, again, relative to a
9	these standards. If you look at these values down here	9	10,000-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard.
10	relative to the standards, it's not close. It is closer	10	Q So it's less than half of the EPA standard?
11	here, but the contribution is very small	11	A Correct.
12	MR. GROSSMAN: All right. By	12	Q Okay.
13	THE WITNESS: it's the background that's high.	13	A NO2 one-hour is approximately, well, a little less
14	MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. So by here, you're referring	14	than half of the standard. The standard is 190. The pool
15	to the last column, which, which shows the particulate	15	is showing 82 micrograms per cubic meter. The school is
16	matter, the fine particulate matter annual average?	16	showing 91 micrograms per cubic meter with a background of
17	THE WITNESS: Correct.	17	28.
18	MR. GROSSMAN: And your point is that it is close	18	Q And, again, that includes all the same activities
19	but not over the standard, including when you include the	19	at the proposed Costco site that you referenced a minute
20	background, but if you take the gas station contribution by	20	ago?
21	itself, which is the first two rows	21	A Correct. These numbers include all the modeling
22	THE WITNESS: Correct.	22	of all the sources. This isn't just incremental Costco.
23	MR. GROSSMAN: and this is Slide 36	23	This is incremental Costco plus all the traffic around the
24	THE WITNESS: Right.	24	area as well.
25	MR. GROSSMAN: that contribution is very	25	NO2 annual average
	Page 263		Page 265
1	Page 263 small	1	Page 265 MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me
1 2		1 2	
	small		MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me
2	small THE WITNESS: Correct.	2	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if
2 3	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18?	2 3	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution
2 3 4 5	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right	2 3 4	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things.
2 3 4 5	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall	2 3 4 5	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school and the pool both were under 15,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The standard is 40,000. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, University. This is the total modeling.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school and the pool both were under 15,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The standard is 40,000. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school and the pool both were under 15,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The standard is 40,000. Q And, again, those levels beneath 15,000 include 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, University. This is the total modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: And then background includes if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school and the pool both were under 15,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The standard is 40,000. Q And, again, those levels beneath 15,000 include what exactly? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, University. This is the total modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: And then background includes if that includes all the traffic for Veirs Mill and University
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 small THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN:13 and .18? THE WITNESS: And this is run in the rural mode, which really is more conservative. It's a very conservative way to present the data because these locations are right next to the mall MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: very close. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And just for the record, if you could just walk us through what the standard is and how it compares to the highest level that you found for each of the contaminants that you analyzed. A And I'll focus on the bottom three rows of Exhibit, page, rather, 36. Q Okay. A For carbon monoxide one-hour maximum, the school and the pool both were under 15,000 micrograms per cubic meter. The standard is 40,000. Q And, again, those levels beneath 15,000 include what exactly? A This includes all the gas station-related sources, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GROSSMAN: Wait a minute. Now you got me again. I thought that the final column, for example, if we're talking about particulate matter, was the Costco gas station contribution. Now you're telling me that those top two rows are not just the Costco gas station contribution model but include other things. THE WITNESS: It does. It's the modeling of all the roadways and all the sources plus background. Well, this is not the background. This is modeling this is directly from the model, all these values. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So the model values you're talking about for pool and school of .13 and .18 for fine particulates, that's PM 2.5 THE WITNESS: Right. MR. GROSSMAN: includes not just the anticipated pollution from the gas station but also the traffic generated, I take it, by the gas station as well as other things? THE WITNESS: All traffic on Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill, University. This is the total modeling. MR. GROSSMAN: And then background includes if that includes all the traffic for Veirs Mill and University and so on, what does background include? Doesn't background

	Page 266		Page 268
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 background that we're adding on to everything we modeled. If you recall, I mentioned that EPA's methodology requires the adding on the regional background. MR. GROSSMAN: The regional, okay. THE WITNESS: So we conservatively take the high values, add those in, and this includes everything else that was modeled MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: including the Costco gas station. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. BY MR. GOECKE: Q And that background, again, that comes from the three sources: Arlington, Beltsville, and Rockville. Is that correct? A The three monitoring locations, correct. Q Three MR. GOECKE: Q The background comes from those three monitoring locations. And those, and they do they take samples at those three locations? A They, yes, they monitor there all the time. Q Okay. And then they used those monitoring results to establish what the background level is for this area? 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	million, which is the standard way to show it, and we can compare that to the California reportable level of 10 as a benchmark, but there's no National Ambient Air Quality Standard for VOCs in terms of specific toxics we're looking at here. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: So now we're looking at the annual average concentrations, and we did it both ways here. We used urban and rural, but the main point to make here and I want to focus now on the urban, which is the more applicable for these three receptors is that we're showing in blue existing sources, and green it's hard to see it, it's small is the pipeline, which would be, at this point in time we did these, these would be Dick's and it would be Costco's warehouse, which hadn't opened, and the incremental would be the Costco gas station. You can't see the other values because the blue is dominating here. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Is the existing another way of saying background? A Existing is background plus modeling of existing sources, you know, the Veirs Mill and Georgia Avenue and so forth. The point, we talk a lot about fine particulates. The issue is a regional issue. It's a Wheaton issue, to some extent, because of the traffic that's there, but it's really not an incremental Costco issue. It's a very small
	Page 267		Page 269
1	A That's what we we based our background based	1	addition, and also, it's the numbers now are less than
1 2 3	A That's what we we based our background based upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the	1 2 3	addition, and also, it's the numbers now are less than the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those,
2 3 4	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington,	3 4	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly?
2 3 4 5	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of	3 4 5	the standard.Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly?A That would be the gas, incremental gas station
2 3 4	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington,	3 4 5 6	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an	3 4 5 6 7 8	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter	3 4 5 6 7 8	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest home Q Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Is there a particular reason for	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard? A Correct. The main point of this slide is, most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest home Q Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard? A Correct. The main point of this slide is, most of the activity is from existing sources. The contribution
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Is there a particular reason for that?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest homeQ Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard? A Correct. The main point of this slide is, most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Is there a particular reason for that? THE WITNESS: There's no standard. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: In the report we show, we show risk	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest home Q Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard? A Correct. The main point of this slide is, most of the activity is from existing sources. The contribution from the pipeline and the incremental sources is a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	upon the state's monitoring data that's been collected at those three locations, two of which are monitored by the Maryland Department of the Environment and one in Arlington, which was monitored by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. So we got about to NO2 annual average. Again, the modeling of all the sources, we're showing a six and an eight, a background of 6.8; totals shown of 13 to 15 or so micrograms relative to a 100-microgram-per-cubic-meter standard. And finally, for PM 2.5 24-hour, the total modeling for the school and the pool with background and all the sources, 28.6 and 28.7 relative to a 35 standard. And finally, the PM 2.5 annual average, with background and all sources included, I was showing 10.9 to 11.0 and that again is based upon a background of 10.8. MR. GROSSMAN: I notice you don't show the volatile organic compounds in this chart. THE WITNESS: Correct. MR. GROSSMAN: Is there a particular reason for that? THE WITNESS: There's no standard. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the standard. Q And so the red sliver at the top of each of those, those bars represents what exactly? A That would be the gas, incremental gas station sources. This is the party we're talking about right here, the Costco gas station. The green would have been, at this point in time, the Costco warehouse and that would have included Dick's. The blue is, again, it's going to be background plus the modeling of existing sources. Q And these would be in terms of exposures to whom? A This would be the exposure at the closest home Q Yes. A in Kensington Heights, the school, as well as the Kenmont pool. Q And so even when you add the emissions from the Costco operations and the mall and you add it to the background level, it still is falling below the annual particulate standard? A Correct. The main point of this slide is, most of the activity is from existing sources. The contribution from the pipeline and the incremental sources is a very small contribution

	Page 270		Page 272
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have this for each of the pollutants. This is showing eight-hour CO. You can see them a little bit better here because they're more defined. You see the background in blue. This is urban. I'm looking at Slide 38, and it's showing micrograms per cubic meter on the y-axis; again, the home, the school, and the pool; and you find that the concentration is well under the standard. The contribution of incremental is 7.12 percent for home, .74 percent for the school, and 3.2 percent for the pool. This does not show levels of concern relative to the standards. Doing an assessment for the Clean Air Act, getting a permit for an industry, if you show values like this, that's considered acceptable. NO2, again, we're looking at annual in this example, but we're showing urban on the left, rural on the right. They're low in both cases, dominated again by the background existing sources. And the incremental sources, again, are a small contributor, much like the other. Q And what is the percentage contribution from the Costco operations? A The school, the incremental the home, rather, I'm sorry, is 1.18 percent. The incremental contribution to the school, incremental Costco gas station, is .06 percent,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	one-hour standard, they will create a CO hot spot similar to those created at intersections. However, unlike an intersection hot spot, which dissipates over a wider area, the hot spot created with this gas station will not dissipate as quickly and will be a true hot spot, circular in nature, centered around the area that is associated with the queuing. And I'll get to the next paragraph in a second. Would you respond to that? THE WITNESS: Yes. I mean, I testified during the hearing, Parks and Planning, that that statement was incorrect, that this particular area, with the asphalt, concrete, and all of the structures present at that location, it was an urban-type land use, it would have had greater dilution than a rural area would have, and that the statement really was not, was just not on target, it was incorrect. MR. GROSSMAN: Do you know what the source of that conclusion was? They said see Attachment 8. Oh, I don't have the attachments here, but we do have them in this. Attachment 8 and this is from Amy Lindsey, who apparently must have been the one to reach that conclusion according to what Ms. Lindsey says in here, she looks at the eight-hour CO concentrations and comes to this conclusion.
24 25	and the pool is .30 percent contribution. Q Yes. And that's under the urban concentration	24 25	Did you look over Ms. Lindsey's report, this Attachment 8 to the staff report?
	Page 271		Page 273
	Fage 27 I		
1	A Correct	1	
1 2	A Correct Q on Slide 39?	1 2	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go
2 3	Q on Slide 39?A slightly different for the rural, and it goes	2 3	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong?
2	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. 	2	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide
2 3 4 5 6	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the 	2 3 4 5 6	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
2 3 4 5	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. 	2 3 4 5	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. MR. GROSSMAN: Leave that. I'm just looking on 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So her statement just was in conflict with the actual evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. MR. GROSSMAN: Leave that. I'm just looking on page 12 of the technical staff report; that's Exhibit 70. Here's the first paragraph: Staff reviewed three of the six pollutants associated with automobile idling or mobile 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So her statement just was in conflict with the actual evidence. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The next paragraph on paragraph 12 of the staff report says: Additionally, the proposed gas station will create a hot spot in NO2
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. MR. GROSSMAN: Leave that. I'm just looking on page 12 of the technical staff report; that's Exhibit 70. Here's the first paragraph: Staff reviewed three of the six pollutants associated with automobile idling or mobile sources since the anticipated queues of vehicles waiting to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So her statement just was in conflict with the actual evidence. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The next paragraph on paragraph 12 of the staff report says: Additionally, the proposed gas station will create a hot spot in NO2 emissions, and even though the incremental addition will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q on Slide 39? A slightly different for the rural, and it goes from for example, the home, we went from being 1.12 percent to 2.02 percent. Q And can you explain again why it's higher on the rural concentration slide? A Under the rural mode of the model, your dispersion is less. There's less dilution from the atmosphere, so higher concentrations, but as we'll show when we have time, when we get to the point of looking at the terrain analysis, the mall is a very warm source compared to the surroundings. Hotter has greater heat capacity; it has greater mixing potential to dilute pollutants into the surrounding land, and that's why the urban coefficients very much apply under that circumstance. But either way, it's well under the standards, but they're lower with the urban. MR. GROSSMAN: Leave that. I'm just looking on page 12 of the technical staff report; that's Exhibit 70. Here's the first paragraph: Staff reviewed three of the six pollutants associated with automobile idling or mobile 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. And so where did she go wrong? THE WITNESS: Well, I mean, if you look at this Slide 38, going back to eight-hour carbon monoxide MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. THE WITNESS: what she was, I believe, referring to, you see that, first of all, it is an urban setting and she, when we Ms. Lindsey, during her testimony, did indicate that she did not have experience with this, with that sort of designation, urban/rural, and didn't have a lot of modeling experience. The issue was, when she said it was a hot spot for CO, showed the concentration is, you know, at 20 percent of the standard. It's nowhere the it's five times less than the standard is, and there's far less than the CO concentrations along Georgia Avenue and other locations with heavy traffic. So her statement just was in conflict with the actual evidence. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. The next paragraph on paragraph 12 of the staff report says: Additionally, the proposed gas station will create a hot spot in NO2

	Page 274		Page 276
1	then she goes back to Attachment 8. The proposed gas	1	MR. GOECKE: How long are we going to go today,
2	station, therefore, will bring emissions directly into a	2	Mr. Grossman?
3	neighborhood, and these emissions will not dissipate as they	3	MR. GROSSMAN: Well, we usually aim for 5 o'clock.
4	would along a transportation corridor. Can you respond to	4	Is there
5	that?	5	THE WITNESS: We have no time.
6	THE WITNESS: I mean, it's just, it's just	6	BY MR. GOECKE:
7	incorrect. In terms of if you're looking at the gas station	7	Q Then we probably shouldn't start this.
8	property and look at the flow towards the neighborhood, down	8	A Yeah. That's going to take more than 10 minutes.
9	the hill towards Kensington Heights, first of all, it's	9	Q Yes.
10	traveling past a forested or wooded area that I mentioned	10	A Well, should I just continue with the current
11	would create, I didn't say a lot, but 10 or 15 percent	11	slide set?
12	further dilution, and that can be justified by the	12	Q Let's go back to Slide 39, I think we're on.
13	literature. So it would have more dilution, and plus, on	13	MR. GROSSMAN: Sure.
14	its way down there, while it's traveling over the mall	14	THE WITNESS: Okay.
15	property, it would be getting an enhanced mixing because of	15	MR. GROSSMAN: I mean, how much longer do you
16	the fact that that surface is so much warmer and more	16	anticipate Mr. Sullivan's testimony will be?
17	thermal than the natural surface. The model doesn't, has	17	MR. GOECKE: Overall?
18	not even quite taken full credit for that. So her comment	18	MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.
19	was, with all due respect, was confused and was not	19	MR. GOECKE: On direct, we are more than halfway
20	consistent with the, with the evidence at hand.	20	through the slide presentation. So what time did we begin?
21	MR. GROSSMAN: All right.	21	1:15. We've gone
22	BY MR. GOECKE:	22	MS. CORDRY: He didn't start until 2:00.
23	Q Is this sort of like you were talking about dose before and Ms. Lindsey is saying that there's going to be an	23 24	MS. HARRIS: I thought you started at 2:00. MR. GOECKE: We started at 2:00, I'm sorry. So
24 25	exposure to the neighborhood but it's	24 25	we've gone for a little under three hours. I don't think
20		25	we ve gone for a little under tillee hours. I don't tillink
	Page 275		Page 277
1		1	-
1	Page 275 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a	1	Page 277 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half.
	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in		it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going
2	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a	2	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half.
2 3	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm	2 3	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next
2 3 4	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban	2 3 4	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words?
2 3 4 5	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than	2 3 4 5	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot.
2 3 4 5 6	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little	2 3 4 5 6	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as near maybe a particular chemical factory. But in this 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value, with a nighttime penalty, was 54.3 decibels. The ordinance,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as near maybe a particular chemical factory. But in this context, nothing happening at this Costco gas station can be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value, with a nighttime penalty, was 54.3 decibels. The ordinance, you know, was, I guess, 65. Now, the more recent ordinance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as near maybe a particular chemical factory. But in this context, nothing happening at this Costco gas station can be construed as any kind of a hot spot. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value, with a nighttime penalty, was 54.3 decibels. The ordinance, you know, was, I guess, 65. Now, the more recent ordinance that we saw, it does show, if it's a, a residential area,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as near maybe a particular chemical factory. But in this construed as any kind of a hot spot. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value, with a nighttime penalty, was 54.3 decibels. The ordinance, you know, was, I guess, 65. Now, the more recent ordinance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A Well, that, that's a good point because, in looking at the NO2 again, when she brought that up as a concern, and we have a value way down here I mean, I'm looking at Slide 39, looking at the closest home, the urban concentrations and the value is substantially less than 20. The standard is 100, and the incremental is a little sliver. So to conclude that the gas station is causing a point of concern for that home relative to established standards just is, is not correct. Q Would the incremental contribution from Costco create a hot spot? A No. Q What's a hot spot? A Well, a hot spot is defined several different ways, but it's a lot of times defined in transportation planning as an area from traffic creates a hot spot, like the HOT lanes on 395 or major construction projects. Also, it's used sometimes in the context of air toxics for an area that has particularly high levels of concentrations, such as near maybe a particular chemical factory. But in this context, nothing happening at this Costco gas station can be construed as any kind of a hot spot. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 it'll take another three hours, but I would think it's going to take at least another hour and a half. MR. GROSSMAN: We can't squeeze him in in the next 10 minutes, in other words? MR. GOECKE: We cannot. We cannot. THE WITNESS: I have to talk very, very fast. MR. GOECKE: It gets even more confusing if we go that fast. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. All right then, yes, let him continue on until 5:00. BY MR. GOECKE: Q Let's talk about noise. A Okay. In terms of noise, we did two things. One is we did noise monitoring at the Sterling gas station to get an indication of a very similar gas station what the noise levels were and also did modeling of the noise levels. As a summary here, we showed that the noise levels were below the County ordinance, weren't particularly high. The maximum modeled value was, on an average day/night value, with a nighttime penalty, was 54.3 decibels. The ordinance that we saw, it does show, if it's a, a residential area, 65/daytime, 55/nighttime. It's below those values. And for

	Page 278		Page 280
1	So basically, we show with the modeling that the	1	distance of the homes in Kensington Heights. The values
2	values are in range, including after making the relocation	2	aren't all that particularly different based on the odor
3	for the gas station. And from modeling the, all of the	3	lab's analysis.
4	incremental sources, modeling Dick's, modeling Costco's	4	I was at the study. I can tell, yes, sometimes at
5	warehouse, and the gas station operations, adding that onto	5	Sterling we did smell gasoline odors, we did, particularly
6	background, we found values that were below the County	6	in one instance in the wintertime, but that station, again,
7	ordinance level.	7	did not have vent control, and you know, if we did have vent
8	Q And how did you go about modeling the noise	8	control, we would not have smelled any odors at the 300-foot
9	levels?	9	level. We'll show values later that the distances from the
10	A Used a traffic noise model and set it up such that	10	pumping area to the closest home is on the order of about
11	we would dealt with queuing based upon using a	11	290 feet if you just measure it off with a map. It's a
12	two-and-a-half-mile-an-hour traffic speed, and we dealt with	12	little bit closer to the three entry ports to the
13	the ring road, we conservatively did that at 30 miles an	13	underground tanks, probably 230 to 270 or 80 feet or so, but
14	hour to get more, relatively more noise, and had parking	14	what we're finding with Sterling and once we applied a
15	lots covered, as well, in that particular model. The actual	15	twofold dilution factor, we were not finding odors at that
16	contribution above background was, was quite small. It was	16	distance, and that's based upon the wintertime, and we had,
17	not a large contribution. And we showed the results with	17	we had greater odors in the summer. In the summertime, the
18	and without the inclusion of the acoustic wall, which has	18	study we did then, we found, again, at about, you know, 70
19	been termed now a screening wall, but it does have acoustic	19	feet or so, we were not detecting odors. Better dispersion
20	properties which will reduce noise levels.	20	conditions were there, less odors.
21	Q And so what do these levels show us? Is this with	21	MR. GROSSMAN: Now, you actually did some testing
22	the acoustic wall or without?	22	there and sent it over to a lab, is that correct?
23	A This, this, the maximum would be I believe this is without, and the staff asked us to do what's called LDN,	23 24	THE WITNESS: We tested with a bag sample, sent it to a lab, and used the field olfactometer, which allows us
24 25	which has a penalty of, a decibel penalty of, I believe it's	24 25	to dilute and see what dilution we need to not detect the
25		25	
	Page 279		Page 281
1	Page 279 five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I	1	Page 281 odor.
1 2		1 2	
	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I		odor.
2	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested,	2	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels
2 3	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards.	2 3	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling?
2 3 4	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them	2 3 4	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay.
2 3 4 5	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I	2 3 4 5 6 7	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels? A Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an incompatibility penalty that we put in our calculations. In
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels? A Correct. Q Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an incompatibility penalty that we put in our calculations. In about two or three years, when they remove the Stage II and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels? A Correct. Q Okay. A For odors we, we, as I mentioned, we did odor testing at the Sterling facility and we did odor background sampling at Kensington Heights. The values were not all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an incompatibility penalty that we put in our calculations. In about two or three years, when they remove the Stage II and especially as time goes on, as the fleet turns over, we would expect a 4x reduction in odor compared to what we would have measured in Sterling for two reasons. One is due
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels? A Correct. Q Okay. A For odors we, we, as I mentioned, we did odor testing at the Sterling facility and we did odor background sampling at Kensington Heights. The values were not all that different once you get an approximately 2 or 300 feet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an incompatibility penalty that we put in our calculations. In about two or three years, when they remove the Stage II and especially as time goes on, as the fleet turns over, we would expect a 4x reduction in odor compared to what we would have measured in Sterling for two reasons. One is due to the vent, the vent control, the second being due to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	five decibels during the nighttime hours of 10:00 to 7:00, I believe is the time period. We did the LDNs as requested, and again, it came out to be under the standards. Q So the 54.3 decibel level, that's the highest level that you modeled? A Correct, and I can show the values. I have them in let's see here. Maybe I don't have them in here. I just have a summary slide. We certainly, if we need to get back to it next time, we have the report, we can go through and show the modeling of isolines. I don't have them in the particular display. Noise ended up being such a low impact and County staff actually did agree that it was a low impact we didn't put a lot of slides in here, but we certainly can present more on Wednesday if that would be helpful. Q So, but according to this summary, even without the green screen or acoustic wall, your modeling shows that the noise levels will be below the County ordinance levels? A Correct. Q Okay. A For odors we, we, as I mentioned, we did odor testing at the Sterling facility and we did odor background sampling at Kensington Heights. The values were not all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	odor. MR. GROSSMAN: Now, with the noise measurement, was that totally modeling? THE WITNESS: No. We monitored the noise levels at Sterling MR. GROSSMAN: Sterling? Okay. THE WITNESS: and could then compare it to the modeling we did for the Wheaton gas station. They were corroborative MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. THE WITNESS: they were similar magnitudes. Now, as I mentioned earlier, now, Wheaton will have odor control which will greatly reduce the odors, and as the in the next two to three years, Maryland expects to remove what's called the incompatibility period. Right now, some of the cars have on-board canisters, some do not, and what's called Stage II, which has the vapors from the cargo back into the underground tank, there's an incompatibility penalty that we put in our calculations. In about two or three years, when they remove the Stage II and especially as time goes on, as the fleet turns over, we would expect a 4x reduction in odor compared to what we would have measured in Sterling for two reasons. One is due

	Page 282		Page 284
			-
1	So, in summary, for odors we do not we expect	1	MR. GROSSMAN: Let's bring the equipment. I think
2	any odors past the ring road to be rare. I'm not saying	2	that my administrative staff is going to store some stuff
3	it's not, it won't happen. It could happen, rare, and in two, three, four years, it would become more rare over time.	3	for you MS. HARRIS: Yes. Okay.
4	As the canister technology takes over, the penalty with	5	MR. GROSSMAN: but there is a screen there. I
6	Stage II incompatibility goes away; the odor control will be	6	don't know how it functions or if it functions at this point
7	stronger over time, better control.	7	because I don't use that room for hearings or for the
8	This is just showing some perspective on where the	8	council in general. Any other administrative matters that
9	vents are located and the three ports to fill the	9	anybody has?
10	underground tanks. I show the closest home is here. We're	10	(No audible response.)
11	showing the distance as	11	MR. GROSSMAN: Seeing no hands, we are adjourned
12	MR. GROSSMAN: Here being due south of this site.	12	until June 19th.
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry. Due south was the	13	(Whereupon, at 5:02 p.m., the hearing was
14	closest residence.	14	concluded.)
15	BY MR. GOECKE:	15	,
16	Q And this is Slide 43.	16	
17	A Correct.	17	
18	Q The pumping area is, again, 290 feet. The vent is	18	
19	270 feet, and the fill, anywhere between 230 and 260. And,	19	
20	again, for perspective, in Sterling, at 317 feet away, we	20	
21	would, we had detectability in one sample and at two	21	
22	dilutions there was no detectability. That's why we do not	22	
23	expect to have odors here except on rare occasions, and it	23	
24	should improve over time.	24	
25	This is showing us we did the analysis in Sterling	25	
	D 000		
	Page 283		Page 285
1	Page 283 and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's		CERTIFICATE
1 2	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i		Ŭ
	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's		C E R T I F I C A T E DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that
2	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to		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
2 3 4 5	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was		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:
2 3 4 5	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station.		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
2 3 4 5	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot		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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well.		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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our		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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports.		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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman.		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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of an administrative sort, that we need to talk about?		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of an administrative sort, that we need to talk about? Ms. Harris, any		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of an administrative sort, that we need to talk about? MS. HARRIS: There's a screen in that room, I		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of an administrative sort, that we need to talk about? Ms. HARRIS: There's a screen in that room, I believe, correct, or should we just make sure we bring all		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:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and distances that we used, and this is showing us what's called the hedonic scale. That scale goes from minus 10 to plus 10. Minus 10 is the worst odor you could imagine. Ten is the best perfume you can buy. Zero is in the middle. Zero is neutral. And we found on the hedonic scale, it was on the order of minus .2 to minus 1.2 for the gas station. It was fairly similar in Kensington Heights. There's a lot of obviously, there's a lot of traffic there as well. So, yeah, it was, it was similar. The data is in our reports. MR. GOECKE: And I think this may be a good point to break, Mr. Grossman. MR. GROSSMAN: All right. So our next session is on Wednesday, the 19th of June. Don't forget, it's upstairs, seventh floor, council hearing room. Go up to the seventh for those of you who have not been there, go up to the seventh floor elevator and make a right turn, and when you get to the window, stop, make a sharp left, and there's a door there. You enter in that door, and once again, we're at 9:30. Do we have any other matters that, of an administrative sort, that we need to talk about? MS. HARRIS: There's a screen in that room, I		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:

	accurate (1)	
\$	accurate (4) 32:10;105:3;214:10;	a
Ψ	234:21	
\$12 (1) 171:12	accurately (3) 18:12;105:4;209:14	a
1/1:12	achieve (2)	
Α	205:23;208:25	
A bigoil (1)	achieved (1) 255:21	a
Abigail (1) 5:13	achieving (1)	
ability (3)	210:10	
70:24;75:17;76:4 able (6)	acoustic (4) 278:18,19,22;279:17	a
8:10;38:2;150:19;	acre (4)	
180:12;218:7;241:15	16:7,9,23;17:17 acronym (2)	a
above (10) 98:5;174:1,1;186:3;	57:6;251:23	
187:22;188:13;235:10;	across (6)	
236:7,9;278:16	65:21;126:22;129:6; 199:14;253:13;273:23	
absence (1) 11:21	Act (4)	a
absent (1)	189:16;256:10,21;	
196:9	270:11	a
absolutely (3) 85:9;223:18;224:4	acted (1) 228:11	a
abut (3)	activities (2)	
69:23;132:4,6	163:10;264:18 activity (2)	a
abuts (2) 64:14;94:12	43:25;269:21	A
abutting (3)	actual (8)	
35:7;144:19,20	30:17;66:2;95:19; 219:11;242:15;257:20;	
accept (2) 6:3;165:9	273:18;278:15	
acceptable (6)	actually (34)	
25:19;196:3,6,16;	13:21;36:10;42:9; 45:3;52:22;56:25;59:6;	
256:7;270:13 acceptance (1)	70:5;74:3;82:6;87:18;	
167:8	97:9;101:12;106:2;	
accepted (1)	113:16;152:14;155:20; 156:21;162:6;169:4;	a
210:17 access (14)	175:1;181:7;190:17;	a
58:2,9,18;61:22;	215:9,17;220:13,24;	
73:10;78:17;79:5;	222:12;227:11;238:9; 239:2;250:11;279:12;	a
128:5,6,12,16;130:7,9; 131:6	280:21	
accessible (1)	acute (1)	a
76:23	160:15 ADA-compliant (1)	a
accommodate (10) 17:5,7,8;18:19;	86:6	a
19:18,23;20:7,12;78:2;	add (21)	a
137:5	29:8,11;93:1;124:10; 130:8;161:12;176:18;	94
accommodated (4) 17:19,21;18:3;19:8	207:1,3;210:13;216:8;	a
accordance (1)	217:17;222:17;226:11,	A
232:4	20;236:19,20;239:19; 266:6;269:16,17	
according (8) 26:10;149:8;242:12;	added (14)	a
256:20;257:4;259:12;	82:16;121:24;190:8;	
272:21;279:16	207:15;215:11;217:11; 221:24;222:2,5;	a
account (9) 21:11,18;27:9;30:19;	223:13;224:6,6,7;	a
41:21,23;170:7;227:5;	226:15	
256:18	added-on (1)	a

223:22 dding (7) 69:4;215:23;228:16; 236:13:266:1.3:278:5 ddition (6) 15:18,19;17:6;85:15; 269:1;273:22 dditional (12) 6:23;7:6;14:19,22; 60:17,18;99:3;191:22; 193:13;209:2;222:8; 224:7 dditionally (2) 70:25;273:20 ddress (12) 11:17;45:6;82:1,23; 116:3;158:16;169:3, 17;171:9;181:17; 182:6,15 ddressed (5) 32:15,20;47:16; 181:23.24 ddresses (3) 43:23;44:15;171:15 ddressing (3) 11:13;68:24;252:17 dds (1) 83:9 DELMAN (52) 5:11,11,13,13:10:5; 24:13:96:4,5,8,16,18, 23:97:8.11.15.21:98:3. 8,14;100:8,12,21; 101:10,16,16,17;102:5, 8;104:10,14,17,18; 105:6,8,20,23;106:2,9, 20.25;107:5.8,10; 108:10,21;241:20; 242:5;252:2,6,9,11,13 dequate (6) 87:7,10;88:8;95:15; 191:4:256:24 djoining (6) 18:8;79:12;109:15; 135:4;145:12,22 djoins (1) 132:9 djourned (1) 284:11 djusted (1) 242:11 djustment (2) 212:19;243:5 **Administrative** (4) 168:15;283:21; 284:2,8 dministrator (3) 160:6,20;191:2 dmission (1) 160:24 dmitted (2) 180:6;245:5 dopted (3)

26:15:63:14:94:15 adopting (1) 82:7 adoption (1) 115:25 advance (5) 6:8;10:17;195:2; 222:14:242:23 advanced (1) 85:1 advancements (1) 176:8 advantage (1) 162:21 adverse (5) 44:17;140:3,5; 188:14;254:5 Advisory (1) 160:19 advocacy (1) 95:5 advocating (2) 68:10;96:2 aerial (11) 36:13;38:9;40:19; 51:21;52:1,2;53:9; 74:1;78:7;134:3; 142:13 AERMET (2) 212:25,25 AERMOD (5) 203:24:209:12.16: 210:9:212:24 affect (9) 12:9;15:20,24; 118:22;119:2;169:22. 24;193:8;214:3 affected (2) 214:7;233:2 affects (3) 70:16;125:10;180:23 afraid (1) 30:21 again (50) 4:13;15:5;31:19; 34:3;41:16;43:23; 44:23;67:22;79:6;95:4; 104:6;123:2,4,5; 124:24;135:1,3;136:6; 142:7;149:23;150:1; 159:23;178:11;184:23; 199:23:221:11:231:19: 238:18;260:8;261:4; 263:21;264:8,18; 265:2;266:12;267:7, 15;269:9;270:5,14,16, 18;271:6;275:2;279:3; 280:6,18;282:18,20; 283:20 against (3) 86:10,24;95:5 agencies (1) 154:9

agency (2) 168:14;230:21 Agliata (3) 29:23;30:16;31:6 **A-G-L-I-A-T-A** (1) 31:6 Agliata's (1) 31:2 ago (5) 93:14:99:15:176:10; 257:2;264:20 agree (32) 10:22;91:18;120:25; 122:13,14;162:3,3; 166:19;177:22;182:25; 184:3;197:10;203:14; 205:6,10,19;206:1,18, 19,21;207:21;211:3; 213:9,10;234:17; 239:16;240:12;242:14; 254:1,2,8;279:12 agreeable (1) 168:4 agreed (6) 13:16;184:17; 205:24;209:6;211:1; 241:5 agreement (3) 13:14;205:5;209:10 agreements (2) 28:22:209:1 ahead (16) 17:13:61:11:67:16; 96:3;104:16;106:19, 24;121:7;141:24; 151:14;173:21;181:15; 182:14,17;226:9; 237:17 aim(1)276:3 air (88) 70:1;154:3.5.5.24; 155:18,23;156:1; 157:9,12,13,19,24; 158:2,4,5,13,16,17; 159:2;160:11,15,25; 161:4,5,14,18,19,22, 24;162:4;165:10,13, 18;166:20,22;173:23; 174:3;175:2,4;177:12, 12,13,17;178:21,22; 180:23;181:14;183:9; 186:4;187:19,20,21,25; 188:12;189:15,25; 190:23;191:8,21; 192:24;195:13,18; 198:6;201:11,18,23,25; 202:6,15;224:17; 230:6;235:6;243:23; 248:10;254:3,5,13,15; 256:10,20;257:24; 258:1,7,11;268:3; 270:11;275:18

	WHOLESALE COKI O	KATION		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	000 16 014 05 015 14	100 00 104 0 111 15	• • • • •	144 16 160 17 162 16
airport (3)	208:16;214:25;215:14,	100:22;104:8;111:15	appropriate (7)	144:16;160:17;163:16;
212:16;213:4,4	15;232:24;233:16;	anticipate (2)	47:17;48:16;56:16;	166:17;181:18,19;
Alexandria (2)	236:19,20;253:2;256:1	235:15;276:16	77:24;79:11;102:13;	206:9;216:20;226:14;
154:3;185:5	amplifying (1)	anticipated (3)	197:8	232:8;257:20,23;259:6
alignment (1)	20:2	169:23;265:16;	approval (1)	argue (6)
72:3	Amy (4)	271:22	55:8	85:24;92:4,11,16,24;
allegation (1)	247:2,5,10;272:20	antipollution (1)	approve (1)	220:20
184:13	analogy (2)	172:7	86:9	argument (2)
allow (7)	254:9;255:12	AP (1)	approved (4)	88:19;189:8
4:6;116:20;122:23;	analyses (1)	232:2	21:11,19;93:5;	Arid (15)
123:10;168:20;246:15;	159:6	apologize (3)	178:19	171:5;172:8,9,18;
254:16	analysis (87)	22:20;67:9,11	approximate (2)	193:2,14,24;194:16,22;
allowed (9)	6:1,5,8,20;15:16,20,	apparent (3)	75:5,13	197:16,19;201:6;
55:8;90:3;91:14;	24;26:11;41:12,14;	41:24;101:25;102:9	approximately (27)	213:15,16,21
93:15;100:16;116:2;	44:11;45:11,17;49:18;	apparently (2)	17:17;30:12,24;	Arlington (6)
124:22;127:2;138:24	102:16,20;103:17,21,	8:18;272:20	31:11,25;32:7,8;35:4;	207:12;243:14;
allowing (2)	25;104:12;105:22;	Appeals (9)	42:18,20;53:4;73:7;	248:25;249:11;266:13;
100:15;168:19	106:3,5,13,18;153:21;	4:4,18,20;86:8;87:2;	74:5,21;75:3,5,7;77:9;	267:4
allows (2)	154:6;155:24;156:8,	88:16;168:9,13,16	132:17;179:7,8,10;	around (21)
192:24;280:24	10,11,21;157:10,12;	appear (1)	193:15;201:7;239:22;	11:23;79:21;80:17;
,				
almost (4)	158:17;159:15;161:1,	87:24	264:13;279:24	130:18;137:19;149:7;
60:21;134:11;	1,7,9,22,23;162:4,7;	appeared (1)	April (1)	183:3,5;197:17,18;
145:21;235:23	163:8,9;164:24,25;	87:25	4:11	198:17;199:16;218:4;
along (41)	165:6,11,14;166:20,21;	appears (3)	arbitrary (5)	220:21;248:4;249:17,
12:3;29:10;33:3;	170:3,8;178:24;	63:5;134:18;170:19	173:11;174:4,21;	18,19;262:4;264:23;
				272:6
42:4;59:1;60:11;65:2,	179:17;193:1,3;	apples (1)	196:11,22	
16,20;66:6;69:3;73:18,	201:24;202:16;203:14;	18:12	architectural (1)	arrive (1)
19;77:20;85:8,9,13;	209:2,11;210:21,23;	applicability (1)	97:12	31:22
86:6;89:9,10;96:10;	213:18;214:9;215:20,	189:22	area (112)	arrow (8)
107:13;111:25;112:2;	21;216:4;218:20,21;	applicable (6)	14:20;16:5;39:7,14;	57:23;58:3,12;66:20;
127:20;129:22;130:2;	219:2,24;220:6;221:3;	127:3;190:16;202:1;	40:2;44:16;49:12;54:3;	67:20;69:8;72:11;
132:10;135:21;137:9;	230:7;231:5,11,25;	212:16;259:19;268:11	56:7,13;58:6,6,7,19;	134:18
144:17,17;145:15,15;	232:24;239:11;243:23;	applicant (12)	61:6;65:22,23;67:2,3,	arrows (9)
149:3;150:8,9,18;	271:11;280:3;282:25	5:1;27:23,25;28:7;	18,21,24;69:5;72:16;	58:14,14;61:23;62:1;
223:22;273:16;274:4	analyze (16)	47:4;85:24;101:4;	75:25;76:14;77:17,19;	65:24;69:9;70:15;
alongside (1)	50:19,23;51:1,14;	104:19;106:7;173:23,	78:12,14,15;101:1,6,	129:2;137:17
84:22	68:9;69:11;70:6,14,17;	25;225:23	22;102:1;108:6,6;	aside (1)
always (3)	118:19,23;119:3,19;	applicant's (5)	109:8,12,15;110:20;	231:3
84:21;185:9;194:17	202:5,19,20	6:3;7:1;9:17;107:17;	111:7;112:8,16;	aspect (2)
ambient (11)	analyzed (2)	131:16	113:20;114:16,17;	49:15;256:3
181:14;186:4;	41:22;263:14	application (13)	118:16;120:13;121:3;	aspects (1)
187:20,25;188:12;	anchors (1)	13:10;24:24,25;	124:6;125:15;127:2;	203:19
191:8,15;202:6;	27:18	31:15;43:12;86:9;	128:11;129:3,22;	asphalt (2)
227:23;235:6;268:3	and/or (4)	140:13;142:14;143:3,	132:6,20,21,22;133:1,	259:11;272:11
amended (3)	47:16;85:6;122:24;	12;184:5;185:1;196:11	6,7;135:5,6;136:3,12,	assembly (1)
11:11,12;84:5	123:11	applied (3)	22;149:4,7;158:12,13;	90:10
amendment (5)		193:19;221:5;280:14	167:2;169:10;170:11;	asserted (1)
	anemometer (1)			
15:20;26:13,19;	186:23	applies (3)	173:4;175:4;178:18,	244:18
28:21;140:15	Angeles (3)	227:20,22;261:23	23;180:18,24;185:3;	assertion (2)
amenities (3)	252:22;253:2,8	apply (7)	190:4,21;193:19;	181:17;184:8
129:4;130:7;131:7	announced (2)	14:25;15:4;120:9;	210:15;214:6;216:24;	assess (2)
amenity (1)	6:12;160:19		217:3,5;226:13,13,22;	157:13;258:18
• • •		126:22;188:4;197:7;		
70:10	annual (27)	271:15	227:21,23;229:5;	assessing (1)
American (1)	179:5;206:15;	applying (1)	247:14;249:17;264:24;	159:7
154:19	211:12,13;227:13,19,	206:11	266:25;272:3,6,11,14;	assessment (10)
Amherst (2)	20;232:20;233:15;	appreciate (1)	273:23;274:10;275:16,	159:19,20;176:23,
112:3,4	234:12;243:12,13;	88:24	18;277:22;279:25;	24;178:1,6,25;191:19;
among (4)	246:19,23;250:3;	approach (8)	280:10;282:18	202:8;270:11
57:6;90:12;92:6;	253:21;260:21,23;	196:4;203:13;	areas (26)	assistant (1)
191:10	261:4;262:3,16;	207:16;208:8,21;	34:12,22;57:7;65:22;	160:19
amount (17)	264:25;267:7,14;	225:16,21;262:7	67:20;81:20;111:23,	assists (1)
171:2,7,19;175:11;	268:7;269:18;270:14	approached (1)	24;122:24;123:11;	14:20
	answered (3)	184:19		
183:7;193:13;194:6;	answereu (3)	104.17	128:10;129:14;130:10;	associated (9)

25:8;70:10;170:5; 131:18 175:16;202:9,19; 237:23;271:21;272:6 86:3 Association (9) authority (2) 5:6,8,16:9:7:10:8: 108:23;152:11;166:9, auto (4) 19 Association's (1) 6:25 assume (11) 46:5,10;90:16,21; 105:4;121:1;145:17; 170:2;200:19;225:8; available (14) 228:19 assumed (7) 170:22;215:1;216:5, 9;217:4;218:20;219:11 assuming (17) Avenue (18) 46:8;76:10;90:13; 119:12;149:24;178:19; 190:5;199:14;211:14; 218:1,3,19;219:22; 224:16,24;225:1,4 assumption (13) 273:17 average (28) 13:24;47:4;92:19,22, 25;108:14,17;130:23; 139:11;211:9;215:13; 218:3:225:9 assumptions (9) 199:3;210:25;228:9; 232:12;234:13,14,16; 235:10:243:6 asthmatics (3) 188:7;256:9,19 averages (2) atmosphere (4) averaging (3) 178:18;180:20; 183:20:271:9 233:10 at-risk (1) avoids (1) 188:7 attached (2) 225:22 80:22;183:6 awarded (1) Attachment (4) 154:20 272:18,20,24;274:1 aware (25) attachments (1) 272:19 attempting (1) 106:4 attend (2) 108:11,17 attendant (1) 229:25 172:12 away (10) attention (10) 16:10;40:1;51:18; 57:19,22;68:5;81:4,8; 82:5;84:16 192:14 attribute (1) 216:16 atypical (1) 231:12 audible (4) back (54) 5:19;131:19;166:12; 284:10audience (1)

78:23;84:3;86:2;89:1; auditorium (1) 95:18:96:22:97:2:98:2: 99:18:105:3:125:5: 126:14;129:1;136:6; 174:11,12 151:8,10;152:20,21; 153:7;154:12;155:5; 52:19;53:7;55:7,20 157:17;178:16;199:5, automobile (6) 7,10,11,21;210:15; 4:7;53:4;55:22,25; 222:10,21;228:4; 94:7:271:21 230:22;233:1;241:11, automobiles (2) 14;273:5;274:1; 130:8;131:7 276:12;279:9;281:18 background (78) 22:5;49:5;184:22; 61:7;96:8;179:6,10; 185:11,12,15,15;207:2; 183:15;192:4;206:21; 223:4;226:1;228:23; 207:6;208:19;215:8, 249:15,18,19 11,14,24;224:12; 225:20;226:4;227:15; 20:21;61:3;73:22,23; 228:2,12;231:10; 78:21;80:9;129:19,20; 238:1,7,7,9;239:1,19; 138:18,23;226:11; 243:10,11,22;246:18, 24:248:8:255:17: 231:9:232:6:260:17: 264:1;265:19;268:21; 256:12;258:13,19; 260:11,12,13,19;261:3, 15,17,18,23,24;262:13, 30:12,25;31:11,22; 20;264:2,3,7,16;265:8, 54:11;108:3;192:10, 9,21,23,23,25;266:1,3, 12;207:6;211:13,14; 12,17,20,25;267:1,9, 212:2;228:5;233:15, 12,14,16;268:19,20; 21;234:12;239:14,15; 269:10,18;270:3,17; 242:10:249:1:253:21; 278:6,16:279:22 261:4:262:16:264:25: backwards (1) 267:7,14:268:8:277:19 187:15 bad (4) 232:24;248:25 162:18,20;254:7; 255:7 211:13:214:14; bag (1) 280:23 bailiwick (1) 197:11 **Baltimore** (1) 158:10 Bank (2) 27:12;42:3;46:12; 129:19;154:8 48:2;54:4;95:4,17; bare (1) 96:1;102:9,12;103:4, 171:20 19,23;104:2,5,19; bars (1) 105:9;122:18;135:24; 269:4 136:4,5,10,14;191:17; base (3) 97:18;109:25;110:1 based (57) 54:9;68:22;145:21, 6:2:25:20:28:13: 23;208:6;216:10; 47:5;49:13,17;86:11; 218:5;227:5;282:6,20 103:6,6;110:2,17,23; A-weighted (1) 111:17;118:15,17; 120:5;124:9;125:23; 139:7;140:19;143:21, B 22;166:25;167:3; 168:12;170:17;172:5, 7:173:13:181:19: 16:10:19:13:29:8: 186:13;187:18;193:3; 32:5;34:7,16,19;55:11, 195:21;203:12,23; 12;57:13,15;66:2;69:4; 208:21;209:2;212:2;

214:8;226:21;230:17, 20;232:1,7;257:1,19, 19,21;260:11;264:7; 267:1,1,16;278:11; 280:2,16 bases (1) 47:6 basic (2) 60:19;192:3 basically (17) 26:12;65:7;108:1; 132:14;170:20;187:10; 212:16;217:12,15; 224:21;227:25;241:17; 248:11;252:25;257:11; 259:5;278:1 basis (13) 54:16;71:2;171:11; 174:5;177:1;180:16; 203:22;206:15;212:21; 227:19,20;230:1; 243:11 bear (1) 68:9 bearing (3) 15:15;128:20;184:6 became (4) 27:15;49:4;154:17; 251:6 become (5) 61:20:104:15:155:9: 249:18:282:4 becomes (2) 47:2:62:8 becoming (1) 158:1 bedroom (1) 99:4 begin (5) 73:12;74:24,25;75:3; 276:20 beginning (3) 59:22;60:22;222:10 begins (6) 73:5,8;76:24;90:23; 103:16;200:5 begun (1) 4:11behalf (6) 4:17;5:1,4;9:6,16; 164:9 behavior (4) 155:14;162:17,18,20 behind (3) 128:24;129:1;209:9 **Bel** (1) 18:21 believes (2) 170:1;246:10 below (36) 40:3;174:1,2;177:24, 24;187:19,22,22,23; 188:8,9,17;189:2,25;

190:7;191:24,24; 192:6;235:16,23; 236:1,1:253:19,21; 256:12;260:7,22,23; 269:18,25;271:25; 277:18,23,25;278:6; 279:18 **Beltsville** (10) 207:12;243:14; 248:24;249:11;250:12, 24;251:2,7,12;266:13 benchmark (7) 174:5;183:11; 187:21;188:1,3; 196:12:268:3 benchmarks (1) 190:18 beneath (1) 263:21 best (6) 24:4:57:4:180:15; 208:22;230:1;283:4 better (9) 88:12;99:13;129:7; 188:17;189:2;228:1; 270:2;280:19;282:7 beyond (8) 91:17;130:21; 141:21;166:16;193:4; 207:18:254:13,17 Bhopal (1) 160:5 bias (1) 251:12 biased (1) 251:7 bicycle (1) 136:24 bicvcles (1) 137:5 bicyclist (1) 139:19 big (10) 58:11;61:23;175:21; 193:14,14;199:18; 209:6;213:14;237:10; 243:8 biggest (1) 172:19 bike (19) 58:16:79:25:84:21; 85:7;137:8,14,16,16, 17,18,25;138:1,3,7,8, 10,11,12;139:13 bikes (4) 67:23;138:24; 139:14,18 bikeway (1) 79:21 bikeways (2) 81:7;82:12 bit (18) 23:21;39:5;157:15;

158/2017210.078147 146(10,14,17,194.24) 175.9 7.31/215.1137.5,11; cmp (1) 20010220102241122292.3 break (5) break (6)	PETITION OF COSTCO	WHOLESALE CORPO	RATION		
2006:10:210:18;215:17; 204:4 Image () 139:51:409,11:41:5; 239:16 221:10:224:1227; 579:189:13;241:6; 121:11 129:16:11:15:04;13:14:15; cares (5) 232:123:02:1230:23; 579:189:13;241:6; 128:51 157:15:1061;2;163:4; cares (5) Blair (1) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) Size (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) Blair (1) Bis (7) 22:441:01:52:0;11:42:5; 128:11:139:16: 175:20:22:16:18:14; Size (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) Blair (1) Bis (7) 122:11:10:12:20; 120:17:10:12:20; 123:11:10:12:20; Size (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) breakdown (2) 122:11:10:12:20; 123:11:12:12:20; 123:11:12:12:12:20; 123:11:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:	150 00 150 10 150 14		175.0		
221:10:23:11:23:23:23 break (5) 121:21 142:91:40:11,51,925 183:325:53 232:18:19,21:23:23:23 233:12 233:12 233:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,925:12:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:15:01:12,92:12 183:13:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:91:16 123:11:13:12:12 124:11:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14:14					
222.81(9):21:230-23: 579:189:13:241-67; puy (1) 148:150-41.31.41.55; cars (50) Blair (1) breakdown (2) 583:12 breakdown (2) 583:12 breakdown (2) 16:16 18:63:188:18 breakdown (2) 157:15:1604.12:1634.1 157:16:16				139:6;140:9,11;141:5;	
23218.19.21239-23. 57.91891.3241-67. pur (1) 148.11504.13.14.15. rars (5) Blair (1) breakdown (2) 58.5188.18 rars (5) 157.151601.21.6154. 157.151601.21.6156. 157.151601.21.6156.	221:10;224:11;227:9;	break (5)	121:21	142:9;146:11,15,19,25;	carpets (2)
270:2280:12 283:12 283:14 15:00:152:91:15:16 128:14 15:71:51:00:12.16:34, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.16:32, 15:71:51:00:12.17:10:12.20, 16:10:31:12:00:12, 16:10:31:12:00:12, 16:10:31:12:00:12, 16:10:31:12:02:12, 17:20:90:21:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10 283:14 15:71:51:00:12, 17:20:45:12:12, 17:20:45:12:12, 17:20:45:12:12, 17:20:45:12:12, 10:11:11:15:10, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:12, 10:10:10:11:11:11:11:11:11:10:10:11:11:1		57:9:189:13:241:6.7:	buy (1)	148:1:150:4.13.14.15.	
Blair (1) breakdown (2) breakdown (2					
l6:16 B60:31:88:18 C B16:16:15:16:92.22: 175:20:22:178:89.21: J2:19:44:78:15 Breenthe (1) B18:7 22:24:116:20:118:11, 175:24:179:24:179:20:21:16:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 180:9.15:18:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:85:19: 175:20:12:14:15:10: 175:20:12:14:15:10: 175:20:12:14:15:10: 175:20:12:14:15:10:12:14:15:10: 175:20:12:14:15:10:11:11:12:15:15:12:13:14:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:			265.4		
			C		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			C		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
	73:10;75:17;76:7,12,	183:5	C-2 (32)	177:22;178:24;179:20;	198:8,8;200:11,15,16;
	22	breathing (1)	4:11:55:9:114:2.5.	180:9,15;185:19;	201:16;211:14,18,19;
8:219-437:15; 57:23:129-216713; 57:23:129-216713; 16:429-12.26812, 57:23:129-216713; 17:209-920164 Brewer (1) 12:21:119:1,220; 12:12:123:10,12, 12:23:25:123:10,12, 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:213-90,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2009:203:15:2049,10; 2017:12:207:12; 2017:12:2012; 2017:12:2022; 2	Blue (12)			186:15.15:189:19.22:	
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· · · · ·				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					· · · · ·
Bineridge (a) Drief (3) 125:13.18.24;127.2 209:13.15:13.93.10.6 235:73232.91.51.6 200:21:10.11;112.4 bring (b) 16:10.814:242.22: cable (1) 217:12:218:13.22: 233:2352:1237.1. Board (1S) 16:10.814:242.22: cable (1) 222:24:235.55.1.4. 21:25:281.1.9 38:20.51:19.24.868.8 69:17 19:11.82:29:26:266.2 241:92:242:15:241.1.9 237:14:238:22:29:8.8. 38:20.51:19.24.868.8 69:17 19:11.82:29:22:24:1.1.7 240:16:16.17,19.11.1.22.9. 241:16:16.16.17,19.11.1.22.2.22:23:3.9. 36:20 broadt (1) 53:39:14:33:17; 268:17:27:22:1.25; 268:693:11:41.9:14:27.2. 20:17.7 36:20 brown (1) 155:21:158:13:159:20; 278:69.31:44:19:14:27.2. 23:14:17:26:18:16:17 20:17:14:14:19:14:27.2. 36:20 BS (1) called (23) 176:24:178:1; 23:18:18:249:32:52:13:10; 278:16:16:10:15:18:20:22:19:51:54; 36:10 154:14 98:51:06:61:40:15; 19:15:18:20:22:19:51:54; 23:18:12:2:22:19:2:15:16; 23:18:12:2:22:25:19:51:54; 39:45 Duffer (42) 155:21:2:2:2:2:2; caniere (6) cacacre (6) <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
bitish (1) bring (6) 189:13 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:28:5.5.14, 242:15:281:19 222:24:23:28:5.5.14, 242:15:221:13:16 222:24:23:28:5.5.14, 242:15:221:13:16:19 38:20:51:19,24:86:51, 12:66:21:00:19:168:2, 36:20 brown (1) brown (1) 11:8:229:66:28:2, 215:56:14:07:158:10; 35:61:40:155:10; 35:61:40:155:10; 35:61:40:155:10; 35:21 223:14.23:44, 233:44 242:15:221:52:23:30, 201:724:114:9:142:14 242:15:221:52:23:30, 201:724:114:9:142:14 boards (2) brown (1) 15:56:14:07:155:10; 15:72:21:58:3.4.25; 58:11 10:11:47:16:80:189:10: 175:22:158:3.4.25; 58:11 233:44 10:11:21:62:20:11; 16:01:43:114:9:142:21:22:20:11; 16:01:43:125:20:11; 16:01:43:125:20:21:55:16 235:18:249:3:25:23:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		57:14;106:6;241:13	cable (1)	217:12;218:13,22;	233:3;235:21;237:1,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	bluish (1)	bring (6)	189:13	222:24;223:5,5,5,14,	21;252:18,25;253:1,3,
Board (18) 274:2283:24:284:1 242:15:281:19 237:14:238:2239:88; case (3) 43:17:20:66:21; broader (1) Galifornia (3) 241:15:229:6268:2 241:19:242:15:249:19; 242:16:22:15:16; 38:20:51:19.24;86:8; 69:17 p1:18:229:6268:2 241:92:242:15:249:19; 242:12:25:15.22;33:9, 12:62:21:10:19:10:82; 207:17 p1:539:14:53:10; 252:16:254:11.42, 18,23; 10:11:49:69:68:15; 50ards (1) brown (1) 135:61:407:155:10; 279:69,14:280:4; 191:12; 192:25:195:15; 50ards (2) brown (1) 155:61:407:155:10; 238:14 191:12; 192:25:195:15; bold (1) 154:14 98:510:66:140:15; 176:24:178:1; 235:18:249:3:253:23; bold (2) 154:14 98:510:66:140:15; 191:15,18:202:8:25 case (3) bold (2) 14:19,21,21,22:21; 100:14:179:11:184:11; 160:13 160:42:31:25:270:16 59:4.5 11:12,14:23:23:22; 181:12 52:1 cast (1) 10:42:12:5270:16 bord (2) 92:17,111:44:179:17:18;:14; 138:12 132:12:23:12;22:24:23:12;22:24:23:12;22:24:23:12;22:24:23:12;22:24:23:12;22:24:23:			calculations (2)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			9:15;39:14;53:17;	268:1;270:2;271:6;	88:6;93:1;141:9;142:7,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	13,16;191:21;217:22	brought (3)	106:13;110:10;112:7;	274:4,12;275:21,25;	20;174:8,11;175:8;
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	boards (1)	182:22;228:6;275:2	135:6:140:7:153:10:	279:6,9,14;280:4;	179:12;186:9;189:10;
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
68:15:126:20BS (1)called (23)176:24:178:1: (21)235:18:249:3:253:23: (25)bull (1)154:1498:5:106:6:140:15; (15):22:158:3:4,25; (16):14:179:11:184:11; (16):13176:24:178:1: (19):15:18:20:8.25235:18:249:3:253:23: (25):13boll (2)14:19.21.21.22:21:5: (10):14:179:11:184:11; (11)160:13160:13160:4:179:11:184:11; (11)160:4:179:11:184:11; (11)160:13160:4:179:11:18:12case (3)border (1)29:17.11.14.17.20:22, (23:93:11,13,15:95:8; (23:93:11,13,15:95:8; (23:93:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:8; (23:39:11,13,15:95:15:23:01:10,17; (23:312:25:15:23:01:10,13,16 (23:34:26:52:15:23:01:18,214*; (23:11:10:15; (23:12:22:16:15:23:01:18,214*; (23:12:12:22:16:25) (23:82:21:16:25)176:24:178:11; (23:13:28:25 (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:23:12:17:13)176:24:178:11; (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:12:23:17:13)176:24:178:11; (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:13:28:25) (23:12:28:21)176:12:12:12:12:12:12; (23:11:15:15:12:12:12) (23:11:15:15:12:12:12) (23:11:12:15:12:12:12) (23:11:12:15:12:12:12)18:12 (23:11:12:15:12:12:12) (23:11:12:15:12:12:12) (23:11:12:15:12:12:12) (23:11:12:11:11:15:12:12:12:12) (23:11:12:12:12:12:12:13:11:12; (23:11:12:12:12:12:13:13:11:12; (23:11:12:11:11:13:11:11:11:12:13:111:11:12:13:111:11:12:13:111:11:12:13:111:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11:11					
			<i>,</i>		
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
bollards (2) 14:19.21,21,22;21:5; 160:14:179:11;184:11; 160:13 160:4;231:25;270:16 15:18;47:14 89:15,17;90:4,14,17, 190:12;192:23;209:11; 181:12 candles (1) cast (1) book (2) 21,23;25;91:3,5,71,0 21:14,25;232:2; 181:12 cast (1) 59:4,5 11,12,14,23;24,25; 248:10;251:3,4; canister (2) catch (1) borrow (2) 132:19,21;145:8,14; 146:1;150:4 191:24;257:11 14,15:230:2;281:16,25 categories (3) both (2) build (3) calling (2) 191:24;257:11 14,15:230:2;281:16,25 categories (3) 160:13;192:19,21; 17;51:12;53:9,19,20, calling (1) 203:8;271:13 cause (8) 238:8,8;260:2;261:23; building (1) 137:18:228:6;241:3, carme (8) carme (8) 23:19:268:8;270:16 built (9) 137:18:228:6;241:3, 7.10;23:14;251:14 275:7 24:28:259:1;263:15 208:11:225:19 30:93:21:238:7,15; 235:5;236:14,17,19,20; 275:7 24:28:259:1;263:15 208:11:225:19 30:93:21:238:7,15; 235:5;236:14,17,19,20; 275:7 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
book (2) 21,23,25;91:3,5,7,10, 11,12,14,23,24,25; 212:14,25;232:2; 248:10,251:3,4; 181:12 5:21 border (1) 92:17,11,14,17,20,22, 23:93:11,13,15;95:8; 23:82:2 cath (1) catch (1) borrow (2) 132:1,9,21;145:8,14; 146:1;150:4 191:24;257:11 145:5;200:10,13, 160:25;165:15;236:2 160:16 both (22) build (3) calls (1) 98:18 203:8;271:13 cause (8) 145:12;150:7;158:8; 4:16;49:23;50:1,8, 16:0:13;192:19,21; 17;51:12;53:9,19,20, 245:46;62:4;219:9 came (8) cause (3) 205:22;215:17;232:10; 24:54:6;62:4;219:9 88:21;110:15; cause (1) 275:7 238:8,8;260:2;261:23; built (9) Can (66) car (10) causing (1) 275:7 24:8;12;25:19 24:51:19:61;51:72;2; 16:21:17:21:18:3; 71:0;23:14;25:114 car (10) causing (1) 32:6;34:20;52:24; 78:10;25:197:22; 16:21:17:21:18:3; 71:0;23:14;25:114 car (10) 58:16:67:22:194:6; 275:7 built (9) built (9) 10:2:17:21:18:3; 71:0;23:14;25:114 car (10) 58:16:67:22:194:6; 275:7					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				candles (1)	
border (1) 92:1,7,11,14,17,20,22, 278:24;281:15,17; 213:13;282:5 85:22 91:11 23;93:11,13,15;95:8; 283:2 canisters (9) identify and the second s	book (2)	21,23,25;91:3,5,7,10,	212:14,25;232:2;		
border (1) 92:1,7,11,14,17,20,22, 23;93:11,13,15;95:8; 278:24;281:15,17; 283:2 213:13;282:5 85:22 91:11 23;93:11,13,15;95:8; 283:2 canisters (9) 160:25;165:15;236:2 borrow (2) 132:1,9,21;145:8,14; 146:1;150:4 191:24;257:11 194:55;200:10,13, 160:25;165:15;236:2 both (22) build (3) calls (1) capacity (2) 169:16 22:3;47:6;50:4; 91:22,23;189:14 98:18 203:8;271:13 cause (8) 145:12;150:7;158:8; 4:16;49:23;50:1,8, 209:11,13,16 247:22 248:14;257:4;273:23 160:13;192:19,21; 17;51:12;53:9,19,20, came (8) cause (1) caused (3) 205:22;215:17;232:10; 24;54:6;62:4;219:9 88:21;110:15; 102:25 178:21,22;248:20 238:8,8;260:2;261:23; 21:1 10,17;279:3 58:16;67:22;194:6; 275:7 24:34:259:1;263:15 208:11;225:19 209:21;18:3; 7,10;233:14;251:14 57:20;58:25;60:10; 74:10:97:18:214:7; 189:11;196:15;197:23; 19:11;25:20;29:11; carbon (16) 42:2;66:519;110:24; 19:6;16;20:16;6:13; <td>59:4,5</td> <td>11,12,14,23,24,25;</td> <td>248:10;251:3,4;</td> <td>canister (2)</td> <td>catch (1)</td>	59:4,5	11,12,14,23,24,25;	248:10;251:3,4;	canister (2)	catch (1)
91:11 23;93:11,13,15;95:8; 283:2 calisters (9) categories (3) borrow (2) 132:1.9,21;145:8,14; calling (2) 194:5.5;200:10,13, 160:25;165:15;236:2 both (2) build (3) calls (1) 194:5.5;200:10,13, 160:25;165:15;236:2 22:3;47:6;50:4; 91:22,23;189:14 98:18 203:8;271:13 cause (8) 81:18;100:11;135:5; building (13) CALPUFF (3) caused (1) 169:16 205:22;215:17;232:10; 24;54:6;62:4;219:9 88:1;110:15; 102:25 carbon (6) caused (3) 205:22;215:17;232:10; 24;54:6;62:4;219:9 88:21;110:15; 102:25 carbon (16) caused (3) 232:6;34:20;52:24; 78:1,20;25;175:22; 78:1,20;25;175:22; 16:21;17:21;18:3; 7,10;233:14;251:14 64:25;65:19;110:24; 32:6;34:20;52:24; 78:1,20;25;175:22; 62:1;17:21;18:3; 7,10;233:14;251:14 64:25;65:19;110:24; Boulevard (11) built-in (1) 40:23;44:6,82;1;47:3.5; 235:5;236:14,17,19;20; CCM (2) 19:1;196:15;197:23; 9:2;25;19:50:13; 238:4;241:19;242:7; 245:31;9:22:153:68; 259:1;260:5;263:18; CD (3) 10:12:25:19	border (1)			213:13:282:5	85:22
borrow (2)132:1,9,21;145:8,14; 146:1;150:4calling (2)194:5,5;200:10,13, 14,15;230:2;281:16,25160:25;165:15;236:2 category (1)both (2)build (3)191:24;257:1114,15;230:2;281:16,25category (1)both (2)build (3)calls (1)203:8;271:13category (1)22:3;47:6;50:4;91:22,23;189:1498:18CALPUFF (3)203:8;271:13cause (8)145:12;150:7;158:8;4:16;49:23;50:1,8,209:11,13,16cate (8)cause (8)44:2;177:2,3,4,6;205:22;15:17;232:10;24:54:6;62:4;219:988:21;110:15;102:25178:21,22;248:20238:8,8;260:2;261:23;buildings (1)137:18;228:6;241:3,102:15cause (3)26:34:20;52:24;78:1,20,25;175:22;10:17;27:3358:16;67:22;194:6;275:724:19;92:13;26:15208:11;22:1930:93:21:17:21;18:3;7,10;233:14;251:1464:25;65:19;110:24;built (9)cau (16023:44:63;25:50:13,238:4;241:19;242:7;111:2,324:28;259:1;263:15208:11;22:1930:93:21:2;35:7,15;202:3;14;207:9;111:2,3Boulevard (1)built-in (1)40:23;44:63;25:50:13,238:4;241:19;242:7;124:22;204:412:12:02;51:28:24;73:2412:14;14;56:21;60:7,235:52:36:14,17,19;20;235:52:36:14,17,19;20;130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:1;7:23;235:52:36:14;89:13;104:1923:13;104:19130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:1;7:23;248:11,2329:13;104:19130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:1;7:23;248:12,23 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
both (22)build (3)calls (1)capacity (2)169:1622:3;47:6;50:4;91:22,23;189:1498:18203:8;271:13cause (8)81:18;100:11;135:5;41:6;49:23;50:18,209:11,13,16247:22248:14:257:4;273:23160:13;192:19,21;24;54:6;62:4;219:924;54:6;62:4;219:988:21;110:15;102:25cause (3)205:22;215:17;232:10;24;54:6;62:4;219:988:21;110:15;102:25cause (3)238:8,8;260:2;261:23;21:110,17;279:358:16;67:22;194:6;causing (1)235:6;34:20;52:24;78:1,20,25;175:22;16:21;17:21;18:3;7,10;233:14;251:1457:20;58:25;60:10;74:10;97:18;214:7;189:11;196:15;197:23;109:32:44:6,8,21;47:3,5,202:3,14;207:9;111:2,3Boulevard (11)built in (1)40:23;44:6,8,21;47:3,5,202:3,14;207:9;112:2,319:6,16;20:16;61:3;220:156,21;48:23,25;50:13,235:5;236:14,17,19,20;CCM (2)19:6,16;20:16;61:3;220:156,21;48:23,25;50:13,238:4;241:19;242:7;154:22;204:462:16;80:9;112:6;bulbs (1)24;51:19;52:21;53:6,8,259:1;260:5;263:18;20130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:17;123;acard (1)8:2161:421;23;2484:22;92:3,12;94:3;acare (2)cement (1)100:20;101:25;102:5;248:11,23195:2554:7;89:9,11;112:2,2181:12107:11;12;13;17:7,1;248:11,23101:9;65:19;20;66;5;125:3;126;2;130:6;carefu (1)59:52:19;53:5,7;54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2burning					
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
81:18;100:11;135:5; 145:12;150:7;158:8; building (13) CALPUFF (3) 209:11,13,16 Capital (1) 44:2;177:2,3,4,6; 248:14;257:4;273:23 160:13;192:19,21; 17;51:12;53:9,19,20, 24;54:6;62:4;219:9 came (8) capture (1) caused (3) 205:22;215:17;232:10; 24;54:6;62:4;219:9 88:21;110:15; 102:25 carsing (1) causing (1) 263:19;268:8;270:16 built (9) 137:18;228:6;241:3, car (10) causing (1) 275:7 263:19;268:8;270:16 built (9) Can (166) 210:14;216:10;218:4, 57:20;58:25;60:10; 32:6;34:20;52:24; 78:1,20,25;175:22; 19:11;25:20;29:11; carbon (16) 64:25;65:19;110:24; 74:10;97:18;214:7; 189:11;196:15;197:23; 19:11;25:20;29:11; causen (16) 64:25;65:19;110:24; 74:10;97:18;214:7; 129:11;25:19 30;9;32:12;38:7,15; 202:3;14;207:9; 111:2,3 Boulevard (11) built-in (1) 40:23;44:6,8,21;47:3,5, 235:5;236:14,17,19,20; CCM (2) 19:6,16;20:16;61:3; 220:15 6,21;48:23,25;50:13, 238:4;241:19;242:7; 154:22;204:4 62:16;80:9;112:6; builbe (1) 24;51:19;52:21;53:6,8, 259:1;260:5;263:18; CD (3)					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
160:13;192:19,21; 205:22,215:17;232:10; 238:8,8;260:2;261:23; 263:19;268:8,270:1617;51:12;53:9,19,20, 24;54:6;62:4;219:9came (8) 88:21;110:15; 137:18;228:6;241:3, 10,17;279:3capture (1) 102:25caused (3) 178:21,22;248:20bottom (9) 32:6;34:20;52:24; 74:10;97:18;214:7; 242:8;259:1;263:15built (9) 78:1,20,25;175:22; 189:11;196:15;197:23; 208:11;225:19Can (160 16:21;17:21;18:3; 19:11;25:20;29:11; 30:9;32:12;38:7,15; 202:3,14;207:9;caused (3) 102:25Boulevard (11) 19:6,16;20:16;61:3; 10:22built-in (1) 20:11;225:19do:23;44:6,8,21:47:3,5, 20:9;32:12;38:7,15; 202:3,14;207:9;caused (3) 102:216; 210:14;216:10;218:4, 71:02;33:14;251:14Boulevard (11) 19:6,16;20:16;61:3; 10:22built-in (1) 20:15 20:11;225:19do:23;44:6,8,21:47:3,5, 20:9;32:12;38:7,15; 20:23;14;207:9; 22:5;23:61:4,17,19,20; 238:4;241:19;242:7; 238:4;241:19;242:7; 238:4;241:19;242:7; 154:22;204:4CCM (2) 154:22;204:4boulevards (1) 10:22builet (7) 21;63:19;68:1;71:23; 84:22:92:3,12;94:3; 10:19;65:19;248:22 24:1123 24:1123card (1) 82:11;90:1,2;114:19, 24:1123 24:1123148:23 264:5;273:5 8:9,11;104:19boundary (5) 54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2burning (1) 100:20;101:25;102:5; 181:12100:20;101:25;102:5; 12:102:11;123:2,5; 181:12100:20;101:25;102:5; 12:102:11;123:2,5; 12:102:11;123:2,5;248:11,23 248:11,23195:25 25:21:9;53:5,7; 248:11,23boundary (5) 59:53;61:19;38:2;burning (1) 100:20;101:25;102:5; 181:12100:20;101:25;102:5; 12:102:11;123:2,5; 12:102:11;123:2,5; 12:102:11;123:2,5;<					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			209:11,13,16		248:14;257:4;273:23
238:8,8;260:2;261:23; 263:19;268:8;270:16buildings (1)137:18;228:6;241:3, 10,17;279:3car (10)causing (1)bottom (9)21:110,17;279:358:16;67:22;194:6; 210:14;216:10;218:4, 7,10;233:14;251:14275:732:6;34:20;52:24; 74:10;97:18;214:7; 242:8;259:1;263:1578:1,20,25;175:22; 208:11;225:1916:21;17:21;18:3; 30:9;32:12;38:7,15; 30:9;32:12;38:7,15; 30:9;32:12;38:7,15; 202:3,14;207:9;CBD (8)Boulevard (11) 19:6,16;20:16;61:3; 62:16;80:9;112:6; 130:2built-in (1) 20:1540:23;44:6,8,21;47:3,5, 202:3,14;205;21;33:6,8, 20:15208:11;225:19 20:1530:9;32:12;38:7,15; 20:3;14:6,8,21;47:3,5, 20:3;14;207:9;CCM (2) 154:22;204:4Boulevard (11) 19:6,16;20:16;61:3; 62:16;80:9;112:6; 130:2built-in (1) 20:1540:23;44:6,8,21;47:3,5, 20:3;14;62:16;07, 24:51:19;52:21;53:6,8, 259:1;260:5;263:18; 264:5;273:5CCM (2) 154:22;204:4Boulevards (1) 61:4builet (7) 21;63:19;68:1;71:23; 10:19:0;1,2;114:19, 21;63:19;68:1;71:23; 21:3;126:2;102:5; 24:3:1;90:1,2;114:19, 21;63:19;68:1;71:23; 24:3;1294:3; 61:4burning (1) 21;63:19;68:1;71:23; 24:3:1,20care (2) 24:3:1,20cell (1) 148:23 caree (2)bouldary (5) 54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2burning (1) 18:12107:11,12,13;117:7,11, 107:11,12,13;117:7,11, 21;120:21;123:2,5; 13:2:2,52care (2) 24:3:1,92,24center (23) 39:5;52:19;53:5,7; 39:5;52:19;53:5,7; 39:5;52:19;53:5,7; 39:5;52:19;53:5,7;	160:13;192:19,21;	17;51:12;53:9,19,20,	came (8)	capture (1)	caused (3)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	205:22;215:17;232:10;	24;54:6;62:4;219:9	88:21;110:15;	102:25	178:21,22;248:20
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	238:8.8:260:2:261:23:	buildings (1)	137:18:228:6:241:3.	car (10)	causing (1)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	· · · · ·				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
Boulevard (11)built-in (1) $40:23;44:6,8,21;47:3,5,$ $235:5;236:14,17,19,20;$ CCM (2) $19:6,16;20:16;61:3;$ $220:15$ $6,21;48:23,25;50:13,$ $238:4;241:19;242:7;$ $154:22;204:4$ $62:16;80:9;112:6;$ bulbs (1) $24;51:19;52:21;53:6,8,$ $259:1;260:5;263:18;$ CD (3) $127:20,25;128:24;$ $73:24$ $12,14,14;56:21;60:7,$ $264:5;273:5$ $8:9,13;104:19$ $130:2$ bullet (7) $21;63:19;68:1;71:23;$ card (1)cell (1)boulevards (1) $82:11;90:1,2;114:19,$ $78:7,10;80:7;81:7,15;$ $8:22$ $148:23$ $61:4$ $21,23,24$ $84:22;92:3,12;94:3;$ care (2)cement (1)boundary (5)burning (1) $100:20;101:25;102:5;$ $248:11,23$ $195:25$ $54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2$ $181:12$ $107:11,12,13;117:7,11,$ career (2)center (23)Brann (12)business (9) $12;120:21;123:2,5;$ $156:20;159:24$ $39:5;52:19;53:5,7;$ $29:5;36:19;38:2;$ $10:19;65:19,20;66:5;$ $125:3;126:2;130:6;$ careful (1) $54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	· · · ·	,			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	19:6,16;20:16;61:3;	220:15	6,21;48:23,25;50:13,	238:4;241:19;242:7;	
130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:1;71:23;card (1)cell (1)boulevards (1)82:11;90:1,2;114:19,78:7,10;80:7;81:7,15;8:22148:2361:421,23,2484:22;92:3,12;94:3;care (2)cement (1)boundary (5)burning (1)100:20;101:25;102:5;248:11,23195:2554:7;89:9,11;112:2,2181:12107:11,12,13;117:7,11,career (2)center (23)Brann (12)business (9)12;120:21;123:2,5;156:20;159:2439:5;52:19;53:5,7;29:5;36:19;38:2;10:19;65:19,20;66:5;125:3;126:2;130:6;careful (1)54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,	62:16;80:9;112:6;	bulbs (1)	24;51:19;52:21;53:6,8,	259:1;260:5;263:18;	CD (3)
130:2bullet (7)21;63:19;68:1;71:23;card (1)cell (1)boulevards (1)82:11;90:1,2;114:19,78:7,10;80:7;81:7,15;8:22148:2361:421,23,2484:22;92:3,12;94:3;care (2)cement (1)boundary (5)burning (1)100:20;101:25;102:5;248:11,23195:2554:7;89:9,11;112:2,2181:12107:11,12,13;117:7,11,career (2)center (23)Brann (12)business (9)12;120:21;123:2,5;156:20;159:2439:5;52:19;53:5,7;29:5;36:19;38:2;10:19;65:19,20;66:5;125:3;126:2;130:6;careful (1)54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,	127:20,25;128:24;	73:24	12,14,14;56:21:60:7.	264:5;273:5	8:9,13;104:19
boulevards (1)82:11;90:1,2;114:19, 21,23,2478:7,10;80:7;81:7,15; 84:22;92:3,12;94:3; 100:20;101:25;102:5;8:22148:23boundary (5)burning (1)100:20;101:25;102:5; 100:20;101:25;102:5;248:11,23cement (1)boundary (5)burning (1)100:20;101:25;102:5; 107:11,12,13;117:7,11, 12;120:21;123:2,5;248:11,23195:25Brann (12)business (9)12;120:21;123:2,5; 10:19;65:19,20;66:5;125:3;126:2;130:6; 125:3;126:2;130:6;careful (1)39:5;52:19;53:5,7; 54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,					
61:421,23,2484:22;92:3,12;94:3;care (2)cement (1)boundary (5)burning (1)100:20;101:25;102:5;248:11,23195:2554:7;89:9,11;112:2,2181:12107:11,12,13;117:7,11,career (2)248:11,23Brann (12)business (9)12;120:21;123:2,5;156:20;159:2439:5;52:19;53:5,7;29:5;36:19;38:2;10:19;65:19,20;66:5;125:3;126:2;130:6;careful (1)54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,					
boundary (5) 54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2burning (1) 181:12100:20;101:25;102:5; 107:11,12,13;117:7,11, 12;120:21;123:2,5;248:11,23 career (2)195:25 Brann (12) 29:5;36:19;38:2;business (9) 					
54:7;89:9,11;112:2,2181:12107:11,12,13;117:7,11,career (2)center (23)Brann (12)business (9)12;120:21;123:2,5;156:20;159:2439:5;52:19;53:5,7;29:5;36:19;38:2;10:19;65:19,20;66:5;125:3;126:2;130:6;careful (1)54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,					
Brann (12) 29:5;36:19;38:2;business (9) 10:19;65:19,20;66:5;12;120:21;123:2,5; 125:3;126:2;130:6;156:20;159:24 careful (1)39:5;52:19;53:5,7; 54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,				-	
29:5;36:19;38:2; 10:19;65:19,20;66:5; 125:3;126:2;130:6; careful (1) 54:2,12,19,22,25;55:4,					
43:3;52:3,6;74:9; 110:25;124:5,7;174:3; 131:6,11;132:8;134:4, 95:8 7,21;108:18;111:3;					
	43:3;52:3,6;74:9;	110:25;124:5,7;174:3;	131:6,11;132:8;134:4,	95:8	7,21;108:18;111:3;

118:17:122:10,11,16; 124:5:134:19.24: 149:3:218:14 centered (1) 272:6 central (6) 65:19,19;66:5; 110:25;124:7;134:11 centralized (1) 231:20 century (1) 248:5 certain (11) 30:23;47:11;95:22; 140:16;155:12,12; 170:15;200:18;206:22; 251:13;254:2 certainly (33) 47:5,21;57:10;69:25; 70:7;71:5,5;86:15; 87:16;91:16;92:10; 100:4:164:7:166:17. 24;167:9;179:18; 187:12:189:19:192:6: 200:25;202:20;204:10; 207:22;211:1;223:15, 17;229:5,24;230:4; 250:8;279:8,14 certificate (1) 162:17 certification (1) 155:10 certified (8) 154:17.18.19.21: 155:3,8,9;166:14 cetera (6) 62:5;85:25;101:1; 102:21;150:7,14 chain (1) 47:15 chains (1) 15:19 chair (1) 5:13 challenge (1) 230:19 chance (3) 40:11;85:20;194:4 change (39) 9:17;15:15;19:2; 24:5.8,9:32:25:49:9, 13;59:12;60:5;83:24; 84:1,5,5;116:17,22; 117:8,8,9,11;119:5; 120:2,8;130:3;179:7; 212:14,18;213:10; 222:1;244:1,2,10,20, 22,23;245:23;246:13; 252:19 changed (9) 26:5;111:18;125:19: 199:4;223:23;243:12; 246:7,19;249:22

changes (15) 6:15;7:2,6;12:7; 15:12.24:106:10: 112:11:126:15:209:1: 214:7;222:25;224:10; 252:18;253:11 character (1) 110:14 characteristic (4) 22:7;24:18;140:2,3 characteristics (1) 56:20 characterized (1) 179:16 characters (1) 5:21 charcoal (1) 200:14 Charleston (2) 158:11;160:8 chart (7) 81:7,15;83:20;137:1; 200:3,6;267:18 Chase (1) 129:19 **ChaseCostcoReport** (1) 104:21 check (1) 238:2 checked (3) 105:3;151:21;210:19 chemical (4) 159:8,17:160:9; 275:20 chemicals (12) 160:14;161:10,24; 162:11,13;165:17; 166:21;193:15;194:9; 202:2,5,22 Chevy (1) 129:18 Chicago (1) 253:2 chicken (1) 181:11 children (2) 256:9,19 chillers (1) 163:22 choices (1) 58:11 choose (1) 100:20 chronic (1) 160:15 circular (1) 272:5 **Circulate (2)** 242:25;243:1 circulation (2) 46:3:86:18 circumstance (1) 271:16

circumstances (1) 95:22 circumvent (2) 80:13.14 cited (2) 43:1:171:3 cities (1) 253:10 citizens (1) 13:14 **Civic** (10) 5:6,8,16:6:24:9:7; 10:8;108:23;152:11; 166:9,18 claim (1) 256:3 clarification (3) 35:8;221:20;223:22 clarified (1) 261:17 clarifies (1) 35:2 clarify (6) 143:10;149:23; 177:19;217:21;222:3; 243:18 clarifying (5) 64:10;222:4,7,18; 223:6 **Class (18)** 80:1,2;110:25; 137:10.14.14.14.14.15. 17,24,25;138:3,6,15; 139:2.3.19 classes (1) 159:3 clauses (3) 222:4,7;223:6 Clean (6) 189:15:208:17; 253:11:256:10.20: 270:11 cleaners (1) 158:14 clear (12) 31:5;47:22;48:20; 185:22;189:1;195:7; 196:14;206:17;207:5; 214:24;235:13;245:14 clearly (10) 93:10;180:22,25; 186:7:216:7.11:221:9: 226:16;228:24;252:21 client (2) 29:2;31:19 clients (2) 154:7;162:21 clips (3) 36:18,19,20 clockwise (1) 75:2 close (8) 16:7;56:23;107:3;

124:6;223:16;262:10, 18:263:9 closer (9) 19:19;21:24;54:6; 151:7;166:24;210:10; 241:17:262:10:280:12 closest (15) 60:24;133:2;145:25; 150:18;225:3;238:5; 249:15;257:12;259:15; 262:3;269:12;275:4; 280:10;282:10,14 cloud (1) 182:22 Club (3) 185:4,19;258:6 club-like (1) 186:18 CO (13) 207:13;224:16; 234:22;238:21;240:23; 270:2;271:24,24; 272:1,23;273:13,16,25 Coalition (6) 5:10,14;10:3;100:7; 143:16;166:5 **COB** (1) 4:16 Coddle (1) 20:10 code (14) 44:15:45:6:50:4: 57:2,4:90:9:93:18: 96:6:97:2:106:10: 117:3:122:3,19,23 coefficients (1) 271:15 cogitate (1) 87:22 coining (1) 7:24 Cole (16) 203:7,8;204:4,6,7.8. 9,17;206:2,17;207:17; 209:3,3,8;210:12; 222:8 Cole's (1) 203:13 Colesville (1) 123:13 collaborated (1) 203:9 collected (2) 192:20;267:2 collecting (1) 165:3 collection (1) 154:5 college (1) 154:13 colored (1) 147:5 colors (1)

110:8 Columbia (2) 103:6.11 column (9) 81:8,9,12;232:14; 240:23;261:3,15; 262:15:265:2 coming (13) 39:8;78:20;127:23; 152:20;195:3;216:6; 217:4,25;218:2; 228:17,20;239:11,12 comma (1) 94:16 comment (2) 139:6;274:18 commentary (1) 6:22 commented (1) 102:24 comments (2) 89:3:240:12 commercial (7) 4:11:94:14:111:4: 124:4;125:13,14;127:2 **Commission** (1) 247:23 common (3) 144:18;145:15;259:7 community (14) 58:5;64:14;93:2; 95:4:96:1:99:12:100:3: 128:24;129:7;135:5; 171:3;205:2;211:1; 234:17 company (1) 157:22 compare (11) 18:12;176:24; 179:20;183:11;189:17; 196:13,17;201:2; 254:25;268:2;281:7 compared (7) 171:14;199:18; 201:8;202:7;256:1; 271:12;281:22 compares (1) 263:12 comparing (1) 258:25 comparison (2) 176:22;200:22 comparisons (1) 198:19 compatibility (1) 30:23 competency (1) 155:13 complement (1) 60:17 complete (3) 64:2;168:1,3

completed (1)

152:14 completely (5) 75:16;114:2;137:15; 138:1:226:16 complex (2) 124:11;185:14 compliance (1) 14:10 compliant (2) 98:19,21 complies (1) 93:18 comply (1) 85:14 component (7) 18:10;51:7,16;68:3; 70:9;85:25;93:7 components (1) 18:7 compounds (5) 184:1;202:4,14,24; 267:18 comprehensive (1) 115:22 comprised (1) 122:11 compute (1) 233:15 computer (2) 163:21:210:2 computes (1) 210:5 conceded (1) 166:18 conceivable (2) 46:25;120:16 conceivably (3) 95:4.23.24 concentration (19) 170:10:179:5.7; 196:15;207:13;215:1; 224:15,19:225:15; 226:8;248:14;249:3; 257:18,19;259:20; 270:7,25;271:7;273:14 concentrations (23) 203:22;204:12; 207:6;213:7;227:3; 229:10;246:23;247:19; 249:6,23;254:1,6; 255:1,10;256:7;259:4; 261:21:268:8:271:10: 272:23;273:16;275:5, 19 concept (10) 6:3;60:19,20;65:7; 78:25;126:19,20; 135:3;182:22;184:4 concepts (1) 57:7 conceptual (1) 135:4**Conceptually** (2)

90:7:121:16 concern (15) 49:10;87:13;179:24; 180:18:236:9:245:6: 255:18:256:14:257:4, 15;259:15;270:10; 273:24;275:3,8 concerned (6) 11:20;86:9;180:17; 181:1;195:9;209:8 concerning (1) 240:13 concerns (5) 6:15,19;92:6;245:7, 15 conclude (8) 43:11,13;44:1,17; 45:7;95:24;177:1; 275:7 concluded (2) 16:3:284:14 conclusion (14) 12:12;28:17;43:19; 44:3,19;45:9;95:17; 120:22;137:12,18; 255:24;272:18,21,23 conclusions (4) 12:9;44:12;46:2; 187:14 concrete (3) 255:5;259:11;272:12 concur (1) 204:20 condition (1) 150:13 **Conditions (6)** 147:18;170:15; 212:16;248:12;259:17; 280:20 conducted (9) 4:17:156:11.21: 157:12,25;163:7; 164:8;193:1;203:4 conducting (3) 163:25;165:4;168:15 conference (1) 160:20 confines (1) 56:23 confirmed (3) 211:22,23,25 confirming (3) 114:21,21,24 conflict (1) 273:18 conflicting (1) 203:21 conform (3) 90:14;112:18;140:14 conformance (7) 11:16,22;12:10; 30:23;41:14,22;68:16 conforms (2)

12:13:68:13 confuse (2) 142:22;221:17 confused (5) 237:14,19:240:1; 261:14:274:19 confusing (1) 277:7 confusion (1) 223:14 congregation (1) 160:9 connect (11) 69:1;75:22;76:4,24; 79:1,12;80:4,14,15; 135:23,25 connecting (2) 80:8;129:20 connection (19) 14:9;33:13;35:4; 63:8:68:10:70:18:72:1, 7.15:73:13.14:75:17. 18;79:25;80:10;142:4; 143:2.8.11 connections (21) 34:12,22;35:3,13; 58:25;60:10;62:1,3; 65:1,17,18,25:66:6; 72:5;73:1,6;81:19; 133:24;134:2;135:9; 136:7 Connectivity (7) 58:23:59:19:60:23: 61:2:68:21:135:4.4 connects (1) 42:9 consensus (11) 203:12.19:204:11. 16,21,21,24;205:12; 208:21,25;210:10 consequences (1) 254:14 conservatism (9) 208:11:214:11; 218:17;219:1;220:16, 22;225:16;228:12,24 conservative (17) 207:1;214:20; 215:13,24;216:2; 220:2,21;224:11; 225:10,21;226:2; 227:6,15;245:18; 259:25;263:5,5 conservatively (2) 266:5;278:13 consider (10) 76:14,18;125:1; 156:3;181:5;191:7; 199:25;215:20;232:22; 254:4 consideration (5) 18:13:41:12.16; 190:19;256:17

considerations (1) 28:14 considered (10) 160:21:176:11: 203:2;231:14,17,18; 233:16;259:10,12; 270:12 considering (1) 246:1 considers (1) 210:4 consistent (10) 14:15;85:16;119:21, 23;185:23;228:3; 234:13,15;247:16; 274:20 consistently (1) 96:10 consists (1) 100:25 constitute (1) 133:5 constitutes (1) 162:18 construct (1) 4:6 constructed (2) 75:16:91:12 construction (4) 90:11:92:7:96:9; 275:17 constructive (1) 213:10 construed (1) 275:22 consult (1) 194:25 consultant (2) 203:6;205:2 consultants (2) 205:4,19 Consulting (3) 154:1,19;162:21 contact (2) 6:18;246:20 contain (1) 85:12 contained (3) 81:24;87:11;202:25 contains (1) 104:21 contaminants (4) 161:11;202:9,18; 263:13 contaminate (1) 159:17 contemplate (1) 72:6 contemplated (2) 72:15,17 contended (1) 175:2 contention (1)

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

256:16 context (12) 21:5;156:19;163:11; 181:6;182:20;184:5; 205:3,18:210:23; 224:13;275:18,21 continually (1) 176:2 continue (7) 73:18:77:20:198:9; 200:17;251:15;276:10; 277:10 continued (1) 77:20 continues (4) 108:7;198:7;200:4,8 continuing (2) 249:20;250:5 contours (1) 76:3 contractor (1) 157:18 contractual (5) 28:13,19,20,22;29:1 contributing (1) 175:4 contribution (22) 175:5;179:9;180:25; 181:8;207:20;261:1,5; 262:6,11,20,25;265:4, 5;269:21,23;270:7,19, 22,24;275:10;278:16, 17 contributor (1) 270:18 control (11) 125:9;176:8;186:19; 196:2;230:3;280:7,8; 281:13,24;282:6,7 controls (10) 171:4,13;172:2; 174:2;191:22;198:10; 199:4,25;201:16; 252:19 conversation (2) 13:24;247:12 cook (1) 180:21 **copy** (27) 8:1,14,15;9:8,10,11; 16:13:22:22:23:1; 25:25;35:14;36:5; 63:19,25;64:1,2,3,4; 101:8,9;167:13;168:1, 17;221:25;223:2,11,16 CORDRY (26) 5:5,5;39:19;61:14, 17;63:1;83:12;87:23; 88:5,11;126:16; 222:11;240:2,7;242:1; 243:3;244:11;245:6, 10,14,17;246:5,11; 250:12,16;276:22

PETITION OF COSTCO	WHOLESALE CORPOR
core (13)	Council's (1)
58:2;65:20;67:2,4,	82:7
17,23;109:8,12,15;	counsel (2)
110:10,20;129:3;135:6	5:7;204:6
corner (20)	count (3)
26:8;38:22;41:5,6,	21:17;212:1;233:3
25;57:24;62:16;73:15;	counted (2)
74:19,20;76:8;77:15;	212:6,10
82:10;101:11,19;	counter (1)
110:8;112:3;132:16;	186:19
142:25;219:9	counties (2)
corollary (1)	158:6,7
18:6	countries (1)
Corporation (1)	190:21
4:3	country (4)
correctly (5)	190:25;195:17;
46:21;101:1;106:21;	227:23;252:25
123:25;194:20	counts (6)
correlates (3)	180:16;181:13;
56:2;83:19;109:16	214:14;232:8;233:4,15
correspond (1)	County (22)
240:14	22:4;82:7;90:6;
corridor (1)	116:6;118:2;123:1;
274:4	130:9;163:6;174:18;
corroborative (1)	185:21;192:6;195:19;
281:9	204:13;206:23;207:7;
Costco (100)	220:13;225:11;227:25;
4:3;5:1,4,9,14;10:3;	277:18;278:6;279:12,
22:6;25:1;40:6,7;41:3,	18
9,25;49:22;50:1,6,21;	County's (1)
51:1;75:7;78:13;95:11;	115:22
140:13;150:25;151:5,	countywide (2)
7;153:21;166:5;	81:7;82:11
169:23;170:1;171:13,	couple (6)
15;172:8,11;173:12;	25:2;27:4;36:20;
175:3,5,9;177:24;	99:15;195:8;232:25
180:25;181:2,2,5;	course (13)
190:7;194:16;196:6,	18:7;84:25;155:11,
23;197:19;198:2,12,	21;156:20;159:24;
17;199:2,8,13;200:4,7;	163:11;164:1;175:16;
203:10,12,16;206:3,15;	176:17;183:5;200:18;
208:15,22,23;210:20;	234:8
211:7;215:19,23;	COURT (10)
216:6,15,17,19,25;	20:6;39:17;73:24;
217:9;219:5,9;220:12;	75:4;100:18;150:19;
248:17;255:10,13,13,	151:22;157:6,6;196:22
18,19;258:21;260:18;	courts (1)
261:22;264:19,22,23;	74:22
265:3,5;266:9;268:16,	cover (1)
25;269:7,8,17;270:20,	47:6
23;275:10,21	covered (2)
Costco's (8)	109:2;278:15
136:12,22;150:15;	covering (1)
179:9;206:12;218:2;	173:3
268:15;278:4	covers (2)
council (16)	187:11,12
4:15;63:14;83:24,25;	CR (23)
85:14;117:7,8;184:19;	29:9,14;111:4,4;
185:9;204:13;228:3;	112:9,22;114:5,17,23;
246:21;247:16;252:1;	115:2,17;118:14,22;
283:15;284:8	119:2,5;120:8,14;
Council-level (1)	125:19;127:14;128:17;
84:5	131:4,5,9

	create (7)
	45:7;231:1;254:5;
	272:1;273:21;274:11;
	275:11
	created (4)
	180:19;215:15;
	272:2,4
	creates (2)
	223:13;275:16
	credentials (1)
	163:1
	credit (5)
	201:12;213:12,13,
	15;274:18
	criteria (3)
	157:21;178:25;
	201:13
	critical (1)
	211:13
,15	criticizing (1)
,	70:13
	critique (1)
	7:24
3;	Croix (1)
, 9;	192:17
	cross (2)
:7; 25;	49:18;130:1
2,	cross-examination (20)
,	5:23;8:6;10:19;11:1,
	7;34:4;49:8;55:17;
	99:24;100:5,16,19;
	108:9;118:6;131:18;
	167:5;222:19,24;
	224:3;237:14
	cross-examine (2)
5	100:17;230:19
	crossing (2)
	129:19,25
	cubic (13)
6;	179:6,8,22;227:17,
8;	19;249:10;252:8;
	263:19;264:7,8,15,16;
	270:5
	cul-de-sac (1)
);	38:21
:22	cup (2)
	255:13,14
	curb (6)
	33:3;90:25;91:1,3,7,
	17
	curiosity (1)
	169:10
	curious (2)
	19:13;194:15
	current (22)
	26:15;27:7;28:18;
	29:20;31:21;32:5;
	34:16,19;35:11;36:1,2,
23;	14;48:6;85:23;90:20;
2;	110:1;116:21;118:17;
	124:11;141:17;143:11;
17;	276:10
	currently (8)

25:3;30:11,24;63:2;
132:19,20;135:23;
136:8 curve (1)
200:20
customers (1)
54:11 cuts (1)
23:21
D
dad (2) 168:5,7
dangerous (1)
178:22 dark (1)
110:10
darker (1)
89:11 dashad (1)
dashed (4) 71:17,23;72:1,10
data (31)
154:4;201:20;207:3,
8,11;209:4,5;211:3; 213:1;225:24;226:1,3,
5,17,23;233:2;234:4,
14;236:3;240:14;
248:24;249:16,17,19; 251:17;258:14,14,22;
263:6;267:2;283:9
database (1)
203:1 date (2)
147:19;244:25
dated (3)
37:11;38:13;51:22 David (3)
8:6;153:12,25
day (30)
4:2;13:15;29:19,21, 25;30:5,12,13,20,25;
31:1,4,22;32:1;42:19;
54:11;61:5;107:6;
108:3;169:4;175:11; 214:16,25;215:3,6;
218:21;219:12;225:4;
226:14;231:22
day/night (1) 277:19
days (6)
6:8;43:5;215:3; 233:2,21,24
daytime (1)
170:17 DC (3)
185:2,8;206:24
de (2)
176:25;191:25
deal (4) 5:22;11:16;191:18;
192:13
deals (1)

11:15 dealt (2) 278:11,12 **December/January** (1) 227:13 decibel (3) 192:11;278:25;279:4 decibels (5) 192:6,10;277:20,25; 279:1 decide (2) 86:8;88:14 decided (1) 212:2 decides (1) 87:2 decision (4) 4:21;88:17;174:6,18 decision-making (1) 26:24 decisions (5) 6:5;195:16,21;196:9; 226:1 decrease (1) 200:5 dedicated (5) 137:16;138:7,10,12, 14 default (1) 185:21 defaults (2) 185:7,19 define (3) 27:19;122:3;183:25 defined (11) 57:2;91:1;107:25; 108:2;122:10;188:11; 199:4;208:8;270:3; 275:14,15 defines (4) 90:9;206:13,14; 256:7 defining (1) 226:14 definitely (1) 200:1 definition (15) 84:21;90:5,7,13; 97:1,11,12,12;105:18; 107:16,17,17;122:15; 174:20:259:14 definitional (2) 49:25;50:3 definitions (1) 108:19 definitive (2) 251:4;258:13 deflect (1) 170:16 deflection (1) 170:20 degree (4) 154:13,14,16;212:13

delineate (1) 195:17 deliver (2) 45:24:200:12 delivered (2) 54:21;55:4 deliveries (5) 42:19;43:6;54:24; 55:3;176:15 delivery (5) 42:20;175:17; 176:19;208:3;219:12 **Democracy** (1) 19:16 denial (2) 68:16;86:23 denied (2) 86:19,21 Dennis (3) 154:22;203:9;204:4 dense (1) 110:16 densities (2) 111:5.6 density (3) 57:7;111:2;114:18 **Department** (2) 267:4,5 dependent (1) 48:24 depending (4) 30:5:70:20:87:18: 95:23 describe (9) 38:19:40:23:132:8; 186:12,15;204:22; 208:10,13;209:1 described (1) 96:14 describes (1) 114:20 describing (1) 199:4 design (25) 8:15,16;57:7;60:15, 16,19;61:16,17;62:4, 20:63:2,6,15;64:4,17; 65:9,10;66:7,12,18; 68:20;70:10,20;192:3; 252:7 designated (4) 72:3;80:23;121:21; 149:3 designation (1) 273:11 designations (1) 259:21 designed (3) 188:5;243:16;256:22 destination (1) 113:12 detail (8) 7:4;60:18;137:11;

175:24;177:8;186:16; 208:13:229:4 detailed (1) 147:12 details (2) 64:9;169:18 detect (2) 193:23:280:25 detectability (2) 282:21,22 detectable (1) 193:4 detecting (1) 280:19 determination (2) 43:9;92:13 determine (11) 6:20;79:11;157:19; 159:15;167:3;177:23; 178:20;190:20;197:11; 204:12:209:13 determined (1) 72:4 determines (1) 213:1 determining (7) 161:10,23;162:9; 165:16;166:21;215:8, 14 detrimental (1) 43:14 developed (2) 27:13:203:25 developing (1) 158:16 development (9) 56:22:71:6:72:4: 78:8;115:21;121:20; 125:15,24;130:6 device (2) 107:4:186:18 devices (2) 171:20;172:8 diagram (3) 61:25;134:12;247:25 diagrammatic (2) 65:6,25 dichotomy (1) 127:7 Dick's (3) 268:14;269:9;278:4 died (1) 160:5 diesel (5) 105:11,15;169:7; 219:12;253:11 diesels (1) 208:17 differ (1) 203:20 differed (1) 206:9 difference (26)

27:9:97:7.8.13; 98:16.17:104:13: 118:18:132:25:136:18; 143:25;144:7,15; 149:12;172:19;190:15; 209:6,17,20;210:9; 213:14;221:6;232:23; 233:12:236:3:237:10 differences (1) 222:16 different (32) 13:9:25:14,15,18; 46:7:60:22:79:9: 100:14:102:14:104:10; 108:4;118:1;122:24; 123:10;126:23,24; 160:2;165:14;176:9; 195:17;196:11;201:19; 203:18;211:16;239:8, 9;243:19;246:8;271:3; 275:14;279:24;280:2 differentiated (2) 122:16.21 differently (1) 188:16 difficult (3) 130:17;172:10;224:9 difficulty (1) 164:10 digital (2) 104:20,20 digress (1) 239:8 dilute (3) 192:24;271:14; 280:25 dilution (12) 163:11:165:1.2: 193:13.20:259:18: 271:9;272:14;274:12, 13;280:15,25 dilutions (2) 192:24;282:22 dimension (1) 92:20 dimensions (1) 32:25 dioxide (1) 202:3 dire (2) 162:16:166:5 direct (6) 63:10;153:18;171:1; 207:19;230:25;276:19 direction (5) 40:24;75:22;76:12; 250:8;252:21 directly (5) 40:2;227:5;265:10; 273:25;274:2 disagree (1) 195:12 disallow (1)

125:24 discrepancy (3) 101:25;102:9;241:15 discuss (4) 189:22;201:23; 203:15;206:2 discussed (6) 52:18;73:1;176:11; 179:1;203:18;228:10 discussing (2) 7:20,21 discussion (13) 14:18,22;17:11;89:7; 102:19;105:17;107:15, 18;122:8;135:20; 170:2;206:1;227:8 discussions (1) 212:20 dishonest (1) 162:20 dispersion (12) 155:18;156:2;159:5; 203:24;206:22;210:1; 213:6;232:4,5;248:9; 271:8;280:19 display (1) 279:11 displaying (1) 38:10 disregard (1) 239:25 disruptive (3) 167:19:168:9.21 dissipate (3) 272:5;273:23;274:3 dissipates (1) 272:3 distance (8) 21:9,14,20;50:10; 122:4;280:1,16;282:11 distances (3) 32:10:280:9:283:1 distant (3) 21:24;54:7;248:20 distinct (2) 96:12;110:14 distinction (9) 55:24;96:23;104:11; 105:21,22;106:3,17; 127:4.9 distinctions (2) 131:15;137:24 distinguish (3) 113:20;114:11,11 distinguished (1) 173:8 distinguishes (1) 226:12 distributed (1) 10:16 distribution (1) 159:2 district (19)

65:19,20;66:5;108:2; 110:25:113:2.4.8.11. 12,23;114:12,19;118:8, 11:119:7:121:12: 124:7;157:6 districts (11) 109:11,12,13,13; 110:6,9,12,14,15; 112:14,20 diverged (1) 203:16 divide (2) 220:4.11 **Division** (1) 247:10 divorce (1) 180:10 dock (8) 208:3,16;219:5,6,7, 10;231:19,20 docks (8) 50:7.10.21:51:4: 208:9;219:5;220:21; 221:4 doctor (1) 254:6 document (5) 62:24;109:20; 170:25;244:21;246:4 documentation (1) 244:4 documented (1) 228:25 documents (2) 98:4,14 dog (1) 9:3 dollar (1) 199:6 dominated (1) 270:16 dominating (1) 268:17 done (34) 158:17,21,21; 159:23;160:4,8,20; 163:3,8;165:7,8; 170:18;185:2,8; 186:11;187:11,12; 201:24;202:8;204:25; 211:23;214:12,19; 216:11;218:5;226:17; 229:2,6:231:3,4:242:9: 245:1;248:16,18 door (2) 283:19,19 dose (13) 159:7,21;160:12,17; 254:5,9;255:2,3,4,21; 256:7:257:1:274:23 dotted (1) 77:14 double (2)

FEITION OF COSICO	WHOLESALE CORI O	NATION	
227 10 220 21	D1	217 2 7 9 221 12	- Lease 4 ² and a (1)
237:10;239:21	Duckett (68)	217:3,7,8;231:13	elevations (1)
double-check (2)	5:15,15;10:9,10;	eastern (2)	144:9
238:3;240:16	108:24;109:1,4,5,6,24;	112:2;145:13	elevator (2)
double-counting (2)	111:12;113:19;114:8,	eastward (2)	189:12;283:17
226:12,16	9,10;115:11,13,16;	15:14;149:8	eligible (1)
down (31)	116:8,11,15,19;117:3,	economic (4)	121:21
23:22;58:12;78:14;	10,13,18,22,25;118:7,	43:10,14,17;121:20	else (9)
81:9;127:20,23,25;	10,14,25;119:4,14,23;	economically (1)	119:20;127:10;
129:20,23;138:23;	120:4,7,18,25;121:2,4,	130:5	131:17;148:23;152:7;
145:12;151:10,12;	9,10;122:9;123:7,21;	edge (2)	166:11;171:23;174:23;
178:14;194:10;198:9;	124:2,19,24;125:2,5,	66:17;83:10	266:6
228:20;237:6;249:18,	12,18,21;126:8,13,25;	edges (5)	elsewhere (2)
23;250:4;251:13;	127:5,8,11,12;130:13,	59:1;60:11;65:2;	80:4;93:16
252:21;253:19;259:1;	25;131:3,13;152:12;	66:7,16	e-mail (9)
261:3;262:2,9;274:8,	153:1;166:10	education (1)	5:24;6:14;7:6,8;8:5;
14;275:3	due (15)	154:12	9:8;88:5;223:15;243:1
downtown (2)	39:6;53:18,18,20;	effect (7)	e-mailed (2)
58:2,7	74:21;134:12;160:18;	42:12;44:18;140:5;	9:8;223:11
downward (2)		170:19;172:15;177:16;	e-mails (1)
	201:16;253:11,12;		
200:19;249:24	274:19;281:23,24;	237:6	7:12
DR (54)	282:12,13	effective (6)	embedded (4)
5:11,11;10:5;24:13;	Duke (3)	133:5;145:9,9,14;	208:11;219:1;
100:8,12,21;101:10,16,	47:16;76:1;185:5	179:9;186:22	220:15,22
16,17;102:5,8;104:10,	Duke's (1)	effectively (5)	emission (9)
14,17,18;105:6,8,20,	76:15	94:15,25;115:3,17;	163:10;172:4;174:3;
23;106:2,9,20,25;	duplication (1)	116:13	175:24;179:4;210:16;
107:5,8,10;108:10,21;	82:6	effects (7)	219:18;228:15;232:1
182:23;203:7,8,13;	during (24)	44:2;160:14;195:10;	emissions (50)
204:4,6,7,8,17;206:2,	29:21;30:14;31:1,22;	202:8;209:21;236:10;	159:1;171:2,14;
17;207:17;209:3,3,8;	32:1;53:3;72:4;144:10;	254:6	172:1,15;176:13,18,19;
210:12;222:8;241:20;	150:2,3,6;152:4;	effort (2)	177:9,12;180:21;
242:5;252:2,6,9,11,13	175:11;184:18;206:1;	68:21;204:23	183:20;193:15,19;
draw (2)	208:10;211:14,23;	eight (8)	194:8;196:2,8;198:15,
40:1;81:8	215:4,5;233:8;272:9;	21:17;99:1;201:5;	17;199:8,11;200:17;
drawing (2)	273:9;279:1	225:2,4;255:14;	201:3,15;206:12,15;
55:23;97:17	dust (3)	260:24;267:9	210:23;213:11,20;
Drive (12)	43:24;183:4,5	eight- (1)	215:2,10,11,22,23;
72:12,12,14,16;			
	Dyson (1)	232:23	216:12;217:20;219:3;
80:10,10;176:10;	182:23	eight-hour (16)	231:20,23;233:10;
216:10;218:4,6,7,10		207:9,13;224:16,23;	235:11,15;236:7;
driveway (1)	E	232:18;234:14,23;	237:22;269:16;271:25;
225:14		235:5;240:23;241:19;	273:22,25;274:2,3
driveways (1)	earful (1)	242:8;260:8;264:5;	emit (1)
259:9	211:1	270:2;272:23;273:5	175:16
driving (2)	earlier (12)	either (13)	emitted (5)
176:21;216:9	32:19;73:1;79:18;	18:16;20:23,25;	180:7,13;202:21,22;
drop (8)	86:2;195:20;196:10;	58:15;75:22;81:6,17;	253:3
		85:3,4;88:11;215:19;	
145:23;194:9;	197:6;222:7;230:24;		emphasize (1)
200:17;210:15;249:20;	231:13;252:1;281:12	236:1;271:16	60:1
250:6;251:15;253:4	Early (8)	elaborate (1)	emphasized (1)
dropped (7)	4:25;139:24;157:17;	254:16	202:15
78:21;249:23;	158:1;199:7,10,10;	Eleanor (2)	emphasizing (1)
250:14,17,22;252:16;	230:22	5:15;126:16	119:22
253:21	easement (2)	electronic (2)	employed (1)
dropping (5)	136:2,5	8:15;9:10	155:20
247:19,20;249:3;	easier (4)	electronically (1)	employees (1)
252:20;253:19	39:1;74:4;139:20;	8:11	121:24
drops (1)	204:14	element (1)	encourage (1)
149:5	easily (1)	87:18	124:4
drove (1)	80:25	elements (1)	encouraged (1)
218:15	east (10)	102:19	56:16
dry (1)	46:8;74:22;149:5;	elevation (1)	end (17)
158:14	150:21;151:1;216:5;	149:4	22:4;73:20,21;74:5,

21,24;75:4,4,6;79:3; 88:16;90:24;117:4; 119:11;208:9;227:4; 250:4 ended (3) 158:1;234:21;279:11 ending (1) 208:8 ends (8) 73:5;76:24;77:9; 90:25;91:3,7;95:6; 220:12 enemy (2) 86:7;87:8 enforced (1) 190:24 engineer (1) 128:22 enhanced (1) 274:15 enhances (1) 113:12 enlighten (1) 55:16 enormous (1) 245:15 enough (6) 78:10;110:3;196:6, 25;226:4;228:10); enter (2) 231:8;283:19 Enterprise (3) 121:12,14,19 entire (7) 53:3;80:17;121:19; 158:12;206:23;220:21; 225:11 entirely (4) 80:13;99:16,17; 102:14 entirety (1) 48:12 entity (1) 100:19 entrance (3) 112:8;128:2;130:4 entrances (3) 128:15,20;129:6 entry (2) 65:17;280:12 environment (2) 183:4;267:4 environmental (12) 44:9,25;153:21; 154:1,8;157:25;171:4; 195:24;203:4;245:8; 247:10;267:6 environmentally (1) 130:5 envisioned (4) 71:10;111:23; 112:14,19 EPA (62)

154:8:157:17,18; 158:9.15:160:7.19: 176:7;178:1;183:10; 187:19,20,25;189:14; 191:3,7;195:16;196:5; 201:12,17,21;202:25; 203:24;205:20,20,25; 206:2,13,14,25;207:15; 224:11;225:17;227:12; 229:10,16,20,21,24; 230:3,18;232:1,2,3,4; 243:16:245:7:248:8,9, 18;249:25;250:1; 252:17;253:1;256:6, 16;257:4;258:18,22; 259:5;260:24;264:10 EPA-approved (1) 202:25 EPA's (9) 157:24;158:2; 195:13;225:16;248:23; 256:20;259:12,21; 266:2 equal (1) 171:23 equipment (3) 164:8;283:25;284:1 equivalent (1) 219:13 erected (2) 14:13:151:3 Erich (4) 29:4,5;43:2;204:4 erroneously (1) 25:20 ESHAVE (3) 8:25:9:2:168:5 especially (3) 159:18;170:16; 281:21 essence (2) 85:22;106:18 essentially (2) 106:11;230:14 establish (6) 106:4;116:10,11; 117:16;197:8;266:25 established (2) 183:1;275:8 estimate (2) 73:16:234:21 estimated (2) 103:6;234:19 estimates (1) 196:14 estimating (1) 224:14 et (6) 62:5;85:25;101:1; 102:21;150:7,14 ethics (1) 155:13 evaluate (7)

8

125:10,11;159:1; 254:3,21:255:5,10; 173:19;187:21;208:5; 258:13:259:1.24: 226:3 evaluated (9) 271:4 163:10;177:8; examples (3) 185:25;202:2,17,23; 224:24;230:1,22 Excel (1) evaluating (4) 219:23 21:9;30:22;147:7; except (5) 198:1 evaluation (2) 251:16;282:23 14:8:43:16 exception (66) evaporative (1) 4:5;9:17;13:10; 198:9 15:15;16:5;21:10; even (38) 13:20;27:19;73:22; 85:12;118:11;125:18, 18;145:11,14,22,23,23; 45:2;50:11,12,20; 168:13;176:2;179:3; 181:10;186:5,13; 190:7;193:2;194:3; 199:5:206:11:214:12: 226:18;233:11;234:13; 101:4,6,22;102:1; 237:10;238:9;239:2; 250:5;255:19;262:7; 6;133:1,6;136:11; 269:16;273:22;274:18; 277:7;279:16 evening (1) 149:4,7:153:22; 228:21 174:12;243:11 evergreens (4) excerpts (1) 94:20;145:15;150:8, 90:10 exclusively (1) everybody (4) 260:17 6:17;129:2;152:24; Excuse (10) 225:21 7:9;23:18;62:17; everyone (2) 169:17:206:5 103:6,14;221:12; evidence (11) 222:11 4:19;42:11;92:19; exercise (1) 95:16,23,24;167:4,6; 118:5 173:13;273:18;274:20 exhaust (1) evolve (1) 176:21 exhaustive (1) 113:11 exact (3) 191:12 90:7;92:20;151:20 exhausts (1) exactly (9) 208:5 11:25;66:7;69:10; Exhibit (83) 186:2;225:4;245:20, 23;263:22;269:4 7;8:13,23;9:15,19; **EXAMINATION (5)** 131:23:140:22; 153:18:154:18:167:4 9;40:2;44:9;50:13; Examiner (3) 4:18;204:19;221:21 55:12;57:20;58:14; examiners (1) 59:7;60:5,7;63:2,6; 186:20 Examiner's (1) 16:11 example (23) 60:23;163:12;164:1; 174:20;179:2;200:11; 211:24;224:16;228:13; 234:22;252:15;253:9;

163:15;169:2;221:21; 222:12;241:20,24; 260:5;265:2;270:15; 263:16:271:19 exhibitized (1) 7:24 160:1;214:13;260:5 exhibits (8) 6:23;44:8;59:13; 103:20,24;104:6; 110:22;152:4 129:16:186:9:222:4; exist (3) 69:20;137:5;176:25 existence (3) 11:20;14:9;53:3 existing (40) 24:22;25:14,15;31:17; 14:19,23;16:20; 35:9,12,21,22;36:1,12, 21:25,25;25:7;35:2; 53:17,19;72:25;73:6, 15;40:3;43:11;44:2; 10,17;74:12;75:14; 51:15;52:15;54:8;55:8; 77:3;79:21;89:15,17; 68:13;69:5,13;70:9,11; 106:5;113:25;114:22; 115:3,18;132:20,22; 86:18:87:3:92:12:93:4, 136:7,10;144:17,17; 7,8,12;94:24;95:21; 149:2;150:8,13; 118:24;125:11;132:4, 268:12,19,20,20; 269:10,21;270:17 exists (1) 140:10,12,12,13,25; 142:7;143:2;147:17; 136:8 exit (1) 231:8 expanding (1) 121:21 expect (8) 18:11;112:12; 171:14;193:3;203:22; 281:22;282:1,23 67:15;100:23;102:23; expected (4) 43:6;103:1;196:14; 248:13 expecting (1) 112:10 expects (1) 281:14 experience (14) 154:23,24;155:5; 157:15;159:6;165:4; 166:2;167:1;185:7; 230:17,20,25;273:10, 5:25;6:17,25;7:2,3,5, 12 expert (29) 16:11;22:11,14;35:15; 44:6,22;49:18;157:2, 36:9,21;37:3,7;38:7,8, 4,5,7,8;160:24;161:21; 164:20;165:10,24; 51:18;52:2,12;53:6,12; 166:3,13,14,19,25; 173:13;177:11,15,20, 23;180:11;230:14,15, 71:21;74:7;78:7;80:20, 17,20;256:4 23;81:1;101:4;103:5, expertise (8) 20,24;104:2,3,6,24; 49:24;56:14;76:15; 105:10;106:6;134:3; 161:13,13;163:2; 141:8,12;142:9,12,12, 166:6:178:3 17,19,22;143:1;146:19, experts (8) 20,21,24;147:15,18,24; 44:5,5,20,21;47:11; 148:10,16,17;149:15; 48:15;177:25;178:2

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

expert's (2) 6:8:173:19 explain (13) 26:14;56:19;58:3; 59:2;71:23;75:20; 81:15;101:25;102:4; 137:11;140:11;185:19; 271:6 explicitly (3) 215:10:248:15.22 exposed (3) 159:8,12,22 exposure (11) 159:16,19,20; 161:23;162:9,10; 165:16;166:21;181:18; 269:12;274:25 exposures (4) 160:15;161:10; 230:23;269:11 expressed (1) 257:15 extend (5) 77:1,2,13;201:8; 250:4 extended (1) 14:25 extends (2) 112:1,7 extension (9) 12:8.8,9,20,21;14:14, 15:75:10.11 extensive (8) 42:13;107:15;164:9; 165:1,4;170:4;231:5, 11 extent (10) 18:5;69:12;70:8: 71:9;106:12;177:9; 254:17;255:25;256:2; 268:24 extrapolated (1) 234:7 extremely (1) 216:2 eye (1) 149:8 F face-to-face (2) 204:2.3 facilities (1) 257:14 facility (10) 55:25;163:7,21; 164:3;179:3,20; 196:15;206:25;257:13; 279:22 fact (38) 16:24;17:1,18;25:20; 27:3;68:15;86:8;88:14;

Min-U-Script®

93:4;94:24;96:19;

PETITION OF COSTCO			à.	
100.15.16.110.15	255 24 272 16		265 12 269 22	250,17,274,9
108:15,16;118:15;	255:24;273:16	Fifty-eight (2)	265:13;268:22	259:17;274:8
120:1;121:2;128:18;	fast (5)	216:23;221:14	finish (6)	focus (3)
137:20;139:6,25;	181:9;208:6;221:16;	Figure (7)	67:6,10;104:14;	202:13;263:15;
166:2,17;169:15;	277:6,8	89:8;236:15;238:23;	111:9;178:12;221:2	268:10
171:3;172:7,10,21;	faster (1)	241:9,15;246:22,22	finished (3)	focused (1)
175:10;177:1;183:20;	218:11	figured (2)	100:12;111:10;	158:7
204:15;208:8;218:18;	fat (1)	15:1;233:21	167:14	focusing (1)
231:3;252:17;253:11;	146:23	file (2)	firm (3)	135:8
260:23;274:16	Faulkner (1)	52:15;104:21	212:4,5,6	folks (3)
factor (23)	38:21	filed (4)	first (54)	126:24;214:16;
55:16;170:13,21;	favor (1)	88:20;101:4;140:13;	5:22;17:16;57:22;	256:23
180:23;193:14,14,16,	88:17	170:25	59:9;60:25,25;61:2;	follow (5)
19,20;208:10;212:17;	feasibility (1)	files (2)	69:3;82:13;83:2,8;	168:13,16;185:9;
216:13;219:24;220:1,	28:12	219:11,23		
			90:1;97:15;103:15;	205:20;210:6
3,5,16,22,23;233:11;	feasible (13)	filing (1)	110:22,24;114:16,23;	followed (4)
234:25;260:22;280:15	25:10,18;26:8,10,18,	106:7	119:17;130:8,15;	203:25;226:17;
factored (1)	18,20;27:5,8,21,23;	filings (2)	131:25;149:22;153:22;	248:9,19
235:24	28:7,17	104:20,21	156:2;158:5;169:4;	following (3)
factors (10)	feature (3)	fill (5)	170:24;171:17;174:8;	155:15;196:19;232:3
102:24;133:4;172:4,	13:10;94:16;133:6	149:19;194:6;	183:9;184:16;195:15;	follows (3)
22;175:24;208:17;	features (3)	210:14;282:9,19	198:24;202:6;203:4,5;	82:14;83:16;206:25
210:5,16;219:18;232:1	70:24;94:25;150:16	filling (17)	205:3;209:3;218:3;	font (1)
factory (2)	federal (5)	4:7;21:3,4;22:3;	219:3;225:4;228:2;	22:23
225:18;275:20	154:9;157:6;173:7;	25:10,11;26:9;27:13;	229:3;235:18;236:15;	food (2)
facts (1)	174:19;179:23	55:22;94:7;100:24;	250:20;251:16;252:12;	181:9;208:6
195:22	feedback (1)	103:16;144:2;149:4;	261:21;262:21;271:20;	foot (6)
factually (1)	107:2	151:8;214:4;231:22	273:8;274:9	33:16,17,22;149:5,5,
131:2	feel (2)	fills (1)	firsthand (2)	12
fair (16)	111:18;137:21	23:13	54:1,14	footage (7)
9:18;13:21,23;15:23,	feeling (2)	films (1)	fit (2)	16:4;18:16;20:13,22;
25;28:12;46:14;63:16;	204:12;212:19	10:12	16:19;17:2	102:1;103:11;122:4
67:8;108:14,17;110:3;	feet (44)	filter (2)	five (27)	footing (1)
0/.0.100.14.1/.110.3.	1661 (44)			
173:18;180:9;222:15;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14;	170:11,12	42:19;57:13;58:14;	96:9
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8;	170:11,12 final (5)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25;	96:9 footings (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9,	96:9 footings (1) 96:12
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1,	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20;	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9,	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18;	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15;	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11,	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25;
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4,	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4;
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5,	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12,	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5,	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12,	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4,	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18,	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13;	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29)	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5,	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6; 52:16;90:5;140:9;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6 field (5)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23; 173:8;179:1,2;180:5,	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20,22;	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1) 17:2
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6; 52:16;90:5;140:9; 159:7 far (14)	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6 field (5) 25:9;157:16;192:22, 23;280:24	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23; 173:8;179:1,2;180:5, 19;190:3;202:2; 206:10;208:20;221:6;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20,22; 151:22;255:15;283:15, 17	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1) 17:2 former (1) 52:18
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6; 52:16;90:5;140:9; 159:7 far (14) 11:20;20:5;112:15;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6 field (5) 25:9;157:16;192:22, 23;280:24 fields (1)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23; 173:8;179:1,2;180:5, 19;190:3;202:2; 206:10;208:20;221:6; 227:12;240:9;243:12;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20,22; 151:22;255:15;283:15, 17 floors (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1) 17:2 former (1) 52:18 forming (1)
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6; 52:16;90:5;140:9; 159:7 far (14) 11:20;20:5;112:15; 129:15;179:1;181:15;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6 field (5) 25:9;157:16;192:22, 23;280:24 fields (1) 209:13	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23; 173:8;179:1,2;180:5, 19;190:3;202:2; 206:10;208:20;221:6; 227:12;240:9;243:12; 249:6,16;252:18;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20,22; 151:22;255:15;283:15, 17 floors (1) 255:9	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1) 17:2 former (1) 52:18 forming (1) 90:11
173:18;180:9;222:15; 256:4 Fairfax (1) 185:21 fairly (8) 158:3;162:1;192:21; 193:4;194:9;213:2; 261:1;283:7 fairness (4) 100:15;173:16; 197:8;205:24 faith (1) 206:5 fall (5) 30:17;145:11,17,18; 169:16 falling (1) 269:18 falls (3) 96:22;97:1;145:20 false (2) 184:14,15 familiar (7) 45:23;50:6;51:6; 52:16;90:5;140:9; 159:7 far (14) 11:20;20:5;112:15;	15:1,1,3;16:5;19:14; 25:2;27:4;32:7,8; 33:19,20;35:4;46:7; 88:7;94:18;98:25;99:1, 1,14;100:25;101:7,23; 118:16;122:12,17; 124:5;132:15,15,17,18; 133:3;139:14;144:14; 151:10;193:17,18,24; 279:24;280:11,13,19; 282:18,19,20 felt (1) 247:15 fence (17) 19:11;94:17,19; 96:11,20,22,24;97:1,5, 12,14,18,21;98:1,12, 18,22 fences (1) 90:12 few (7) 5:22;46:7;105:25; 169:3;203:15;214:13; 229:6 field (5) 25:9;157:16;192:22, 23;280:24 fields (1)	170:11,12 final (5) 6:5;20:20;46:19; 203:11;265:2 finally (3) 175:1;267:11,14 find (21) 51:20;56:11;95:11, 13;116:7;131:11; 142:12;179:22;180:4, 5,11;216:18;218:12; 219:11;221:10;223:5; 244:20;245:24;250:5; 253:4;270:6 finder (2) 166:17;204:14 finding (5) 45:1;133:12;247:18; 280:14,15 findings (6) 13:11;44:15;47:11; 68:12;180:4,14 fine (29) 117:2;158:18,23; 173:8;179:1,2;180:5, 19;190:3;202:2; 206:10;208:20;221:6; 227:12;240:9;243:12;	42:19;57:13;58:14; 76:20;94:18;98:25; 99:14;109:12;110:9, 12,13,23;112:20,20; 162:13;201:7;216:9, 11;218:4,6,16,17,18; 220:14;233:21;273:15; 279:1 five-minute (1) 57:9 fixed (1) 183:8 flat (2) 76:10;151:9 flattening (1) 252:20 flatter (1) 76:19 fleet (9) 176:7;185:10;194:4, 12;198:7;252:17,18, 25;281:21 floor (12) 4:15;112:16;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20,22; 151:22;255:15;283:15, 17 floors (1)	96:9 footings (1) 96:12 footnote (4) 34:24,25;35:6;37:17 forbid (1) 181:12 forest (4) 95:8;132:9;149:25; 173:2 forested (5) 14:19,21;150:4; 170:11;274:10 foresting (1) 150:14 forestry (1) 92:13 forget (1) 283:14 form (1) 21:5 formal (3) 164:6,14;246:3 format (1) 17:2 former (1) 52:18 forming (1)

formulating (1) frving 191:8 forth (10) fuel (103:1;163:22; 183:24;185:10;203:18; 206:24;230:23;237:22; 259:11;268:22 fuelin Forty-six (2) 15:2,3 forward (4) 197:19;198:7;199:3; full (9 223:24 forwarded (1) 6:16 forwarding (1) full-se 87:20 full-si found (9) 41:23;169:2;211:5; 243:19;263:13;271:24; full-ti 278:6;280:18;283:5 fully four (12) 76:21;109:11; 110:24;162:9;194:7; 203:1;220:8,8,11; fumes 234:24;235:23;282:4 functi fourfold (2) 235:10;243:7 four-foot (1) funct 143:8 fourth (1) furth 204:25 frame (3) 199:11:200:16; 227:13 Frank (1) 163:15 frankly (4) Furth 12:24;177:8;186:9; 226:6 fraudulent (1) furth 162:23 Frederick (1) futur 19:9 free-flow (2) 232:7,11 freeway (1) 181:10 frequency (1) gallor 163:24 gallor frequently (1) 54:21 Friday (8) 233:5,8,14,17,19,22; Gang 234:1,2 friends (1) 167:13 Frizzell (1) 43:13 front (13) 16:17:21:23:35:23; 50:17,18;64:21;66:12; Gang 78:18,24;90:8;101:8; 144:13;146:3 gap (

HOLLONLE COM O		
ying (2)	200:6	19;133:2;150:3
181:11,11	garage (4)	159:20;168:13;
iel (14)	53:17,19;217:4;	175:4;183:22;2
15:14;42:19;45:23,	231:14	205:18;209:12
24;46:4,4,6;47:14;	Gas (163)	generated (2)
48:2,5;54:24;175:12,	5:10,14;10:3;16:18,	103:1;265:17
12;176:16	20;17:1,6,16,24;18:7;	gentleman (1)
ieling (6)	22:7;24:18;25:1;26:23;	182:3
15:13;18:8;33:14;	56:6,8,12,16;69:1,22;	gentleman's (1)
79:7;176:20;279:25	70:17,20;71:4;87:17;	163:1
ıll (9)	88:17;95:6;103:9;	Gentlemen (1)
8:18;22:17;53:2;	105:12,14,15;119:15,	108:8
103:15;138:25;146:10,	21;121:25;125:22;	Georgia (13)
17;204:16;274:18	128:2,12;130:9;	20:21;61:3;129
ill-service (1)	133:14;135:13,18;	20;138:23;226:
53:4	136:10,11,11;137:7;	231:9;232:6;26
ıll-size (3)	140:1,3;144:1;149:13,	264:1;265:19;2
36:8;101:12,14	19;151:3;163:12;	273:17
ill-time (1)	166:5;171:25;172:11,	gets (5)
172:12	13;175:1,7,9,15,18,18;	64:8;78:25;97:2
ılly (3)	176:19;177:2,7;	
		254:6;277:7 Giant (1)
177:22;178:20; 205:24	178:17,19,22;180:13;	220:18
	181:2,5;183:21,22,23;	
imes (2) 43:24;193:1	192:3,20;193:1; 194:16;195:9;198:13,	given (8) 22:5;46:3;106:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		120:20;167:2,6
unction (1)	16,16;199:1,6,9,16,18,	
247:20	22;200:24;201:1,1,2,4,	13 gives (1)
(2)	6;202:10,12,15,19,22;	
284:6,6	203:23;207:19;208:6;	65:7
urther (23)	209:9;210:13;211:16;	giving (1) 75:13
6:21;49:17;54:9;	215:16,20,22;225:13,	
70:14;99:24;108:21; 124:3;143:14;145:11,	18;228:18;229:3,3,8,	glad (1) 96:6
23,24;150:21,25;151:8,	11,12,21,24,24;230:5, 15,25;231:4,8,8,9,11;	
9;162:16;172:15;	237:21,22,25;243:9;	glare (1) 43:25
189:22;194:9;196:7;		
199:12;206:2;274:12	260:12,14,19;261:5,22; 262:20;263:23,24,25;	glean (1) 117:20
urthermore (1)	265:3,5,16,17;266:9;	goal (3)
185:11	268:16;269:5,5,7;	29:16;127:2;13
irthest (2)	270:23;271:23,23;	goals (6)
193:17,23	270:23,271:23,23, 272:4;273:21;274:1,7;	41:15;69:14;71
iture (6)	275:7,21;277:14,15;	110:23;126:21
70:24,24;71:6;168:2;	278:3,5;281:8;283:6	GOECKE (108)
198:11;249:19	gases (2)	5:3,3;15:2;67:6
198.11,249.19	180:20;194:6	74:10;130:11;1
G	gasoline (17)	152:22;153:3,9
0	158:14;169:20,23;	154:11;155:2;1
allon (3)	171:2,6,21;172:21;	157:11;159:13,
172:16;210:18,22	175:13,17;200:12,17,	160:23;161:3,5
allons (5)	24;203:17;230:22;	162:2,6,9,13;16
169:19;170:1,3;	231:7;233:16;280:5	17,22,25;168:1
171:12;172:5	Gateway (1)	169:8,12,13;17
lang (26)	103:7	174:24,25;178:
8:6;10:20;11:4,5,9;	gave (1)	181:16,22;182:
12:16;17:15;23:20;	28:25	18;183:16;185:
47:9,18;48:16,25;49:5,	general (13)	186:25;187:4,6
17;52:11;57:19;76:6;	4:11;6:3;37:16;55:3;	190:10;191:6;1
81:4;89:5;100:22;	100:17;112:20;120:7;	194:15,21,24;1
102:5;109:7;131:25;	125:13,14;144:2;	197:12,16,23;1
140:24;143:24;152:14	164:10;215:18;284:8	206:7;212:9;21
lang's (3)	generally (20)	216:14;217:13;
5:23;63:10;126:23	40:22,25;52:16;53:9,	221:23;222:16;
ap (1)	23;112:2;127:17,18,	227:16;231:16;
-r (-)	20,112.2,127.17,10,	227.10,231.10,

19;133:2;150:3,4;	241:8;242:3,22,25;
159:20;168:13;169:24;	243:17;249:13;253:7;
175:4;183:22;202:14;	256:15;258:10;261:8,
205:18;209:12	12;263:10;266:11,19;
enerated (2)	268:18;274:22;276:1,
103:1;265:17	6,17,19,24;277:5,7,11;
entleman (1)	282:15;283:11
182:3	goes (31)
entleman's (1)	11:11;14:7,8;61:20;
163:1	67:20;69:7,16;96:10;
entlemen (1)	111:7;112:3,4;115:20;
108:8	125:5;130:21;134:19,
eorgia (13)	23;155:5;194:3;198:7;
20:21;61:3;129:19,	199:10;209:9;213:1;
20;138:23;226:11;	232:7;236:24;248:4;
231:9;232:6;260:17;	254:17;271:3;274:1;
264:1;265:19;268:21;	281:21;282:6;283:2
273:17	Good (20)
ets (5)	4:23;5:3;86:7;87:8;
64:8;78:25;97:22;	98:3,8;151:25;153:1;
254:6;277:7	155:10,14;162:17,17;
iant (1)	194:24;206:5;209:5,7;
220:18	210:24;241:8;275:1;
iven (8)	283:11
22:5;46:3;106:10;	government (1)
120:20;167:2,6;180:4,	197:7
13	Governments (6)
ives (1)	184:19;185:9;228:4;
65:7	246:21;247:17;252:1
iving (1)	grade (6)
75:13	78:19,21,24;97:18; 144:17;149:14
lad (1) 96:6	grades (1)
lare (1)	147:14
43:25	gradient (1)
lean (1)	248:14
117:20	gradients (1)
oal (3)	248:20
29:16;127:2;131:10	grading (1)
oals (6)	78:19
41:15;69:14;71:1,10;	graduate (1)
110:23;126:21	154:13
OECKE (108)	Grandview (2)
5:3,3;15:2;67:6;	112:5,6
74:10;130:11;148:10;	grant (3)
152:22;153:3,9,12,19;	87:3;174:11,11
154:11;155:2;156:17; 157:11;159:13,14;	graph (2) 247:18;250:18
160:23;161:3,5,7,9,16;	graphic (1)
162:2,6,9,13;167:11,	65:2
17,22,25;168:11,22,24;	grasped (1)
169:8,12,13;173:5,6;	214:15
174:24,25;178:8,9,15;	gravitational (1)
181:16,22;182:1,5,9,	159:4
18;183:16;185:17;	gray (6)
186:25;187:4,6,7,24;	69:8,9;70:15;110:10;
190:10;191:6;193:6;	134:18;198:25
194:15,21,24;195:3,5;	great (8)
197:12,16,23;198:21;	8:12;38:25;106:23;
206:7;212:9;214:21;	131:14;152:22;169:10;
216:14;217:13;219:16;	175:24;177:8
221:23;222:16;223:18;	greater (6)
227:16;231:16;238:11;	186:16;259:18;

TETHION OF COSICO	WHOLESALE CORI O	KATION	1	1
271:13,13;272:14;	104:8,13,16;105:2,7,	236:6,11,13,17,23,25;	176:24;184:25;190:14;	148:3,5,8;247:9;
280:17	19,24;106:8,14,23;	237:5,8,12,13,17;	191:8,17,18;202:1	276:23;283:22,23;
greatly (1)	107:2,7,9;108:8,22,25;	238:18,21,23;239:4,14;		284:4
281:13	109:3,22;111:9,11;	240:10,18,20;241:2,6,	Н	Harris's (3)
green (18)	113:16;114:7;115:9;	9,14,22;242:4,17,21,		7:4,8;8:5
71:17,23;72:10,24,	116:4,8,14,23;117:1,5,	23;243:1;244:6,9,13,	half (10)	hates (1)
24;77:14;89:15,17;	7,11,15,20,23;118:4,9,	16;245:2,9,13,16,21;	81:12;142:14;	129:2
110:11;169:21;193:7;	13,18;119:1,10,17,25;	246:6,12,25;247:3,5,	197:18;220:2,3,5,11;	hazard (1)
199:1;200:3;249:11;	120:6,11,19;121:1,7;	11,21,25;248:3,6;	264:10,14;277:2	45:8
253:22;268:12;269:7;	123:4,15,18;124:1,17,	249:5,8,25;250:2,9,17,	halfway (3)	head (2)
279:17	24;125:3,8,17,20;	21,23;251:1,18,20,22;	73:16;77:10;276:19	149:7;245:3
gross (1)	126:1,4,7,10,18;127:1,	252:5,22;253:6,13,17,	· · · · ·	heading (3)
			hamburgers (1)	
122:11	6,9;130:11,14,17,20,	24;254:12,16,20;	169:7	72:1;149:5,6
GROSSMAN (741)	23;131:2,12,14,20,22;	255:23;257:18,22,25;	Hampshire (1)	health (44)
4:2,18,24;5:2,12,17,	133:19;134:8,11,15;	258:3,5,9;259:3,22;	138:18	44:5,6,15,20,21,22,
20;7:10,14,19,23;8:4,	136:18;137:23;138:3,	260:1,3,10,15,20;	hand (2)	24,25;103:16,21,25;
12,18;9:1,4,12,14,22,	6,9,12,15,20;139:1,4,	261:10,14,19;262:1,12,	153:15;274:20	104:3,7,12,12,25;
25;10:3,7,10,14,18,22,	11,21;140:19;141:8,13,	14,18,23,25;263:3,8;	handed (1)	105:21,21;106:3,3,5,
24;11:3,25;12:5,15,18,	19,23;142:1,11,16,21;	265:1,11,15,21;266:4,	62:19	12,12;177:2,3,4,6,11,
22,25;13:18,21,23;	143:14,16,19,21;	8,10,17;267:17,20,23;	handicap (1)	16,20,23,25;178:5;
14:2,6,13,24;15:3,7,10,	144:23;145:6;146:19,	268:6;271:18;272:17;	76:23	188:6;189:18;190:1,
23;16:1;17:9,12;18:2,	23;147:1,9,13,15,21,	273:2,6,19;274:21;	handling (1)	11;195:10;236:10;
	24;148:4,9,11,14,17,	276:2,3,13,15,18;	247:7	254:5,14;256:3,4,17
14;19:24;20:2,5;22:11,				
15,25;23:3,10,14,16,	19,21,23;149:1;150:12,	277:3,9;280:21;281:2,	hands (2)	healthy (2)
18,19,23,25;24:3,5,8,	22;151:2,11,14;152:7,	6,10;282:12;283:12,	5:20;284:11	254:3,8
15,23;25:1,13,16;	10,13,16,23;153:2,4,7,	13;284:1,5,11	hang (1)	hear (10)
26:25;27:3,7,20;28:1,4,	10,13,14,17,23;154:10;	ground (9)	9:2	7:10;13:20;107:11,
6,10;29:5,7,11;31:5,14,	155:1;156:13;157:7;	87:1;96:17;97:25;	happen (6)	12,12;109:2;203:21,
18;33:16,19,24;34:3,8,	159:11;160:23;161:2,	98:12;144:23,25;	86:21;186:10;194:2;	21;246:6;254:23
16;35:14;36:4,7,13,17,	4,6,8,21;162:5,8,11,15,	145:5,10;163:23	225:9;282:3,3	heard (3)
22,24;37:3,8,10,13,21,	22,25;163:14;164:16,	grounds (1)	happened (7)	5:18;61:6;120:5
24;38:9,12,14,23;39:1,	18;165:9,12,16,20,22,	166:1	55:24;110:1;224:17,	hearing (19)
4,9,11,15,22,24;40:6,	25;166:4,8,11,13;	group (1)	18;225:3;234:19;	4:3,11,15,17,18;
15;41:2,5,9,18,21;42:7,	167:9,12,16,20,24;	100:16	251:10	6:12;16:11;18:24;
11,14,16;46:5,11,14,	168:4,7,12,23;169:4,6,	groups (2)		96:19;107:25;169:5;
			happening (4)	
25;47:12,20;48:1,4,9,	10,14;170:24;171:10,	100:3;195:24	195:7;220:8;225:6;	186:19;204:19;221:21;
11,13,18,25;49:2,4,25;	16,24;172:3,6,17,20,	Grove (1)	275:21	223:16;242:20;272:10;
50:3;51:21;52:13;	25;173:12,17;174:10,	150:19	happens (4)	283:15;284:13
53:14;55:15,23;56:3;	15,22;175:3,6;176:2,5,	guardrail (1)	87:3;182:25;210:19;	hearings (3)
57:8,10,12,15,17;59:8,	15;177:3,14,17,21;	145:16	218:21	157:6;168:15;284:7
12,15,18,20,23,25;	178:4,7,12,16;179:11,	Guckert (3)	happy (7)	hearsay (7)
60:4,13;61:9,11;62:17,	15,25;180:3,9;181:2,	47:17;61:5;212:5	18:25;22:22;24:2;	99:6;229:16;244:4,6,
18,22;63:5,7,9,12,16,	15,24;182:2,8,10,12,	Guckert's (5)	25:24;116:2;146:7;	12,17;245:9
21,24;64:3,7,18,21;	14,17,24;183:25;184:2,	45:10;212:5;216:4;	257:9	heat (2)
65:9;66:1,11,14;67:6,8,	7,13,15;185:12;186:17,	218:20;233:4	Harbor (1)	209:20;271:13
10,14,16;68:7,18,23;	24;187:3,5,17;188:8,	guess (19)	20:10	heating (1)
69:19;70:1,12,22;71:3,	13,16,20,23,25;189:4,	10:18;39:15;41:6;	hard (4)	210:5
		46:15;90:22;93:1;		
8,12;72:9,17,19;74:15,	6,17,20,24;190:9,12;		9:8,11;186:8;268:12	heaven (1)
18,20;76:6,16,25;77:6,	191:5;192:9,15;	126:15;151:2;152:17;	hardwood (1)	181:12
8,11,13,18,25;78:3,5;	194:15,22;195:2,4;	162:6;171:16,16;	145:14	heavy (3)
80:19;82:25;83:4,7,15,	197:2,5,12,15,22,25;	173:18;204:24;205:11;	Harris (66)	159:3;160:9;273:17
18,21;84:2,7,10,14,18,	204:6,8,15;205:7,10,	237:14;245:24;246:11;	4:23,23,24,25;6:1;	heavy-duty (2)
20;85:1,5,8,11,18;	15;206:6;207:23;	277:21	8:1,8,9,17;9:22,24;	219:12;231:21
86:14,20;87:12,15;	208:14;209:19,23,25;	guidance (5)	10:13,15,21;25:13;	Hecht's (1)
88:3,9,13,25;89:2,20;	210:3,7,11;211:8,18,	185:13,15,15,24;	35:18,20,23;36:1,5,14,	53:19
90:16,19,22;91:1,6,15,	21,25;212:8,22;213:8,	196:7	18;46:21,24;48:24;	hedonic (2)
18,21;92:3,8,15;93:9,	19,24;214:1,3;215:8,	guideline (4)	51:25;63:7,10,13,19;	283:2,5
19,22,24;94:3,5,8,11,	12,25;217:7,16,23;	205:20;207:16;	64:1;102:3;131:21,24;	height (7)
24;95:3,13;96:4,5,7,14,	219:8;221:16,19,22;	248:10,11	133:20,22;134:9,14,16,	94:18;99:14,16,17;
		Guidelines (23)		
17,21,25;97:10,13,20,	222:15,17,21,24;223:4,		25;136:20,21;139:5,22,	132:17;151:17,20
24;98:7,9,15;99:6,9,11,	8,10,12,17,19,21;	60:16;61:16,17;62:4,	23;140:18,24;141:18,	Heights (34)
22,23;100:1,4,6,9,10,	224:2,4;226:20;227:7;	20;63:2,6,15;64:4,17;	21;142:3;146:18,21,	5:6,8;6:24;7:21;9:7;
15;101:9,12;102:3,7;	229:15,19;230:13;	65:9,10,12;66:7,12,18;	25;147:3,5,8,10,25;	10:1;11:2;14:23;58:5;

64:14:68:3:81:20; 71:11 108:5.13:112:15: 114:18;144:19,20; 166:18;192:4,19; 203:6;207:20;209:10; 219:1;220:25;221:7; hill (4) 257:12;258:2;269:14; 274:9;279:23;280:1; Hills (1) 283:7 Hello (2) 204:8,9 hilltop (1) 78:20 help (3) 15:7;69:15;159:15 himself (1) helpful (8) 158:15;169:17; hint (1) 205:17;223:1;224:5,8, 85:1 12;279:15 hired (1) Henry (2) 203:6 203:7;204:7 history (2) Here's (7) 36:14:88:13:168:8; hit (1) 200:24;231:18;261:22; 271:20 hitting (1) hesitation (1) 186:5 162:18 Hlinka (3) High (21) 16:16;31:3;145:21; Hold (15) 160:16,17;187:12; 192:6,22;196:20; 212:19,19;218:21; 228:2;229:11;230:6; 231:1:239:24:262:13: 266:5;275:19;277:18 higher (22) 57:7;99:1;145:19; home (23) 151:7;172:23;181:9, 13,19;183:7;186:14, 15;190:22;199:11; 201:5;209:12;217:12, 17:228:22:233:8; 251:6;271:6,10 highest (18) 111:2,5;146:1; homes (10) 191:23,23;207:3,6,13; 214:17,25;224:18,20; 243:13,19;260:8; 263:13;264:6;279:4 honest (1) highlight (7) 37:16;59:1,6;60:2,5; 113:17;160:2 13:12 highlighted (14) hop (1) 8:10,14,15,19;65:23; 12:15 67:3;71:20;89:11; hoped (2) 115:10,13,14;135:6; 216:24;257:16 highlighter (3) 37:15;58:21;78:11 **HOT (14)** highlighting (4) 59:4;60:7;131:15; 257:16 high-loading (2) hotel (1) 221:3,4 highly (1)

271:13 high-risk (1) hour (14) 160:16 highways (2) 61:1:72:3 22;220:10;225:2; 144:16;145:12; hourly-resolved (1) 209:9:274:9 209:5 hours (12)110:12 279:1 204:17 house (1) 183:14 houses (5) 145:11,17,18,19; 149:9 housing (6) 210:20,20 21,22 195:22 Howard (1) 204:4 huge (1) 245:7 154:22;203:9;204:4 hundred (2) 25:2;27:4 12:16;19:13;53:14; 61:10;83:21;117:7; 118:4;137:23;141:19; 142:11,13,16;161:2; icon (1) 173:12:229:15 58:1 idea (7) holidays (2) 31:23:32:1 21:21,25;181:11; identification (4) 183:2,10:225:3:238:5; 8:24;9:20;81:2; 240:23;242:9;254:10, 142:18 22;255:6;257:12; identified (12) 259:15;269:12;270:6, 8,21;271:4;275:4,8; 10:79:21:89:15: 280:10:282:10 137:10;232:9 21:11,25;78:19; identifies (1) 144:5,6;151:5,22; 256:10 identify (15) 169:20,22;280:1 4:21;9:4;11:10; 204:23 Honestly (1) 159:2,21:160:16; 244:25 identifying (3) 204:10;210:9 idle (2) 220:9,10 Hopefully (1) 152:18 idling (13) 185:4;186:1;272:1,3, 4,5;273:13,21;275:11, 22;263:25;271:21 13,14,16,17,22 **II**(4) 230:2;281:17,20; 124:10 282:6 Hotter (1) illumination (1)

43:25 imagine (1) 196:21;214:16,25; 283:3 218:7,9,11,20;219:19, immaterial (3) 11:21;12:2;13:10 232:15;277:2;278:14 immediate (2) 177:4.7 immediately (3) 47:7;48:6;134:5 54:18;108:5;215:2,6; impact (23) 219:23;220:8;225:2,4; 18:4;43:17;45:1,2, 232:19:276:25:277:1; 12:50:20:51:15:69:15: 75:14;102:16,20; 140:8;169:19;171:3; 175:7;179:21;190:7; 192:10,13;212:23; 221:1;279:11,13 impacted (1) 273:25 111:1;124:4,12,15, impacts (22) 49:11:71:10:187:19: 189:25,25;198:1,5,11; 201:25;202:16;208:12; 212:13,17,21;214:12; 220:1,17;221:7,10; 229:14;231:1;232:22 implications (1) 71:6 implies (1) 120:16 imply (1) 68:11 important (5) 88:18;190:18;209:5; 67:19;187:18;227:9; 254:4;255:4 241:8;245:3,4;247:14 imposed (1) 28:21 impression (4) 120:4,10,11,12 44:22:61:1.21:65:8. improve (2) 49:14:282:24 110:13:112:16:133:5: improvements (1) 32:6 improving (2) 200:12;201:18 inadequate (1) 86:17 inappropriate (1) 35:15;44:6,21;53:12; 74:4;79:20;80:7;134:4; 173:19 incense (1) 181:12 incentives (1) 110:9;160:12;203:22 121:20 inches (2) 97:17;98:5 inches' (1) 176:2;219:13,14,14, 98:12 include (19) 17,22,23;220:2,16,19, 4:7;12:7;68:20; 78:16:84:21:162:20; 163:16;175:6;238:8,8; 261:24;262:19;263:21, 25;264:2,21;265:6,23,

Ι

24 included (9) 82:21;91:2;159:5; 163:15;164:17;172:8; 215:21;267:15;269:9 includes (14) 15:13;91:16;104:2; 154:4:238:1,9:261:16; 263:23;264:3,18; 265:15,21,22;266:6 including (18) 90:12;154:7;158:2, 10,13;160:10;171:4; 172:8;180:24,24; 188:5,7;232:10; 236:21;256:9;262:19; 266:9;278:2 inclusion (2) 6:20;278:18 incompatibility (3) 281:15,19:282:6 inconsistent (3) 34:4,5;98:4 incorporated (3) 50:7;154:2;210:21 incorrect (6) 120:12;184:9; 217:19;272:11,16; 274:7 increase (7) 171:18,18,19;211:6; 220:1:228:11:235:9 increased (7) 210:25:211:4.10: 212:13,17,21;243:7 increasing (1) 211:8 incremental (21) 181:4;191:20; 206:14;215:22;237:25; 261:21:264:22.23: 268:16,25;269:5,22; 270:8,17,21,22,23; 273:22;275:6,10;278:4 indeed (1) 17:2 independent (5) 43:16;44:11;45:11; 168:14;225:8 India (2) 160:5,10 indicate (6) 31:22;33:12;70:15; 72:14;143:1;273:10 indicated (9) 31:1,10,25;72:25; 76:8;77:3;85:11;139:2; 143:24 indicating (2) 74:15:119:4 indication (4) 40:17;56:6;207:19; 277:15

individual (2)	
211:19;214:4	
individually (1)	j
230:18	
individuals (4)	j
22:5;177:16;188:7;	
189:9	i
indoor (2)	
181:7,8	j
	1
industrial (2)	
94:14;226:19	i
industry (5)	
160:9,18;195:23,23;	i
	1
270:12	
infeasible (1)	j
26:15	
influence (1)]
47:1	
informal (10)	i
40:14,15,18;41:11,	
24;42:3,8;135:20,23;	
136:8]
information (15)	1
27:10,11;28:16,25;	j
31:12;42:22;44:3,19;	
45:8;50:18;55:17;	j
144:13;166:16;224:8;	
228:14	
inherent (1)	j
225:16	
initial (3)]
211:9;213:12;234:17	1
211.9,213.12,234.17	
initially (4)	j
165:11;213:2,11;	
242:10	
initiatives (1)	j
201:17	1
input (1)	j
184:20	
inputs (2)	j
184:22;185:21	[
104.22,105.21	
inside (6)	
91:12,23;135:5;	
181:10;183:2,10	
insignificant (2)	
206:14;233:12	
install (2)	
174:2;230:2	
instance (2)	
138:17;280:6	
instantly (1)	
97:16	
instead (2)	
76:20;234:25	
institutional (1)	
94:13	
instructed (1)	i
245:4	
integral (1)	i
	1
18:10	
integrate (1)	li
61:24	
integrated (6)	i
Bratea (0)	1

58:24:60:9:64:25; 65:18;66:5;157:24 intended (2) 120:14;135:10 intensity (1) 56:1 intent (1) 214:9 interest (2) 87:20;169:12 interesting (1) 116:6 interior (1) 15:14 internal (1) 102:25 Internet (1) 163:21 interpretation (4) 92:10;206:10; 208:19,20 **Interpretations (1)** 203:20 interpreting (1) 69:7 interrupt (5) 17:9;18:2;62:9; 173:1;185:18 interruption (1) 17:13 Intersection (2) 216:3:272:3 intersections (5) 45:12,15;218:1; 228:16;272:2 intervals (1) 96:13 intervening (1) 169:21 into (51) 7:7;21:11;30:19; 41:12,16,21,23;42:9; 50:7;64:8;96:17,22; 97:1;106:17;112:8; 113:11;116:21;117:1, 14;138:23;159:1; 169:18;170:7;175:13; 176:21;179:18;180:21; 182:10;184:18,21; 187:13;208:23;210:15, 21,23;213:17;217:4; 218:24,25;219:24; 220:5,16,24;249:21; 250:5;254:14;256:17, 18;271:14;274:2; 281:18 introduce (1) 153:23 introduced (3) 16:12;106:11;246:9 invention (1) 197:17 inventory (1)

	158:12	23
	investigator (2)	judg
	157:24;158:8	19
	invite (1)	judic
	152:2 invited (2)	63 July
	6:17;151:24	5 1
	involve (1)	jump
	165:5	18
	involved (6)	June
	26:22,24;158:17; 160:10;204:3;234:20	4:1 36
	involves (2)	28
	159:19;164:25	junk
	involving (3)	25
	161:14;163:7,9	juris
	IRIS (1) 203:1	19
	I-R-I-S (1)	juris 19
	203:1	justi
	isocyanate (1)	27
	160:6	
	isolines (1)	
	279:10 issue (25)	Kam
	47:14;48:17;69:16;	Kain 6:1
	88:22;92:6;97:22;	80
	98:23;142:23;163:18;	Kam
	180:17,19;181:1,5;	88
	184:3;192:1;198:5; 209:9;210:21;232:23;	Kare 5:5
	252:17;268:23,23,23,	keep
	25;273:12	23
	issues (16)	ken (
	11:16,17;30:23;	16
	43:23;47:10,15;65:13; 69:17,19,20;70:2;	Kenr 25
	154:4;160:12;164:5,7;	Kens
	192:13	5:5
	Item (1)	9:7
	102:19	19
	IV-A6 (1) 102:15	81 11
	102.15	20
	J	19
		20
	January (7)	22
,	184:23;211:5,22,23; 232:15,16;257:7	25 27
,	Jim (1)	key (
·	31:6	25
	job (2)	KHC
	131:14;187:6	9:1
	jog (1) 218:11	kicki 18
	join (1)	kind
	230:8	68
	jointly (1)	17
	203:25 judge (3)	19 22
	173:16,16;253:20	22
	judgment (5)	knew
	191:3;195:15,21;	25
	D	i

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

1	1
224 18 248 22	
234:18;248:23	Knolls (3)
judgments (2)	39:8;257:14;258:6
190:20,20	knowledge (5)
judicial (1)	54:1,10,14;57:4;
63:14	191:7
July (2)	known (3)
51:22;203:5	4:10;21:12;202:9
jump (2)	knows (5)
181:15;246:22	117:4;119:8;225:21;
June (10)	229:20,24
4:12,14;5:24;9:5,15;	
36:3;80:24;225:3;	L
283:14;284:12	
junkyard (1)	I A (1)
	LA (1)
253:4	252:15
jurisdiction (1)	lab (2)
191:16	280:22,24
jurisdictions (1)	label (2)
190:18	105:21,21
justified (1)	labeled (8)
274:12	73:22;79:23;89:20;
2/7.12	104:21;110:6;112:9;
V	
K	143:6;253:14
	laboratory (4)
Kamen (8)	165:4,8;192:17,18
6:13,18;7:17;9:6,16;	lab's (1)
80:21;247:7,9	280:3
Kamen's (2)	lack (4)
88:5;92:5	12:9;68:16;166:1,2
Karen (2)	Lagoon (3)
5:5;7:3	9:5;167:13;168:4
keep (2)	Lagoon's (1) 8:21
23:25;169:12	
ken (1)	land (8)
166:16	28:13;33:6,7;140:25;
Kenmont (3)	195:20;197:11;271:14;
257:13;258:5;269:15	272:13
Kensington (40)	landscaping (1)
5:5,8,15;6:24;7:21;	132:20
9:7;10:1,7;11:1;14:23;	Lane (11)
19:6;58:5;64:14;68:2;	20:10;137:14,16,17;
81:20;108:4,12,23;	138:7,12,14,20,22,25;
110:12;112:6;144:19,	186:3
20;152:11;166:8,18;	lanes (4)
192:4,19;203:6;	
	138:8;185:5;186:1;
207:20;209:10;219:1;	275:17
220:25;221:7;257:12;	language (2)
258:2;269:14;274:9;	91:7;223:8
279:23;280:1;283:7	large (13)
key (1)	57:23;119:15;
257:11	170:13;194:10,19;
KHCA (1)	198:13,14;199:20,24;
9:16	208:16;226:18;227:20;
kicking (1)	278:17
183:4	larger (5)
kind (13)	175:19;201:1,7,9;
68:11;79:21;95:17;	233:8
170:5;189:14;190:25;	Larry (1)
196:9;208:8;226:3;	Larry (1) 5:9
228:14;246:8;251:23;	laser (1)
	38:23
275:22	
knew (1)	last (22)

PETITION OF COSICO	WHULESALE
46:16,22;53:2;62:19;	leeway (2)
65:11;107:25;131:8;	49:8;141:24
155:25;161:18;184:23;	left (10)
186:18;195:8;198:12;	10:25;53:18;62
200:6;205:1;207:11;	74:10;101:19;1
235:9;261:15;262:15	200:22;220:6;2
lastly (2)	283:18
213:11;261:4	left-hand (4)
late (4)	57:23,24;81:8;8
199:15,15,17,23	legal (3)
later (7)	136:2;169:15;1
167:3;175:25;	legend (2)
186:22;187:1;260:2;	58:1;79:23
267:25;280:9	legitimate (3)
latest (2)	25:16,21;34:4
35:19;37:4	lends (1)
law (1)	10:15
190:16	length (2)
lawns (1)	33:20;75:18
259:8	Lerch (1)
laymen (1)	4:25
166:16	less (34)
layout (3)	16:7,9,23;94:17
11:10,13,14	99:14;158:23,2
LB (1) 70-24	170:2;179:21;1
79:24	11;191:23;194:
LB-3(2)	198:11,11;206:
80:8;83:11 LB-5 (13)	221:6;239:2;24 245:18;249:17;
79:23;80:3;81:9;	255:11;262:6;2
82:14;83:12,13,13,15,	13;269:1;271:9
22;84:10,11;85:11;	273:15,16;275:
137:2	280:20
LDN (1)	less-traveled (1)
278:24	226:13
LDNs (1)	letter (18)
279:2	7:1,3,15,16,21;
lead (2)	15;80:21,22,24
95:16;201:17	87:11,24;88:3;
leak (2)	105:10;106:6;2
254:11;255:6	level (37)
leakage (1)	144:23,25;145:
214:4	149:8;151:13;1
leaks (1)	166:15;174:19;
255:6	179:23;180:12,
learned (1)	183:7;185:24;1
176:10	14,24;190:20;1
leasable (1)	19;200:18,19;2
122:12	215:2;230:6;23
lease (2)	243:22;255:20;
136:12,22	266:25;268:2;2
leases (2)	278:7;279:4,5;2
25:7;27:17	levels (22)
least (10)	157:13;159:16;
6:8;55:20;150:19;	163:24;176:25;
167:25;173:12;195:14;	191:25;192:2,4
207:25;215:6;247:12;	243:19;263:21;
277:2 Joava (5)	275:19;277:16,
leave (5)	278:9,20,21;27
37:22;48:18;167:5;	281:4 Lexington (1)
182:8;271:18 Lee (2)	Lexington (1) 20:16
160:7,7	20:16 lifetime (2)
100.7,7	meunie (2)

155:11,11 light (1) 129:25 53:18:62:15: light-duty (1) 101:19;120:21; 231:21 lighter (1) 2;220:6;270:15; 89:10 lighting (1) 24;81:8;82:10 108:6 lights (1) 169:15;197:4 232:10 likely (3) 180:6,12,14 limit (2) 188:22:196:20 limitation (2) 29:14,15 limitations (3) 28:13;29:1,9 limited (1) 154:3 Lindsey (7) ,23;94:17; 247:2,5,10;272:20, 158:23,24,24; 22;273:9;274:24 179:21;188:9, Lindsey's (1) :23;194:3; 272:24 ,11;206:16; line (35) 239:2;243:13; 32:8,9,24,24;54:9; 3;249:17;250:7; 68:8;69:6;70:5;71:18, ;262:6;264:10, 18,23;72:2;89:13; 9:1:271:9.9; 90:25;91:1.2.3.8.17; 5,16;275:5; 117:23:144:18.19.21. 22;145:13;149:3,6; 151:9;200:3;214:7; 222:3;247:19;251:25; 253:13;279:25 5,16,21;9:6, lines (9) 21:2;32:23;72:24,25; 21,22,24;85:20; 190:2:198:15:199:19: 24;88:3;92:6;):106:6:244:14 250:5,6 Lipman (1) 3,25;145:5,10; 43:12 151:13;163:23; list (7) 5;174:19;178:23; 7:7;44:8;104:2,25; 142:12;163:16;169:18 3;180:12,14; 185:24;188:10, listed (3) 83:11;165:11;169:14 190:20;191:2,):18,19;209:12; lists (4) 230:6;236:6; 103:20,24;104:6; 2;255:20;263:13; 105:10 5:268:2:269:18; literature (8) 279:4,5;280:9 105:11;170:14; 179:19;180:22;183:1; 3;159:16; 186:14;191:13;274:13 4;176:25;186:6; little (26) 5;192:2,4,11; 18:24;19:2;23:21;);263:21;270:10; 39:5;58:20,21;73:24; 9;277:16,16,17; 126:14;127:3;137:11; 20,21;279:18,18; 141:23;172:10;210:18; 215:17:227:9:232:18, 19,21;237:13;239:23; 261:14;264:13;270:2; 275:6;276:25;280:12

live (3) 71:2,6,10 130:6;131:6;205:22 look (47) lived (2) 16:15;22:8;35:15; 54:3:160:12 37:6:40:11:56:10: living (1) 60:20;62:12;81:9; 153:24 82:13;83:22;88:10,21; loading (18) 89:5;95:19;96:21;97:2, 39:7:50:7.10.20: 3:98:2:99:19:101:14; 51:4;183:17;208:3,9, 122:7;124:12;142:9; 16:219:5.5.5.6.10: 146:8;149:14;150:5; 220:20;221:4;231:18, 184:17;196:7;201:12, 20 13;204:19;207:11,25; loadings (4) 218:18;219:11,14; 183:12,13;190:3; 222:10;240:22;241:18; 221:8 242:7,8;259:13;262:9; local (9) 272:24;273:4;274:8 58:2,18;61:22;79:25; looked (11) 120:17;176:20; 81:7;82:11;108:18; 190:18;207:19 179:18;190:2;191:14; locally (1) 207:12;208:3,4; 209:16;230:23;233:16 163:13 locate (2) looking (36) 38:7;53:6 22:8,19,21;35:20; located (20) 36:15;38:7;50:12;59:9; 74:2;89:8;99:18; 4:8;17:17;32:7;33:2; 35:3,13;38:18;45:24; 101:13;116:8;125:25; 51:8,11;53:5,7,13; 133:23;142:25;144:4; 78:9;93:16;96:10; 147:3,16;176:23; 100:25;124:7;136:16; 198:20,24,25;228:16; 282:9 238:13:251:13:268:4. locating (1) 7:270:4,14:271:11,18; 121:21 274:7:275:2.4.4 location (53) looks (3) 13:3;15:13;16:19; 77:14;141:7;272:22 17:3;20:20;25:2,3,9,10, Los (3) 252:22;253:2,8 18,19;26:4,9,10,15,17, 23;27:4,5,8,19,21,23; loss(1)28:7,17,18;35:12; 214:6 37:16;40:3,18;41:3,25; losses (1) 46:7,18,20;47:13,23; 198:9 48:10,20;50:6;52:19; lost (1)54:8:69:2:70:23:75:5: 102:23 77:10;78:17;79:11; Lot (34) 124:9;134:17;179:5, 4:9;62:8;100:16; 10;272:13 129:20;139:19;180:19, locations (21) 20;181:13;199:11; 18:5;81:19;118:2; 201:12,15;216:12,25; 130:1;186:4;207:14; 217:2;218:6,6,8,14,15, 216:6;221:7;243:19; 16;219:2,13;221:5; 249:14;257:11;258:8, 227:8;229:2;231:13; 21;259:8,10;263:6; 257:7:268:22:273:12; 266:15,21,22;267:3; 274:11;275:15;279:13; 273:17 283:7,8 Locks (1) lots (21) 20:11 216:7,8,15,16,16,17, long (10) 19,19;217:9,21,24; 25:19;93:14;102:19; 218:2,25;220:23,24; 155:10;183:12;186:11; 221:4;228:21;231:6; 214:18;218:21;237:15; 248:17;260:18;278:15 276:1 louder (1) longer (1) 23:21 276:15 love (1) long-term (3) 146:9

$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$;
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$;
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
17;232:19,20;234:18;108:6,6,11,12;112:8,Martin (1)14,20,21;135:21184:17;196:23;254:4;256:1;270:16;22;113:1,3,12,25;4:18MDE (1)204:1,2,3;208:24279:11,12114:2,4;115:3,18,20;Maryland (6)229:10209:2;214:8;227lower (21)116:13;118:1,15;4:9;103:7,12;188:5;mean (81)244:24,25;247:957:24;62:15,16;121:11;128:3,5;129:4,267:4;281:1413:12;27:25;33:16;meetings (1)	
254:4;256:1;270:16; 279:11,1222;113:1,3,12,25; 114:2,4;115:3,18,20; 116:13;118:1,15;4:18 Maryland (6) 4:9;103:7,12;188:5; 267:4;281:14MDE (1) 229:10204:1,2,3;208:24 209:2;214:8;227 mean (81)10wer (21) 57:24;62:15,16;116:13;118:1,15; 121:11;128:3,5;129:4,4:9;103:7,12;188:5; 267:4;281:14mean (81) 13:12;27:25;33:16;244:24,25;247:9 meetings (1)	
279:11,12114:2,4;115:3,18,20;Maryland (6)229:10209:2;214:8;227lower (21)116:13;118:1,15;4:9;103:7,12;188:5;mean (81)244:24,25;247:957:24;62:15,16;121:11;128:3,5;129:4,267:4;281:1413:12;27:25;33:16;meetings (1)	
lower (21)116:13;118:1,15;4:9;103:7,12;188:5;mean (81)244:24,25;247:957:24;62:15,16;121:11;128:3,5;129:4,267:4;281:1413:12;27:25;33:16;meetings (1)	.11,
57:24;62:15,16; 121:11;128:3,5;129:4, 267:4;281:14 13:12;27:25;33:16; meetings (1)	
206:13,13;211:15; 23;150:15,16;170:18; 58:17 79:9;82:16;83:15; mega (1)	
213:3,7;225:12,15; 207:17,24;208:4,12; master (6) 89:13;91:19,23;92:3,8, 130:9	
238:10;271:17 215:4,18,19;217:10,25; 11:15;29:16;68:14; 13,23;93:2;98:15; Melvin (2)	
lowest (2) 218:24;220:21;221:9; 72:3;94:15;143:9 106:14;121:15;132:10; 150:19;151:22	
218:7;226:8 226:7,8,21;228:15; master's (1) 145:18;146:6,12; members (2)	
luck (1) 258:4;259:10,16; 154:16 147:4;150:18;151:6, 140:4;256:8 224:20 222:27:27:27:12 match (1) 18:155:14:159:21 match (2)	
234:20 263:7;269:17;271:12; match (1) 18;155:14;158:21; membership (1)	
lunch (2) 274:14 211:4 159:11,12;167:16,20; 22:6 04.4.152.10 11.4	
94:4;152:19 mall/core (1) matched (1) 172:22;174:18;175:12; memberships (1)	
luncheon (1) $65:24$ $213:4$ $181:2;183:1,13,18,21;$ $140:1$ 152.5 $140:1$ $140:1$ $140:1$	
153:5 malls (4) material (1) 188:9;189:9;194:12; memorandum (4)	
122:4,6,25;123:11 98:13 200:13;201:11;202:11; 80:22,23,24;85:2	1
M manageable (1) materials (1) 205:25;218:11;219:17; memory (1)	
226:2 90:11 228:13;229:11,17; 141:6	
magnitudes (1) management (2) math (5) 235:14,17;239:6; mention (5) 201 11 210 12 220 11 210 12 220 11 210 12 220 11 210 12 220 11	
281:11 157:25;205:4 218:13;220:11; 240:2,3;244:14;245:3, 5:24;80:19;103:3	;
mailed (1) mandating (1) 224:21,22;225:7 7,10;247:21;252:9; 113:8;163:14	
9:11 6:1 matter (14) 256:1;258:12;259:4,8; mentioned (26)	
main (4) mandatory (1) 4:3;137:20;157:21; 272:9;273:4;274:6; 21:16;30:4;58:10	
115:20;262:8;268:9; 93:7 158:18,22;179:1,16; 275:3;276:15 90:1;142:3;144:1	
269:20 manner (1) 183:8;249:6;254:9; meander (1) 162:16;163:3;16	
mainly (1) 203:24 255:2;262:16,16;265:3 78:25 192:16;193:12;19	
137:21 many (22) matters (10) meandering (1) 196:10;201:25;20	
maintained (1) 31:22;43:5;54:4,11; 5:22;8:7;9:23;10:1,2, 76:19 230:24;231:13;2	
260:24 108:1;118:16;121:24; 4,5;202:11;283:20; meaning (6) 234:17;243:15,2	
maintenance (3) 155:22;156:23;158:1; 284:8 28:3;56:10;80:14; 248:8;266:2;274	10;
97:15,22;98:16 160:5;165:5;172:5,11; maximum (9) 91:8;164:16;204:17 279:21;281:12	
major (11) 176:10,11;191:10; 179:5,21;214:13; means (18) mentioning (1) 27:10:01:1710:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02:02	
27:18;61:1;71:25; 192:24;197:18,18; 243:25;259:2;263:18; 4:19;6:4;56:21,21; 74:14 17:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0:0	
176:20;180:23;206:20; 198:18,18 = 271:25;277:19;278:23 = 59:3;60:3;78:24;81:16; met (9)	~
210:13,22,22;248:16; Map (20) May (41) 91:16;92:3;119:12,13; 19:11;95:14,22,2	,
275:17 58:14;66:21;71:16, 4:12,12;6:19; 174:10;183:2;185:20; 195:11;203:7,18	
makes (13) 17;72:14;74:1;79:16, 11:3;18:14;25:22; 188:17;224:14;235:14 227:25;254:14	
26:9,17;97:8;98:17; 18,20;109:9,16,18; 36:23;37:11;47:1,1; measure (1) meteorological (9)	
130:3;172:19;195:16; 110:16;111:25;126:14; 55:12;57:16;68:2; 280:11 154:4,19;161:14 222:7:222:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:22:	,
223:7;232:22;233:12; 127:13,14;142:4,10; 88:16;92:8,8;93:22; measured (14) 25;165:21;166:2	2;
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
making (11) maps (1) 116:1;119:9,15; 10;208:1;224:17; meteorologist (9) 12 24 86 6 98 7 146:01:147:20:148:18 225:24:226:7.15; 154:20:21:155:2	10
13:24;86:6;88:7; 83:20 146:21;147:20;148:18, 225:24;226:7,15; 154:20,21;155:3	
105:22;106:2,16;March (1)19;153:17;159:16;249:16;281:2317,21;156:21;15176:11:214:9:222:21:186:10161:24:169:24:186:3:measurement (1)162:19	9:7;
259:14;278:2 margin (8) 189:12;191:21;200:18; 281:2 meteorology (10) 154:16(157:8.0)	
Mall (112) 188:6;189:11,15; 217:22;229:4;236:9; measurements (5) 154:16;157:8,9; 4:10:14:22:17:2) 101:14:25:05:24:25 220:7:29:24:11 102:14:22:05:21:11 100:25:16:120:11	().2.
4:10;14:23;17:2; 191:1,4;256:8,24,25 239:7;283:11 192:14,23;258:2,11, 160:25;161:22;1	
25:8,11;26:8;27:17; Mark (3) maybe (22) 12 165:12,13;166:2 28:20,20;29:19;30:11, 5:11;8:13;141:8 7:6;88:15;107:3; measures (1) 170:18	Ј,
	•
24;31:11;38:22;39:12, marked (10) 110:16;170:22;172:10; 258:8 meteorology/oceanogra 16:42:4:45:13.15.18, 8:23:9:19:52:12; 186:2:193:13:198:4.4; mechanisms (1) 154:15	pny (1)
	0
54:4,5,7;55:21;57:25, 142:6,8,17;148:15 210:18;229:5;241:7; medical (1) 179:6,8,22;227:1 245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;245:18:10:10:275:20 254:6 10:240:10:252:80;254:6 10:240:10:252:80;254:10:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10:240:10:252:80;254:10;254:10;255:20;254:10;254:10;255:20;254:10;254:10;255:20;254:10;254:10;255:20;255:20;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;255:20;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;254:10;255:20;255:20;254:10	
25;58:24;59:22;60:9, 24;62:3,11;64:25;market (1)245:18,19,19;275:20, 23;279:7254:619;249:10;252:820:1623;279:7meet (6)260:25;263:20;2	
24;62:3,11;64:25; 200:16 23;279:7 meet (6) 260:25;263:20;2	04.7,

	WHOLESALE CORI O	NATION		
8,15,16;270:5	122:17;169:19,25;	model (63)	183:6,8;221:17;	247:17;256:8,20;
method (1)	170:3;171:12,12;	158:22;164:1;175:9;	225:5,18;251:8;266:23	259:19;269:20
224:12	191:19,20,24;199:6;	179:4;184:9,9,10,21;	monitored (3)	mostly (1)
methodology (3)	200:25;225:7,9;268:1	185:2,14,14;194:17;	267:3,5;281:4	252:18
206:2;208:23;266:2	mind (6)	203:10,16,24;204:18;	monitoring (24)	Mount (10)
methods (4)	24:5;57:8;84:21;	206:11,25;207:17,24;	154:5;161:13,14,15,	21:12,19,21;32:15,
187:19;196:2;	85:2;97:14,16	208:9,22;209:11,12,15,	18,19,20,24,25;163:24;	20,24;78:8,14,19;
201:23;205:20	minds (2)	19;210:1;212:24;	164:2;165:2,18,20,21;	135:21
methyl (1)	27:14;28:1	213:2,6;217:20;	166:22,23;209:22;	mountain (1)
160:6	mine (1)	224:13,14;225:11,13;	225:20;266:15,20,24;	76:18
Metro (9)	23:2	226:10,10,21,25;227:1;	267:2;277:14	mounted (1)
57:7;118:15;121:3;	minimis (2)	229:8,21;230:5;231:2,	monitors (6)	36:2
122:24;123:10;124:5,	176:25;191:25	4;234:13,14;238:7,24;	226:7;251:2,3,5,7,9	mouth (1)
6;125:14;185:24	minimizing (2)	248:12;254:25;257:19,	monoxide (15)	203:13
metropolitan (2)	130:8;131:7	21;260:11,11,13;265:6,	202:3;207:9;235:5;	mouthful (1)
158:12;180:24	minimum (2)	10,11;271:8;274:17;	236:14,17,19,20;238:4;	130:17
Michele (7)	122:11,12	278:10,15	241:19;242:7;259:1;	move (8)
5:7;8:1;9:6,16;	minor (3)	modeled (31)	260:5;263:18;264:5;	46:17;107:13;
19:19;36:25;64:1	172:15;176:20;	175:24;192:2;198:5;	273:5	145:23;160:24;174:22;
micro-areas (1)	220:25	207:15;208:15;215:10,	Montgomery (7)	183:3;187:8;192:9
181:17	minus (4)	10;220:4;227:1;229:4;	16:15;22:4;52:19;	movements (2)
micrograms (13)	283:2,3,6,6	230:18;231:23;232:18,	53:5;54:2,6;195:19	45:18,20
179:6,8,21;227:17;	minute (4)	19,20;235:18,21;238:6,	month (1)	MOVES (9)
249:9;252:8;263:19;	62:9;261:10;264:19;	25;239:8,9,18;248:15,	31:3	184:10,11,18;185:2,
264:7,8,15,16;267:10;	265:1	16,17,22;260:16;266:1,	months (3)	22;186:8,13;206:11;
270:5	minute-resolved (1)	7;277:19;279:5	150:3,6;249:21	219:24
microns (2)	209:4	modeler (1)	morass (1)	M-O-V-E-S (1)
158:24,24	minutes (15)	185:6	142:12	184:10
microphone (2)	42:20;147:7;152:20;	modelers (2)	more (73)	movie (2)
106:25;107:4	203:15;216:9,11;	213:10;230:3	15:14;16:23;21:24;	10:11;124:10
mid (3)	218:4,13,16;220:12,13,	modeling (76)	27:15,19;48:14;54:6;	moving (2)
199:7,15,17	14;241:10;276:8;277:4	154:5;155:18,23;	55:20;56:16;61:21;	15:13;252:21
mid-1990s (1)	misinterpreted (1)	156:1,2;159:1;161:1,4,	62:8;65:12,13;119:16;	much (26)
199:17	245:19	5,22;162:4;163:25;	122:17;135:13;137:11;	8:13;27:15;57:17;
middle (6)	missed (1) 208:10	164:2,9,10,13,15;	151:4;171:25,25;	61:20;99:1;145:22;
10:25;49:9;75:7;	mission (1)	165:1,10,13;166:20;	172:10,14,21;174:2;	152:16;164:25;167:2; 170:17,19;181:9;
115:1;218:15;283:4 might (25)	229:1	177:13;178:2;179:3; 184:17;186:11;196:14;	175:19;176:20;180:18; 189:12;191:20;192:25;	183:19;186:15;190:21;
25:25;39:1;55:24;	misspoke (1)	203:12;205:9;206:12,	199:12,191:20,192:23; 194:4,4;199:22;	201:1;204:14;209:14;
76:1,14,17;87:23;	167:23	22,22,23,23;207:4;	207:17,19;209:14;	211:15;213:3,6;
98:16,19;99:21;100:2;	misunderstand (2)	208:21;210:13;214:11;	210:18;212:16;213:3,	255:14;270:18;271:15;
118:2;119:21;120:9,	32:19;174:15	215:9,23;226:15;	4,7;214:9;218:24,24;	274:16:276:15
24;138:17;159:8,11;	Mitchell (1)	227:5;229:1,12;231:5,	220:2,24;222:5;223:7;	multiple (2)
160:2;163:14;180:10;	43:13	6,6,7,10,14;243:23;	228:7;229:2,6;233:7;	67:21;100:18
205:17;222:6;224:7,12	mix (5)	248:9,10,21;255:17;	239:2;243:7;247:14;	multiply (1)
Mike (5)	56:21,23;112:17;	259:6;261:25;264:21;	248:20;249:17;255:5;	218:22
5:3;19:20,25;20:2;	176:7;185:10	265:7,9,20;267:8,12;	259:25;263:5;268:10;	multiplying (1)
24:13	mixed (1)	268:20;269:10;273:12;	270:3;274:13,16;	228:18
mile (1)	111:1	277:16;278:1,3,4,4,8;	276:8,19;277:7,21;	must (4)
219:18	mixed-use (12)	279:10,17;281:3,8	278:14,14;279:14,25;	9:13;94:16;241:3;
miles (15)	113:11;115:21;	models (5)	282:4	272:21
196:21;218:7,8,10;	116:20;118:15,21;	159:5;164:11;	morning (6)	myself (4)
219:13,14,17,19,22;	119:7,8;124:10;125:7,	205:21;232:4,5	4:23;5:3;7:6,12;9:9;	9:4;164:17;203:9;
220:4,6,7,8,10;278:13	21,22;131:9	modified (4)	228:21	204:4
Mill (22)	mixing (2)	212:15;222:4;	most (32)	
4:8;19:6;29:10;61:3;	271:13;274:15	227:14;228:7	36:2,14;46:17;47:10;	Ν
62:14;65:16,20;	mobile (4)	modify (2)	73:9;79:11;101:3;	
109:10,16;111:25;	158:14;179:4;	82:14;83:15	146:21;147:25;148:1,	NAAQS (1)
127:21,25;128:7,13;	180:20;271:21	moment (2)	8;151:18;158:7;160:4;	271:25
130:2;226:11;231:9;	MOBILE6 (2)	140:18;257:2	175:19;179:1,4,9;	name (3)
260:18;264:1;265:20,	184:9;219:20	Monday (1)	187:18;191:23;194:7;	4:18;72:7;153:25
22;268:21	mode (2)	234:2	198:2;211:13;215:18,	named (3)
million (14)	263:4;271:8	monitor (7)	21;233:9;239:17;	103:21,25;104:7
			1	1

names (1) 104:25 naming (1) 104:11 narrow (1) 200:8 national (19) 158:5:176:22; 177:25;187:20,25; 188:4,12:191:8,15: 202:1,6;205:22; 227:22;235:6;252:16, 23,24;255:1;268:3 nationally (3) 195:18,19;230:23 natural (7) 94:16,25;95:15; 133:5;145:8;259:9; 274:17 nature (7) 42:4;49:13;126:23; 154:6;162:24;167:3; 272:6 near (7) 57:7;73:24;77:5; 112:6;181:10;220:25; 275:20 nearby (1) 163:20 nearest (5) 21:10,20,25;273:24, 24 necessarily (3) 75:19;126:10;197:20 necessary (9) 47:21;49:4;93:13; 98:20,20;106:17,20; 133:10.11 neck (1) 9:2 need (16) 37:22:38:1:47:15; 58:13;68:12;93:17; 130:8;131:5,7;144:8; 194:25;195:21;258:14; 279:8;280:25;283:21 needs (7) 5:25;6:4,8;78:21; 93:15;176:10;191:3 negated (1) 209:20 negative (1) 140:8 neighborhood (19) 6:4;22:4;105:18; 106:15;107:16,17,18, 19,25;108:3,13;143:9; 192:4,19;193:11; 257:15;274:3,8,25 neighboring (1) 169:20 neighbors (1) 169:24

neutral (4) 140:7;170:21; 277:24 192:21:283:5 new (13) 206:426:10,17;29:23; nor (1) 206:1 48:15;60:7;75:18; 102:25;138:18;140:13, normal (2) 30:1:206:24 15:154:15:224:21; 253:4 north (4) newer (2) 52:6;198:8 12 newly (1) northeast (1) 46:19 112:3 next (24) northern (3) 4:13:10:19:46:16: 104:14;105:25;106:15; north-south (1) 40:24 153:8,10,12;186:1,2; 218:5,25;223:20; northwest (5) 242:19,19;259:16; 263:7;272:7;273:19; 74:18,19 277:3;279:9;281:14; northwestern (2) 283:13 73:9:77:4 nice (1) note (4) 78:10 night (1) noted (2) 170:17 nighttime (2) notice (6) 277:20;279:1 nine (5) 33:16,17,19,20,22 noticed (3) nine-foot (4) 33:13.18:141:1.16 notion (1) nitrogen (2) 245:17 202:3:260:21 November (8) NO2 (7) 264:13,25;267:7; 270:14:273:21,25; 257:6 nowhere (3) 275:2 nobody (1) 117:4 nozzle (1) nobody's (2) 210:15 61:11:92:13 nozzles (1) noise (44) 200:11 43:24:154:6;156:7, **NRI** (1) 21;161:1,9,22;162:7; 91:4 163:4,18,24,24,25,25; **NSA (1)** 164:1,2,5,7,8,11,13,15, 221:17 20;165:24;166:24; nuisance (1) 192:1,1,2,10;202:16; 45:8 277:12,13,14,16,16,17; number (50) 278:8,10,14,20;279:11, 18:281:2.4 nomenclature (1) 57:5 non-cancer (1) 160:14 non-conforming (1) 116:16 None (6) 10:10:15:23:38:5; 103:20.24:104:6 non-inherent (4) 22:7;24:18;140:2,3

non-residential (1) non-standard (1) 39:5;132:12;134:5, 204:5 112:5;127:22;206:24 O2 (1) 35:5;38:21;73:15; 271:24 oath (1) 11:4 object (6) 22:2;63:13;92:2,5 254:18 139:25;167:9 6:6;7:1;63:14;67:20; 186:18;267:17 4:13,14:212:18 22:19:238:16.16; 241:18,25;242:1,2; 43:24 32:18;77:5;273:15 210:12 196:25 28:20 obvious (1) 104:15 29:22:32:2:35:15; 50:13:58:4.11.15:74:8: 282:23 79:9:81:9:87:10: 102:24,25;132:2; 90:11 137:19;142:22;146:19; occupy (1) 147:19;154:23;156:11; 139:16 157:1;158:21;162:3,3, occur (17) 4,6;163:22;172:25; 183:11;196:17;205:19; 206:3;211:9,23;212:1; 214:17,23;218:22; 221:13:224:25:227:6; 228:11;239:9,19;

112:11:205:13; 241:20,24;246:19,20; 249:18:251:13 207:14:225:5:243:14 numbers (33) oceanography (1) 32:12:103:5:179:20; 157:9 186:14;190:22;191:1; o'clock (3) 196:13:198:23:211:2: 152:21;241:11;276:3 224:25;232:13,21; odds (2) 233:8,9:234:18; 225:6,6 238:24;239:23;240:2, odor (31) 154:6;156:10,11,25; 4,5,8,12,13,14;241:3, 10,16;245:8;252:9; 161:1,9,23;162:7; 260:7,10:264:21:269:1 163:7,8;164:22,24,25; Nussbaum (1) 165:2,3,23;166:20; 192:16,18;193:8,18; 194:8;202:16;279:21, 0 22;280:2;281:1,13,22; 282:6;283:3 odoriferous (1) 193:15 odors (16) 43:24;192:8;193:4, 23:194:1:279:21: 130:11;165:24; 280:5,8,15,17,19,20; 167:8;229:13;244:3; 281:13;282:1,2,23 off (25) objected (2) 10:25;17:11;18:21; 99:6:254:22 38:20,21;39:8,17;47:3; 73:22,22;92:25; **Objection** (19) 13:17,18;25:13;47:1; 109:15;122:8;128:6,7, 130:15;141:18,20; 16:145:11.17.18: 167:9:173:15:174:7: 148:24;165:3;173:2; 198:8:200:19:280:11 177:10;197:3;205:7; 230:8.14:254:12.24: offer (2) 255:22:256:5 60:3:166:15 objectionable (1) offered (3) 70:8,9;163:2 objective (4) offering (2) 195:21;196:9,12; 161:21;244:19 offhand (1) objectively (1) 122:18 office (3) obligations (1) 108:5;111:1;168:14 official (1) observations (2) 59:7 Off-road (1) 6:19;88:24 138:5 offset (1) 69:15 obviously (4) 171:12;173:22; off-site (1) 195:8;283:8 70:10 occasions (1) often (1) 55:4 occupancy (1) old (3) 53:19;218:12;253:4 older (1) 198:8 olfactometer (2) 29:17;43:6;62:3; 192:23:280:24 65:14;67:18;96:12; on-board (5) 97:23:109:9:110:17. 194:5;200:14,14; 20;111:19,20,21,22; 281:16.25 112:11:119:5:125:16 once (11) occurred (5) 34:3;79:4,4;95:3;

124:24;210:19;224:24; 227:4:279:24:280:14: 283:19 one (142) 15:13;17:9;18:7; 19:13;20:25;22:21; 27:8;28:19;29:8;31:14, 16;33:6;35:25;36:2,2; 38:20;39:13;42:19; 44:24;46:16,22;47:7,7; 48:6;51:25;52:4,5,6; 55:20;58:18;60:21,21; 63:19;64:10;68:12,15; 69:9;71:25;72:10; 73:15,24,25;74:1,13; 75:2;76:21;79:3,6; 83:21;84:18;85:13; 86:5;88:11;92:10,16, 23;98:19;100:17,20; 103:15;106:18;108:1, 3;109:11,13;119:16; 127:13,24;129:16,18, 23;133:23;135:8,14; 136:7;139:1,14; 140:18;141:19;144:5, 5;147:5,17,25;148:2; 149:5,5,12;156:2; 158:3;159:19;160:4; 161:25;162:3;164:23; 167:12;179:10;181:20, 22;183:14;184:20; 185:1,1,3,3;186:9,17; 191:23:193:18:196:11; 205:1,19;206:9; 207:14;215:13;219:22; 221:5,6;223:6;224:15; 225:7,9;229:15; 231:15;232:14;237:15; 239:11;243:19;244:8; 246:19:250:13:251:3. 6;252:4;260:8;262:4; 267:4;272:21;277:13; 280:6;281:23;282:21 one-hour (7) 259:2;260:6,21,22; 263:18;264:13;272:1 ones (2) 145:25;240:3 onions (1) 181:11 only (36) 22:5;25:10,18;26:8; 27:5,8,14,21,22;28:7, 17;63:1;64:6;66:17; 67:19;112:10,12; 114:13;119:4;125:14; 127:13;128:8;129:18; 130:9;140:1,4;145:13; 191:16;197:17;213:19; 220:7;222:1,1;237:22; 242:12;250:20 onto (2) 189:12;278:5

open (5) 40:2,9;78:12,15; 162:15 opened (1) 268:15 opening (4) 60:15;65:11;79:8; 198:3 opens (2) 199:8,13 operate (1) 4:6 operated (3) 53:5;55:7;178:19 operation (7) 54:18;108:5;154:2; 177:2;215:4,5;229:2 operational (3) 70:24;210:20;211:15 operations (11) 54:2;175:15;202:23; 203:10,23;226:19; 228:18;231:22;269:17; 270:20;278:5 opine (1) 180:12 opinion (24) 12:1;27:22;46:19; 49:22;58:3,8;59:2; 60:3:81:16:97:3.3: 129:11,15:133:9; 137:7:140:2:180:11: 195:11;203:19;206:19; 230:15,15,20;246:2 opinions (2) 47:10;197:4 opportunity (3) 6:9;63:17;176:13 opposed (2) 87:1:90:19 opposite (1) 112:6 opposition (15) 7:3;49:11,16;86:2, 11;87:16,17,21;163:1; 173:14;181:17;184:8; 195:13;205:24;208:18 opposition's (2) 93:3;126:19 optimal (1) 190:20 option (3) 79:6,6;87:25 options (6) 58:4,15;67:21,23; 79:10;185:10 oral (1) 244:21 orally (2) 245:1,4 orange (3) 89:10,11;110:9 oranges (1)

18:12 order (6) 10:19;192:5;201:9; 258:12;280:10;283:6 ove Ordinance (15) 4:5;18:9;19:12; 43:10;90:6;115:23; 122:5;123:19;133:12, 14;277:18,20,21; 278:7;279:18 ordinarily (1) 205:11 organic (7) 176:18;184:1;202:4, 14,21,24;267:18 organics (1) 175:16 ove organization (3) 185:2;189:18;190:12 organizations (1) 154:8 **Organization's (1)** 190:1 original (2) ove 106:7;144:10 originally (7) ove 12:13,18;14:14; 27:13;140:10;227:10, Ov 15 others (1) ove 5:17 otherwise (1) ove 119:5 ought (1) ove 223:24 ounces (2) ove 255:14,14 ourselves (1) 248:24 ove out (50) 8:8:15:1:34:4:38:20. ove 24;49:15;50:24;77:24; 98:5;106:6;109:14; 110:1;116:7;121:2; ove 144:4,11;146:20; 150:1,4;152:17;153:2; ove 170:11;184:25;185:24; 187:6;190:17;194:25; ow 198:20;200:3;206:1; 208:1;213:16;218:13; 219:11:220:11:224:24, 25;225:17,19;230:6; ow 239:14,15;240:4; 241:9,15;244:20; oxic 245:24;258:20;259:14; ΟZ 279:3 outcomes (1) 99:20 outer (1) ozo 33:3 outside (17) 45:15,20;49:24,24; 56:14;67:20;69:5,24;

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

75:23;90:19;91:24,25;	pace (2)
94:19;129:21;135:5;	19:2;24:5
172:12;244:19	pack (1)
ver (37)	146:23
85:21;112:5;130:1;	packet (1)
159:23;180:21;185:5;	101:5
194:4,10;195:8;	pad (1)
196:18,19;198:7;	47:14
199:4;207:14;212:1;	page (132)
217:22;218:18;221:5;	22:2,9,10,18,25;
224:20;231:19;236:8;	23:10,11,14,15;26:7;
239:12;240:24;243:20; 251:15;253:12;259:17;	29:20;30:10;32:5;33:1; 34:10,10,19;36:22,24;
262:19;272:3,24;	37:10;43:8,23;45:6;
274:14;280:22;281:21;	52:21,23;53:2;56:18;
282:4,5,7,24	57:22,23;58:1,20,23;
verall (18)	59:9,11,17;60:6,23;
16:4;61:20;65:7;	61:15,25;62:10,12,14,
68:19;69:14,18;87:16;	14;63:21,21,23;64:6,
122:1;135:3;175:14;	11,13,15,16,19,21;
178:18,23;211:18;	65:2,6,8,9,23,24;66:1,
217:20;259:20,20;	7,17,18,21;68:5;71:14;
261:6;276:17	79:13;81:4;82:5,8,9,
veremphasizing (1)	11;83:2,5,20,20,23,23;
120:1	84:16;89:9,25;90:15;
verlay (1) 36:7	100:24;101:5,13,19,19; 102:17,18;103:14;
verlook (1)	105:10;107:23,24;
103:7	108:7;109:16,19;
verlooked (1)	110:5,13,22;111:3,6,
89:22	25;113:7,24;114:3,15,
verrule (2)	16,19;115:1;121:18;
230:13;255:25	126:15;127:14;133:18,
verstate (2)	25;134:1,2,18;135:1,9;
243:15,16 verstated (4)	136:6,24;137:1;139:7; 142:4;147:21,22;
208:12;214:19;	201:21;224:22;241:18;
221:10;248:17	242:7;263:16;271:19
verstatement (2)	pages (9)
208:16;216:8	60:22;62:25;63:1,11;
verstates (4)	64:5;89:5;133:17,18,
214:12;220:20;	18
225:21,22	panel (1)
verstating (2)	192:18
86:12;216:12 verview (1)	papers (2) 88:19;184:8
201:24	paperwork (2)
wn (7)	142:12;172:7
78:11;138:14;	paragraph (18)
190:19,19;208:18,19,	22:12,18;30:10;
20	34:20;52:24;53:3;
wned (1)	59:16;60:15;65:11;
53:5	103:15;115:2,7,9,12;
xide (1) 260:21	271:20;272:7;273:19,
DZAH (8)	20 parallel (6)
4:4;103:5,20,24;	33:3;75:21;76:3;
104:2,6,24;105:9	78:12;79:2;80:8
zone (1)	Parcel (33)
157:21	4:9;19:14;20:19;
n	25:11;30:11,24;40:25;
Р	42:5;45:13,15,18,21;
	52:16;53:6;55:21;

57:25:62:11:69:18; 206:12;221:6;249:6, 79:22;80:5,13,17; 16:253:16:262:15.16: 81:22:89:9,10:112:21, 21;132:9;134:6; 135:24;136:1,3,13 parcels (2) 19:7;112:17 Pardon (1) 123:22 parens (2) 94:12,12 park (15) 216:10;218:4;244:9; 245:6,22;246:1,2,9,14, 15,17,25;247:6,12,22 parking (30) 25:9;33:3;49:11; 53:17;129:20;216:7,8, 12,17;217:2,4,21,24; 218:6,6,8,14,15,16,25; 219:2;220:23;221:4; 228:21:231:6.13.14: 248:17;260:18;278:14 Parks (7) 227:25;244:1,5,7,9, 25;272:10 part (25) 6:16;85:24;86:25; 112:22,24;115:21; 117:12;129:17;143:2; 146:23:150:24:159:6; 163:9.21:165:2: 170:24;171:17;175:2, 8:178:17:207:21: 212:20;236:25;247:6, 10 participant (1) 6:18 participants (1) 6:12 particle (2) 180:16:181:13 particles (16) 159:2;170:12;173:8, 180:5,6,13,14,17,19, 69:13;99:18;139:1; 160:11:163:8:202:5: 215:13;220:18;229:2,

9;174:19;179:24; 22;181:8;183:21,22 particular (25) 6:4;8:22;42:8;52:7; 207:6,7;209:15; 11;247:6;251:8;255:2; 267:20;272:11;275:20; 278:15;279:11 particularly (7) 68:1;192:22;202:12; 275:19;277:18;280:2,5 particulate (21) 157:21;158:18,22; 179:3,16:183:8,12,13,

17;190:3;202:11,21;

265:3;269:19 particulates (21) 158:23,25;179:2; 190:4;202:3;206:10, 18;208:20;227:12; 243:12:252:18:253:3: 254:2,7,8;255:9,16,18, 19:265:13:268:22 parties (9) 4:21;6:16;7:8;27:14; 28:2;49:7;77:24; 107:16;197:9 party (2) 165:7;269:6 passes (1) 69:9 past (4) 194:2;251:15; 274:10;282:2 Pat (3) 4:23;35:17;51:24 patently (1) 173:23 path (58) 11:18,21;12:3;33:2, 13,18;41:11,24;42:8; 69:3,15;70:8,25;71:4; 76:7:77:3,15,19:79:2; 81:18,18;83:10;84:11, 22,22;85:7,12;86:3,4, 10,15,16,17,25;87:4,6, 8,9,25;88:8,16;135:21, 23;136:8,24;137:3,9, 25;138:1,3;139:12,13, 14,15,17;141:1,17; 143:2 paths (5) 37:16:38:8,17:42:4; 80:4 pathway (4) 11:23;40:14;79:1; 141:4 pathways (1) 74:12 patience (1) 197:14 pattern (1) 51:1 patterns (1) 130:6 peak (1) 214:13 pedestrian (73) 11:18,21;12:3;33:2; 34:11,21;35:3,13;38:8; 40:14,17,18;41:11,24; 42:3;45:18,20;46:3; 58:8,25;60:10;65:1; 66:6;68:10;69:3,15,17; 70:4,8,18,25;71:4;72:1,

75:17,18;76:7;77:3,15, perhaps (6) 19:78:16:84:22:85:6.6. 12;86:3,4,10,15,16,17, 25;87:3,5;88:8;129:16, 18,20,21:133:24; 135:21;136:7;139:12, 13;142:3;143:2,8 pedestrian-access (1) 68:25 pedestrian-friendly (1) period (6) 68:21 pedestrians (1) 139:16 penalty (6) 168:19;277:20; 278:25,25;281:19; 282:5 Penn (1) 154:16 people (19) 32:1:61:6:63:17: 100:19;107:18;108:3, 11;128:23;129:2; 130:6;131:6;160:5,12; 172:12;180:10;195:8; Permeators (1) 210:17;218:4;225:25 per (32) 29:19,21,25;30:20; 31:3,4;38:4;61:5; 108:3:143:9:149:15; 170:1.3;172:15;179:6. permitted (1) 8.22:220:8.12:224:23: 227:17,19;231:22; 249:9:252:8:263:19: 264:7.8.15.16:267:25; 270:5 percent (57) 76:20:121:15.16: 170:14,22;193:13; 201:15;213:17;214:19; 216:5;217:8,25,25; 218:2.21.23:220:23; 221:6;228:19,19; 232:25;234:23;235:1, pertain (1) 14,14,16,16,22,22,25; 236:18;237:19,24; 238:2;239:2,3,4,7,10, pertains (4) 12,13,20,23;240:25; 241:1;242:11,13; 270:8,8,9,22,23,24; 271:5,5;273:14;274:11 percentage (2) 194:10;270:19 percentile (1) 253:20 Peregoy (4) 72:12,12,14,16 perfect (2) 86:7;87:8 perfectly (6) 25:16,19,21;88:23; 107:12:256:2 7,15;73:1,6,10,13,14; perfume (1)

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

283:4

91:25

281:15

periodic (1)

96:12

periods (2)

periphery (2)

perimeter (10)

152:19;212:2;

224:23;225:1

92:22;132:10

213:15,16,21

194:16

permit (6)

permits (1)

168:10

personal (3)

persons (2)

person's (1)

perspective (5)

282:8,20

119:19

70:5

69:21

pertinent (1)

per-year (1)

pesticide (2)

163:9,10

petitioner (1)

petitioner's (3)

petition (1)

4:4

4:6

phase (1)

183:23

200:24

166:6

person (3)

230:5

Permeator (15)

phases (1) 158:1 47:17;57:3;86:6; Philadelphia (1) 126:20;222:8;234:20 158:10 philosophy (1) 11:24;12:8;33:3; 189:14 42:4;64:13;73:19; phones (1) 75:23;79:22;80:17; 148:23 photo (3) 51:21;52:1;142:13 photograph (5) 36:13;38:10;53:10, 243:13,20;279:2; 18;78:7 photographs (1) 16:11 phrase (1) 106:21 physical (1) 43:25 pick (1) 171:5;172:8,9,19; 78:24 picture (1) 193:2,14,25;194:22; 197:16,20;201:4,7; 20:18 pictures (1) 19:10 piece (1) 131:8 125:9;173:23,24; pipeline (2) 174:8,10;270:11 268:13;269:22 place (12)4:15:23:12:27:14; 38:21;42:23;55:1; 107:5;112:12;119:5; 199:25;200:1;221:11 149:13;159:21;247:7 placed (1) 107:6 54:10;182:22;183:6 places (7) 99:2;158:11;207:20; 107:19;159:22 215:19;224:14,15; 258:5 placing (1) 90:13 plan (139) 47:16;78:23;201:10; 6:15;7:2,4;8:10,14; 9:18;11:10,12,13,15, 15,16,21,23;12:10,14; 13:2,11;14:10,16;15:4, 25:22;68:8;69:11; 6,16,20,24;29:16; 30:22;35:12,14;36:1,7, 9,12,15,24;37:18,19; 41:12,13,15,22,23; 46:13,16,21;47:2,4,19; 48:6,15;49:9;50:12; 56:5,9,13,15,25;57:20; 60:17;65:5;66:2,17; 67:21;68:3,6,10,14,14, 20;69:7,14;71:1,11,14; 72:3;78:19;79:14;81:5; 82:6,8,19;83:3,20;84:6, 9,17;85:17;89:6,21,25; 103:19,23;104:5 90:20;91:9;93:21; 94:15;101:4,8;109:12, 22,23;110:2,6;111:23;

112:13,13,19;113:7; 114:1,5,11;115:25; 116:12;119:14,22,24; 120:21,23;121:18,19; 125:6,23,25;126:21,22, 22;131:16;133:19,20; 134:1;135:1,5,12,17; 139:7:142:4:143:9: 144:8;149:9;152:19; 178:17 planned (7) 25:2,3:67:2:99:16: 109:14;169:25;181:16 planners (1) 57:6 planner's (1) 78:22 Planning (27) 6:21;21:15,15,18; 27:11;68:15;76:12; 107:23;126:20;228:1; 244:1,7,10,25;245:7, 22;246:1,10,14,16,17, 25;247:6,13,23: 272:10;275:16 Planning's (1) 246:2 plans (14) 9:17;21:22;46:6,15; 47:7:60:20:61:19: 110:1;146:3,5,6,11,16, 17 plant (1) 195:25 planted (2) 94:19;132:19 planting (1) 94:18 plasticized (1) 8:21 plat (1) 16:24 Plat/Existing (1) 147:18 play (3) 130:7;131:6;178:17 Plaza (1) 4:9 please (32) 4:22;16:21;19:22; 24:1,10:32:13:36:23; 38:18;44:8;52:21; 56:19;58:3;59:2;67:7; 71:14;79:13;82:6;89:5; 90:1;102:17;108:8; 123:5;131:21;132:8; 140:11;148:2,24; 153:11,15,22;182:21; 187:16 plots (6) 257:5,8,9,18,19; 259:20 plume (1)

170:12 plus (14) 201:16;238:7;243:5; 260:12.13.16.19: 261:24;264:23;265:8; 268:20;269:10;274:13; 283:3 pm (20) 153:5;179:12,21; 180:5,14:185:25; 186:5;195:25;246:18, 23:250:3:255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24;284:13 pockets (1) 160:16 point (98) 13:23;25:18;27:12, 12;33:6;34:4;38:20,24; 42:15;46:13,22;47:21; 50:24;52:21;82:11; 84:1,4;85:19;88:6,14; 98:3,8,9;106:16;114:8, 21,23,24;118:6,7,11; 119:8,14;120:2,15; 125:6,14;129:13; 132:16:145:18,21; 167:8;182:11;185:22; 187:18:190:5:193:18; 195:6,15:198:6,12; 199:12.23:200:3: 203:5:204:19.22: 205:21,22;206:20; 208:17,20;210:17; 214:15;216:3;219:3,4; 220:19;221:7,20; 230:19;231:3,20; 233:9;235:9;239:16; 240:22;246:1;250:14, 18;251:15;255:2,4; 256:11,14;257:3; 262:8,18;268:9,14,22; 269:8,20;271:11; 275:1,8;283:11;284:6 pointed (1) 49:15 pointer (2) 38:23;198:20 pointing (7) 27:3;39:4;57:24; 109:14;121:2;216:23; 217:3 points (9) 62:1;98:4;114:20; 128:6,16;175:25; 187:13;205:5,6 point's (1) 217:9 poisoning (1) 160:6 poles (1) 90:12

policeman (1) 196:18 policies (2) 158:2.16 policy (7) 118:16;121:3; 122:24;123:11;124:6; 125:15:220:13 pollutant (4) 159:8:178:25; 202:12;254:3 pollutants (13) 157:13,22;171:7,19, 21;178:21,22,23; 201:13,19;270:1; 271:14,21 polluters (1) 230:16 pollution (18) 70:1;157:20,20; 158:16:160:15:165:5; 170:13:172:23:175:4: 178:18;180:23;215:14, 15;224:17;225:14; 230:6;254:5;265:16 **pool** (14) 258:24;259:16; 260:4,6;261:22; 263:19;264:14;265:12; 267:12:269:15:270:6, 9,24;277:24 population (7)159:9,12,16:161:10; 256:9.17.23 populations (1) 44:18 portion (18) 8:15,16,19;14:2; 50:16;51:21;77:13; 114:3,13,14,22;115:20; 120:10;124:15,22; 127:3;159:21;168:2 ports (2) 280:12;282:9 pose (1) 85:19 position (11) 86:7,13;87:16;93:3; 186:7;195:13;196:5, 24;206:11,16;230:3 possibility (2) 6:2.7 possible (4) 86:4,5;224:25;225:1 possibly (1) 232:25 potency (2) 178:1;202:25 potential (11) 45:2;96:2;99:20; 113:11:161:10.23: 162:10;165:16;166:21; 172:23;271:14

potentially (4) 49:14:149:16: 170:16.16 pounds (1) 189:12 power (1) 117:8 PowerPoint (7) 10:16;169:1;178:11; 187:8,10;221:20,25 PowerPoints (1) 181:7 practice (6) 154:3,7,22;162:21; 229:21:254:25 practicing (1) 154:21 Pre (1) 18:21 precedential (1) 55:21 preclude (5) 70:24;73:9;167:18, 20.21 precluded (1) 71:4 precludes (1) 135:18 precluding (1) 137:8 predecessor (2) 24:23.25 predominance (1) 281:25 preferable (3) 86:16;87:9,25 preliminary (10) 5:22;6:14;8:7;9:23; 10:1,2,4,5;88:10,21 premises (1) 94:13 prepare (2) 24:21;41:13 prepared (3) 60:17;140:25;169:1 preponderance (1) 259:17 present (5) 150:13,14;263:6; 272:12;279:14 presentation (8) 10:15;169:1;171:9; 173:2;178:11;187:9; 257:10;276:20 presentations (1) 163:17 presented (3) 149:16;152:5;173:13 presently (1) 99:16 president (1) 154:1 press (1)

160:20 Presumably (1) 165:12 presume (3) 9:7:49:13:179:12 pretty (2) 41:18:234:21 previous (3) 11:14;27:4;71:21 previously (6) 10:16;11:6;57:21; 65:22;136:11;220:23 price (1) 110:10 primarily (1) 172:18 primary (1) 202:13 principal (2) 157:24;158:8 principles (1) 68:19 printed (2) 9:13;221:25 prior (18) 24:21;26:11;29:18; 30:13,25;31:10,13,14, 16,25;32:2;33:9,11; 34:4;114:1;140:24; 142:7,14 private (1) 72:5 probably (19) 21:4:74:4:75:24: 76:2,3;99:13;129:23; 146:4,14;180:15; 182:7:185:8:194:7: 209:20;226:24;227:3; 228:10;276:7;280:13 problem (12) 19:25:175:2:177:2.3. 5,6;180:5;196:4; 206:17;223:21;225:22; 236:7 problematic (1) 49:15 procedure (9) 206:25;207:2,4; 226:18;248:9;258:15, 16,17;259:13 procedures (3) 158:2;232:3;248:19 proceed (10) 5:21;10:11;18:14; 93:22;95:9;106:14; 153:17;167:11;181:20; 203:18 proceeding (4) 100:18;168:16; 204:11:205:9 process (12) 26:24;27:11;72:4; 79:11;160:10;175:17,

17;197:1;204:14,22; 205:18:226:17 processor (1) 212:25 produce (1) 193:12 produced (2) 203:23:240:11 produces (1) 167:4 producing (2) 198:16,17 products (1) 55:5 proffered (2) 87:6,10 program (2) 121:20;210:2 project (16) 21:12;120:22; 141:17;157:25;159:15, 18:160:18.18.21: 163:12,20;185:5; 187:11;190:4;204:25; 227:11 projected (2) 189:24;198:3 projecting (4) 190:5;198:10;199:2, 20 projection (3) 190:6:199:21:250:6 projects (7) 158:8,9;163:4,19; 164:23;187:21;275:17 project's (1) 41:14 promise (1) 100:12 promised (1) 105:24 promote (1) 131:4 promotes (1) 130:5 properly (1) 107:1 properties (8) 18:9;35:8;43:11; 79:12;122:25;123:12; 145:22;278:20 property (46) 16:19,22;17:16;18:6, 13;20:14,22;21:2;26:8; 32:6,8,9,23,23,24; 34:12,22;35:5,7;38:22; 44:1,17;45:3;54:9; 91:17;93:16;99:4; 100:24;109:15;112:5; 114:25;115:21;118:1; 124:11;128:3,5;132:4; 133:15:144:18,19,21, 22;145:13;149:6;

274:8,15 proportion (1) 178:21 proportional (1) 172:1 proposal (4) 69:1,3,22;70:17 proposals (2) 9:17;85:24 propose (1) 181:20 proposed (87) 6:15;7:2;11:12;12:7, 13,19;13:13;14:7,14; 15:3,13,20,24;17:1; 21:3,3,9,20;22:3;25:9, 11;26:4,9;33:14;36:9; 41:22;44:1;45:7;46:15, 17,19;47:3,4;48:6; 50:11;54:8;55:25; 69:15;72:2,19,22,23; 73:5,6,17;75:10;76:4, 6;77:2,15,20;78:8,16; 79:21,24;80:3,4;95:6; 97:6;103:8,16;105:14; 111:3,6;127:15;128:9; 129:3;133:9;136:7,11; 139:14:140:10:141:17; 143:11;151:3;153:22; 169:21;178:20;180:13; 181:3;193:7;200:4,7; 260:12:264:19:273:21: 274:1 proposing (2) 46:22:95:12 protect (6) 92:17:93:11.12; 195:16;256:8,22 protected (1) 256:11 protective (5) 188:6;191:4;195:14; 196:24;205:25 protects (4) 91:24;92:11,12,14 protocol (4) 203:8,10,25;258:22 prove (2) 244:17,19 provide (7) 6:7,10:29:15:60:17, 18:70:25:75:17 provided (7) 33:6,9,13;168:18; 246:21;247:18,25 provides (3) 29:14;121:20;168:20 providing (1) 98:18 provision (3) 94:6.20.23 proximity (3) 56:24;124:6;133:3

public (6) 4:2:6:16:56:24:72:5: 107:25:188:6 publications (1) 163:17 publicized (1) 160:4 pull(2)146:20;196:19 pulled (2) 248:24;253:10 pulling (1) 196:18 pump (2) 172:21:231:8 pumped (6) 171:2,6,19,21,25; 175:7 pumping (9) 169:19;172:13; 175:12,12,17;193:18; 236:19;280:10;282:18 pumps (8) 4:7;103:8,9;175:10; 211:19,19,20;237:21 punch (1) 79:8 purchase (1) 271:23 purchased (1) 253:5 purple (7) 110:11:111:23,24; 127:21,22;128:24; 129:1 purpose (10) 14:20;79:7;92:17; 121:14;124:3,3;131:5; 135:2;246:9,15 purposes (5) 11:9;55:22;177:12; 223:25:258:21 pursuant (1) 4:5 purview (2) 254:17;256:2 put (31) 10:16;14:9,11;36:5; 63:19;93:14;96:17; 142:21;181:6;183:6; 187:6;188:16;190:17; 203:13:208:22:210:15: 213:17;218:25;219:24; 220:5,24;224:12; 226:7,7;228:24;230:6; 232:21;241:4;257:9; 279:13;281:19 putting (2) 194:1;231:3 Q quadrant (8)

62:11:66:21:71:16, 17:73:9.20:142:10: 217:1 qualified (5) 154:18:164:7: 177:11.12:256:4 qualify (2) 166:19,25 quality (53) 22:6;24:17;154:5,5, 24;155:23;156:1; 157:9,12,24;160:25; 161:4,5,14,18,19,22, 24;162:4;165:10,13, 19;166:20,22;175:2; 177:12,17;183:10; 187:19,20,21,25; 188:12;189:25;190:24; 191:8;195:13,18; 198:6;201:11,18,25; 202:6,16;235:6; 248:10:254:13.15: 257:24;258:1,8;267:6; 268.3quality-related (1) 154:4 quantifiable (3) 174:5;196:16;202:24 quantified (2) 175:23:176:18 quantify (1) 172:11 quantity (2) 171:2.6 quarter (2) 250:20;251:16 questioner (1) 100:17 queue (7) 176:11:227:2; 235:21;237:1;242:12; 243:6,8 queued (3) 211:14,18;212:1 queues (7) 54:15;232:10;233:7, 10;243:8;260:19; 271:22 queuing (25) 175:8,10,20,22; 203:17:210:25:211:2, 6,9,10;214:6;231:7; 232:8,12:234:14; 235:9,11,24;236:14,17; 237:9,21,23;272:7; 278:11 quickly (3) 99:5;172:14;272:5 quite (16) 7:25;12:24;70:18; 170:4:174:8:178:12: 204:23;206:5,9; 207:24;211:6;221:10;

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

236:4;260:23;274:18; 278:16 quote (4) 22:3,5;49:22,23 quoting (1) 101:1 R radius (2) 122:7;259:13 raise (9) 87:12;88:22,22,23; 153:15;197:3;222:18, 25;254:24 raised (5) 49:10;92:6;169:4; 197:6,10 raising (2) 197:6,9 ran (7) 185:6;195:2;204:18; 209:14,14,18,19 random (1) 240:4 range (13) 30:5,6,7,15,19;31:2; 132:13;151:19;154:7; 192:22;233:20;264:6; 278:2 ranged (2) 132:15,17 ranges (3) 30:17,17;133:2 rare (6) 193:4;194:3;282:2,3, 4,23 rate (2) 102:25;251:14 rates (1) 163:10 rather (11) 27:23;76:13;143:19; 180:16;188:18;209:4; 222:21;240:25;247:14; 263:16;270:21 ratio (2) 112:16;171:21 ratios (3) 163:11:165:1.2 raw (1) 240:14 reach (8) 20:1;44:3,19;69:23; 79:3;120:22;126:18; 272:21 reached (3) 45:1;46:2;137:12 reaches (1) 205:11 reaching (2) 44:12:45:9 read (12)

25:6;85:21;88:6; 90:1,10;91:22;94:8; 96:6,24;121:19; 195:12:252:2 readable (2) 222:5:223:7 reading (9) 87:23;91:14,19;95:2; 123:17,18,25;251:9,9 Ready (4) 148:25;149:1;153:8; 219:25 real (2) 184:4;196:15 realistic (1) 228:7 reality (3) 195:11;211:4;230:25 realize (1) 80:20 really (31) 7:15;14:10;18:4,11; 69:21;97:2;106:21; 150:24;173:15;177:18: 183:13,13;184:5; 191:17;197:10;201:10; 205:14;214:15;218:11, 11,13;226:25;230:9,9; 240:1;245:25;254:21; 258:13:263:5:268:25: 272:15 realm (2) 49:24:56:14 rear (2) 78:24;79:1 reason (20) 8:22;13:1,13;14:17; 32:1;75:13;98:23;99:2. 5;108:1;137:18;224:9; 230:5,17;245:20,24; 246:6,7;251:14;267:20 reasonable (9) 91:21;130:23;188:6; 191:1;207:24;211:6; 225:8;256:7,24 reasons (6) 86:18;87:10;108:1,2; 217:15;281:23 reassessed (1) 228:5 rebuttal (1) 6:10 recall (16) 22:11;23:14;25:11, 24;33:7;48:16,23,25; 78:22;98:10;99:18; 141:1;184:18;238:3; 245:1;266:2 receive (4) 8:1,14;31:11;183:8 received (5) 6:23,24;7:2,24;185:1

30:11,24 recent (9) 101:3;147:25;148:1, 8;179:4;197:17;198:2; 247:18:277:21 recently (2) 46:17;116:7 receptor (3) 224:18;225:2;243:24 receptors (3) 224:13;259:19; 268:11 recess (3) 57:14;153:5;241:13 reclassification (1) 94:14 recognize (1) 143:5 recognizes (1) 225:17 recollect (1) 150:20 recollection (4) 95:18,20;97:24; 98:11 recommend (2) 69:21;135:13 recommendation (13) 4:20;13:2;56:15; 68:16:81:21:82:18; 86:10,22,24;90:14; 118:20:135:14:246:18 recommendations (8) 12:14;68:14;85:17; 89:8;110:23,24; 114:18;133:24 recommended (4) 86:23,25;94:13; 120:23 recommends (1) 87:19 reconsider (1) 246:18 record (27) 4:22;5:25;6:11,16; 7:1;11:10,12;16:24; 17:11;31:5;44:7,22; 57:15;80:25;121:17; 122:8;153:7;167:7; 169:2;183:25;188:25; 195:7,12:229:5; 241:14;249:5;263:11 recording (2) 167:22,24 recross (5) 140:19,22;143:19, 20;152:10 rectangular (1) 53:24 red (7) 65:24;110:11;222:2, 3;224:6;249:11;269:3 redeveloped (3)

128:9;129:3,14 redevelopment (16) 29:17:58:6,19:65:21; 67:2.18:109:9.14: 110:17,20;111:19; 112:10;119:16;127:15; 128:11.20 redirect (7) 131:20,23;140:20; 141:22;143:17,21,22 redline (1) 36:7 reduce (8) 170:21,22;177:9; 194:5;196:2,8;278:20; 281:13 reduced (1) 193:19 reduces (1) 193:15 reducing (1) 172:15 reduction (3) 170:9;201:15;281:22 redundant (1) 162:14 Reedie (2) 80:10,10 refer (7) 103:15,16:105:11; 133:25;190:11;240:21; 259:6 reference (27) 15:5:21:2:27:16: 29:9;56:18;57:6;62:4; 66:4;81:19;82:9;84:3, 9:102:24:107:24; 112:15;131:9;147:14; 175:25;219:20;229:17, 18:230:4,12:232:2; 251:3.5.8 referenced (5) 24:17;66:16;80:25: 81:5;264:19 references (2) 61:19;105:11 referencing (13) 35:16;37:17;59:16; 62:10;63:22;64:5; 94:23;97:5;141:1; 171:20;172:22;222:7; 240:15 referred (4) 96:19;102:15;137:1; 147:25 referring (28) 48:5;49:2;61:14; 62:20,22;66:1;83:1; 93:25;94:2;105:4; 133:25;134:3;136:6; 147:9;174:18;185:4; 208:2;216:16,20; 229:23;235:3;237:2;

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

238:12,13:248:13; 257:1:262:14:273:8 refill (1) 46:18 refine (2) 228:1.12 refined (2) 228:7;232:13 refinement (1) 211:7 refinements (1) 213:17 refining (1) 214:9 reflect (4) 30:7;58:8;83:25; 84:3 reflected (3) 58:2;66:18;82:8 reflects (4) 22:6;24:18;83:24; 84:11 refresh (2) 25:25;141:6 regard (3) 6:6;70:18;256:5 regarding (5) 7:2;9:16;28:25; 112:15;163:1 regardless (1) 98:21 region (4) 207:7.8:224:17; 259:21 regional (15) 118:17;122:3,10,25; 123:11:177:9:180:18, 19;225:25;226:17; 249:15;265:25;266:3, 4:268:23 regional-measured (1) 207:3 regions (1) 195:17 regular (1) 54:15 regulate (1) 157:19 regulator (2) 179:22;180:4 regulatory (1) 195:20 reject (1) 85:23 relate (3) 65:2;66:17;134:17 related (5) 11:17;45:1;122:1; 132:2;208:24 relates (2) 67:4.4 relating (2) 43:10:44:15

relation (2) 50:20:51:15 relationship (3) 73:5:171:1.6 relative (11) 171:11;180:16; 253:21;255:16;262:10; 264:8:267:10,13,25; 270:10;275:8 relatively (3) 197:16;262:7;278:14 released (4) 171:7,20,22;194:6 relevance (4) 117:24;174:9;205:8, 14 relevant (4) 63:11;71:11;90:10; 124:25 reliable (2) 226:5;258:22 relied (2) 28:16;47:10 relies (1) 43:19 relocated (1) 47:14 relocation (1) 278:2 rely (4) 43:12:44:4,19:45:8 remain (1) 120:14remainder (1) 114:24 remained (1) 114:14 remaining (2) 11:9:114:22 remember (11) 26:1;32:3;33:15; 44:23:50:24:78:18: 132:14;141:3,4;147:1; 251:24 removable (2) 15:19;159:4 remove (6) 159:3;170:12; 201:17;223:8;281:15, 20 removed (1) 223:23 removing (1) 213:21 Renee (7) 6:13;9:6,16;80:21; 88:5;247:7,9 renew (2) 174:7;255:22 repair (2) 53:5;55:25 repeat (3) 24:10;161:17;180:1

receives (2)

PETITION OF COSICO	WHOLESALE CORFO	KATION	I	
noncotodly (1)	160.7.207.17.	127.21.150.14.	7:3	24.262.6.265.11 14.
repeatedly (1)	160:7;207:17;	137:21;150:14;		24;263:6;265:11,14;
193:21	209:15;210:13;244:1,	220:18	ridden (1)	269:6;270:16;273:19;
repetitive (1)	10,19,21;245:22,23;	restaurant (1)	137:18	274:21;277:9,9;
100:13	279:2	208:4	ride (4)	281:15;283:13,17
rephrase (3)	requesting (3)	restaurants (2)	139:15,15,19,20	right-hand (4)
16:21;155:25;159:13	5:25;6:1,2	181:9;208:7	right (249)	58:1;62:16;110:8;
replicate (1)	require (5)	restrictions (1)	5:2,12,21;8:4;9:1,5,	137:13
240:19	64:19;168:19;178:2;	25:9	14,22,25;10:18,24;	rights (1)
	191:22;230:5			88:23
replicated (2)		restrictive (3)	11:3;12:17,25;14:1,4,	
242:9,16	required (6)	27:16,19;190:23	12,24;15:7,10;16:10;	ring (38)
report (109)	18:10;94:1;95:21,22;	result (4)	17:12;23:5,9;24:15;	11:24;12:3;33:4;
4:19;16:3;21:15,16,	189:15;249:20	25:7;119:11;214:4;	28:4;32:3;33:24;35:23;	42:9;64:14;69:4,23,24;
18;22:2,10;24:21;25:7,	requirement (3)	237:11	36:17;38:14;39:2,3,4,	73:19;77:21;80:8;
14;26:7;29:18,20,24;	95:1;133:13;155:13	results (14)	13,20;41:2;42:16;	81:13;83:10;84:12;
30:7,13,19,22;31:1,10,	requirements (18)	102:15;201:23;	46:18;47:3;48:3;52:11,	85:13;86:6;90:24;
13,21,21,25;32:2,5,17,	14:22;19:12;27:16,	204:17,20;205:23;	13;53:18;55:8;56:3;	137:9,19,21;139:2;
18,20;33:1,7,7,12,25;	17,18;28:21;93:20;	209:7,16,17;233:2,13;	57:12,15;59:12,20;	144:18;145:15;149:18;
34:1,10,17,19;42:18,	95:14;102:20;133:10;	236:3,14;266:24;	60:4;62:15;63:5,9,12,	150:9;193:4,11;194:2;
21;43:8,12,19,23;44:7,	140:14;155:16;184:20;	278:17	24;64:6,18;66:11;	214:15,18;215:1,2;
9,24,25;45:6,10;50:19,	192:7;200:10;230:2;	resume (4)	68:18;71:8,12;73:25;	226:10;231:6;260:17;
22;51:3,5,14,17;52:18,	248:23;253:1	4:13;5:23;11:3;	75:2,12,24;76:8,16,25;	264:1;278:13;282:2
21;55:11;56:18;81:6,	requires (6)	57:16	77:9,11,22;78:5,18,20;	ripping (1)
24;82:21;100:23;	18:9;49:16;155:12;	résumé (1)	83:7,18;84:14;87:12;	255:8
101:1;102:14,19;	248:18;258:18;266:2	163:15	88:11,23;90:18,22;	risk (18)
103:3,15;104:3,7,12,	research (2)	resumed (2)	91:10,15;92:8;93:9,22;	159:19;170:5;
24,25;105:9,21;106:3,	163:9;165:5	4:12;11:7	95:9;96:16,25;97:10,	176:23,24;178:1;
5,12,18;107:23;141:1,	residence (2)	resuming (1)	20;98:15;101:11,15,	189:9;191:14,14,16,18,
2,3,6;191:21;198:2;	143:25;282:14	10:19	15;104:16;105:5;	20,23;202:8,23;231:1;
203:4,11;211:2;	residences (2)	retail (7)	106:8,23;107:9,13,13,	267:24,25,25
213:13;238:16,17;	21:10;144:20	25:8;108:4;111:1,1;	14;108:22,25;116:14,	risk-causing (1)
				194:9
240:3,6;241:18,25;	residential (16)	113:12;120:8;122:17	23;117:6,10,13;119:10,	
245:11,14;246:3;	18:9;32:7,9;34:12,	retrofitting (1)	25;121:7;123:17;	Road (63)
257:6,6,16;267:24;	22;94:13;111:4;132:5,	197:20	124:1;125:20;126:1,	4:8;11:24;12:3;
271:19;272:24,25;	7;133:7,15;144:6,16;	review (11)	12,25;127:23;128:8,23,	18:21;19:6,9;29:10;
273:20;279:9	169:24;193:11;277:22	6:10;18:4;56:5,8,8,	25;129:10,11;130:12,	33:4;42:9;61:22;62:14;
report/health (1)	residents (5)	13;72:4;191:12;	14,16,19,22;131:13;	64:14;65:16,20;69:4,
44:9	44:16;67:22;145:25;	192:18;202:15;208:11	134:10,19,23;136:2;	23,24;72:7,9;73:19;
reportable (1)	273:24,24	reviewed (4)	137:4,6;138:6,9;	77:21;78:12;80:8;
268:2	resolution (4)	7:15;28:22;271:20,	141:14;145:6;146:12;	81:13;83:10;84:12,23;
reported (1)	82:7,8,15;83:5	24	147:15,21;148:25;	85:13;86:6;90:24;
184:4	resolved (1)	revised (5)	151:21;152:3,6,10,13,	109:10,16;111:25;
REPORTER (1)	160:17	36:8;46:6;47:19;	23;153:10,14,15;	127:21,25;130:2;
20:6	Resources (1)	146:22;247:13	154:10;155:1;162:5,8,	137:9,19,21;138:13;
reporting (1)	191:21	Revision (4)	15,25;165:22;167:25;	139:2;144:18;145:16;
191:19	respect (12)	37:11;101:3;147:19;	169:11;174:22;175:6;	149:19;150:9;178:14;
reports (5)	12:9;15:12,18;45:12,	148:6	177:14,21;178:7;	193:5,11;194:2,13;
44:24;55:20;181:6;	17;68:2;69:17;164:22;	revisit (1)	184:7,12;186:1,2,17,	198:8,9;214:15,18;
186:13;283:10	195:10;206:18;208:18;	89:1	17,24;187:5,8;188:23;	215:1,2;225:13;
represent (2)	274:19	revoked (1)	189:2,6;191:5;192:15;	226:10;231:6;260:17;
234:1,4	respecting (1)	155:15	194:13;195:4;203:3;	264:1;278:13;282:2
representation (1)	69:17	rewrite (7)	205:10;207:10;208:18;	roads (1)
207:1	respond (4)	115:22;116:1,5,22;	210:7;211:12;215:12;	228:20
Representative (3)	172:14;195:1;272:8;	117:3,12;120:24	216:2;218:25,25;	roadway (8)
207:8;212:6;239:17	274:4	rezone (1)	219:6,8,23;220:25;	81:18;83:9;84:11,20;
represented (2) 27:24;28:8	response (7) 5:19;6:25;49:10;	116:12 rezoned (9)	226:8;227:4,7;231:20; 232:14,14;234:19,23;	85:10;137:2,8;186:2 roadway/on-road (1)
				•
represents (3)	131:19;166:12;184:23;	112:22;113:21,21;	236:16;237:8;238:18;	79:24
30:15;58:3;269:4	284:10	114:4,13,17;115:21;	240:10,18,20;241:12;	roadways (4)
request (8)	responses (1)	120:15;130:10	242:17;244:16;245:2;	226:13;248:16;
63:14;99:12;118:23;	55:17	rezoning (4)	248:6;250:1,20,24;	263:25;265:8
125:11;167:12;168:17,	responsible (1)	113:24;114:20;	252:4,21;253:6,16,18,	Rockville (7)
17;244:22	237:23	116:1,5	22,24;254:18;259:16;	5:14;207:12;243:14;
requested (11)	rest (3)	Richardson (1)	261:17,20,25;262:5,12,	248:24;249:11;250:9;
				. , , ,

266:13 roug role (1) 21 159:18 rout rooftops (1) 81 163:23 routi 22 **room** (6) 4:16;20:3;244:19; row 283:15,23;284:7 25 21 **ROSENFELD** (259) 5:7,7;7:9,11,17,20; rows 26 8:3;9:6,10,13,16,21; 10:2,23,25;11:1,8;12:6, 26 rule 21;13:4;15:8,9,11; 16:2;17:13,14;18:2,5, 10 15;19:4,21;20:4,9; 20 22:14,16;23:1,6,11,15; ruled 24:11,16,25;25:5,23; 16 28:11;29:11,13;31:7,9, rules 16,20;33:18,22;34:2,7, 16 9,18;35:17,19,22,25; run 36:16,21;37:2,5,14; 75 38:6,11,13,16;39:25; 16 40:7,8,16;41:4,7,10; 2042:2,7,10,13,15,17; 23 46:9,10,12;47:9,13,25; runr 48:3,8,11,14;49:20,21; 62 50:2,5;51:23;52:1,5,9, 16 10,14;53:22;55:15,19; 21 56:1,4;57:8,11,16,17, 24 18:59:11,14,17,19,21, runs 24;60:2,12;61:21;62:6; 40 64:2,10,12,16,23; rupt 65:15;66:9,11,13,15; 25 67:9,11,25;68:7,12,19; rura 69:12,25;70:7,19,23; 23 25 71:5,9,13;72:10,13,21; 15 74:16,23;78:6;80:24; 81:3;83:2,5,8,13,17,19, 26 27 25;84:4,8,13,15,19,24; 85:3.6.9.16:86:12.15: 87:5.14:88:20.24:89:1. 3,4,22,24;90:20,25; 91:4,13,16,20;92:2,5; S-27 93:3,6,10,20,23,24; 14 S-28 94:3,6,10,22;95:2,20; 99:22,24;100:2,5; 4:4 109:19;115:14;126:17; safe 140:20,21,23;141:11, 87 15;142:2,15,19,24; 19 143:14;161:17;163:3, safer 18:164:4,12,19,22; 13 165:6,9,13,18,21,23; safet 46 166:1;167:7;177:10, 87 15;180:1;205:7,13; 19 221:19,24;222:6,13,20, 23;223:1,11,15,20,25; sake 224:3,5;230:8,11; 17 236:12;254:12,19; sales 255:22 19 Rosenfeld's (2) same 80:21;135:14 14 rough (1) 19 213:2

oughness (3)	44:20;5
212:15,15,22	100:19;
oute (1) 81:8	120:19; 25;157:
outinely (1)	172:2;1
225:25	189:14:
ow (5)	196:23;
259:1;261:20,20,20,	4,20;22
21	240:22;
bws (5) 261:4,25;262:21;	264:18
263:15;265:5	sample (4 168:3;2
ıle (7)	280:23:
	samples (
100:17;168:8,9,17, 20;170:10;190:16	165:3,3
iled (1)	20;266:
167:18 iles (1)	sampling 165:5;2
168:13	Saturday
in (15)	31:4;23
75:21;76:3;185:13,	19,24;2
16,23,25;186:7,8,8,9;	Saturday
205:21;209:11;219:21;	31:12
232:5;263:4	saw (6) 7:16;8:2
nning (10) 62:15;78:12;149:18;	251:1;2
164:10;203:24;210:1;	saying (5.
219:20;228:5;232:3;	27:20;4
248:25	15;63:1
$\operatorname{ins}(1)$	69:19;7
40:24 1 ptures (1)	73:25;7 88:18;9
255:7	9,16;93
ral (21)	101:18;
239:7,11;242:10;	119:19;
258:24;259:3,6,7,10,	22;128:
15,21,23,25;262:4,7;	188:14;
263:4;268:9;270:15; 271:3,7,8;272:14	194:2;2 236:2,1
271.3,7,0,272.11	245:17;
S	250:19;
	274:24;
·2794 (1)	scale (7)
142:16 • 2863 (2)	179:4;2 218:23;
4:4;105:14	2.5
ife (6)	scaled (3)
87:6;88:8;129:25;	232:24;
195:18,19,19	234:22
ifer (1)	234:22 SCGC (1)
fer (1) 137:21	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11
ifer (1)	234:22 SCGC (1)
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15;	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 scheduled 8:5 School (1
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 schedulec 8:5 School (1) 16:16;3
ffer (1) 137:21 ffety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 kke (2)	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 schedulec 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14;
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ike (2) 170:2;189:8	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 schedulec 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16;
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ike (2) 170:2;189:8 iles (2)	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 schedulec 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16; 263:18;
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ke (2) 170:2;189:8 les (2) 198:14;200:25 me (45)	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 scheduled 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16; 263:18; 267:12; 9,21,23
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ke (2) 170:2;189:8 iles (2) 198:14;200:25 me (45) 14:24;15:4;17:15,23;	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 scheduled 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16; 263:18; 267:12; 9,21,23 Science (1
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ke (2) 170:2;189:8 les (2) 198:14;200:25 me (45) 14:24;15:4;17:15,23; 19:5,15;22:20;23:2,4,	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 scheduled 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16; 263:18; 267:12; 9,21,23 Science (1 160:19
fer (1) 137:21 fety (11) 46:3;69:17;85:25; 87:1;188:7;189:11,15; 191:2,4;256:8,25 ke (2) 170:2;189:8 iles (2) 198:14;200:25 me (45) 14:24;15:4;17:15,23;	234:22 SCGC (1) 5:11 scheduled 8:5 School (1 16:16;3 257:14; 259:16; 263:18; 267:12; 9,21,23 Science (1

58:1:88:1.6; 9;107:5,5; 9;133:18;154:23, 7:1;161:24; 184:23,24; 4;192:3;193:20; 3;197:6,9;221:3, 24:18:225:5; 2;252:24;259:7; 8 (4) 258:20; 3;282:21 (7)3,6;192:17,18, 6:21 **g** (3) 234:1;279:23 y (9) 33:5,7,14,17, 234:4,5 ys (1) :20;9:8;195:3; 277:22 53) 48:20;58:12, 17;65:4;66:3; 70:13:71:3; 76:9,12:77:7,23; 90:23.24:92:4.9. 3:16;95:25;96:1; 8;111:17;116:16; 9;120:12;125:22, 8:18;150:11; 4;189:1,2,5; 229:20;235:18; 18;244:9,11; 7:246:9.13; 9:256:6:268:19: 4;282:2 206:11; 3;240:24;283:2, 3) 4;233:11; 2 1) ed (1) 18) 39:8;156:16; 4;258:6,25; 6;260:5;261:22; 8;264:15;265:12; 2;269:14;270:6, 3 (1)g Seeing (1)

141:21:158:6 scores (2) 178:1;202:25 screen (13) 10:11,17;79:7;99:16, 17;133:6;145:9,10; 169:21;193:7;279:17; 283:23;284:5 screened (3) 94:15,16,25 screening (4) 95:15:98:19:99:3; 278:19 SE-2794 (2) 140:25;142:7 second (40) 6:13;12:16;17:10; 19:13;22:17,17,18; 34:20;52:23;53:2; 58:23;81:12;82:10; 83:21;101:19;102:18; 113:10,17;114:21,23; 117:7;118:4;137:23; 141:19;142:22;144:5, 11;149:9,13,20; 151:22;158:6;161:2; 178:16;209:8;219:4; 229:15;233:1;272:8; 281:24 second-level (1) 218:14 secondly (2) 130:20;206:20 Section (17) 4:5;6:4;43:9,22; 44:14;45:5;61:1;69:10; 93:25;95:14;96:6; 102:15;103:4,14; 122:21;127:24;131:25 sections (2) 97:19,21 sector (90) 8:10,14;11:15,21,23; 12:10,14;13:2,11; 14:10,16;15:6,16,20, 24;30:22;41:12,13,15, 22;56:5,9,12,15,25; 57:20;61:19;65:5;66:2, 17;67:21;68:3,6,10,14, 20;69:7,10,14;71:1,10, 14;79:13;81:5;82:6,7, 19;83:3,20;84:9,17; 85:17;89:6,21,25;91:9; 93:21;109:12,22,23; 110:2,6;111:23; 112:13,13,18;113:7; 114:1,4,11;116:12; 119:14,22,24;120:21, 23;121:18;125:6,23, 25;126:21,21;127:1; 131:16;133:19,20; 135:5,12,17;142:4

284:11 seem (4) 147:1;196:10; 207:23;240:14 seems (7) 106:10;127:6; 130:20;223:23;239:10; 250:9:255:2 segment (3) 80:3:89:10:167:15 segments (2) 80:7,12 sell (1) 233:20 selling (2) 105:14;172:5 send (1) 6:11 sending (1) 165:3 sense (9) 46:15;79:8;120:13; 130:3;151:2;173:17; 191:15;230:16;275:23 sensitive (3) 256:8,10,18 sensor (1) 251:11 sent (7) 5:24;6:14;7:15;9:10; 192:17:280:22.23 sentence (20) 22:17;29:8,12;34:14, 20;58:24;59:21;60:3,9, 16;61:2;64:24;65:11; 90:2;91:9;113:10,16; 115:6,9:120:16 separate (9) 68:24;96:12;108:2; 122:12;138:4,20,22; 139:13:173:7 separated (2) 137:15;138:2 separation (3) 97:17,25;98:12 September (4) 187:14;203:6;204:1; 227:11 series (1) 69:9 serious (1) 230:16 served (1) 158:7 service (12) 51:6,16;52:19;53:7; 54:2,11,15,19,22,24; 55:4,21 services (2) 130:7:131:6 Servpro (1) 255:8

session (3)

4:14:6:24:283:13 set (12) 95:5;96:15;137:22; 177:25;191:1,2; 211:19;226:3;248:22; 258:14;276:11;278:10 setback (2) 27:18;140:14 setbacks (3) 18:20;62:5;140:16 sets (1) 192:21 setting (2) 186:5:273:9 settling (1) 159:4 Seven (3) 20:10;152:20;260:23 seven-and-a-half (2) 218:8,10 seventh (4) 4:15;283:15,16,17 several (3) 43:1;97:9;275:14 severe (2) 76:1.13 severity (1) 75:25 shaking (1) 245:2 shall (2) 91:13:141:8 share (3) 6:19;138:16,24 shared (8) 79:24;81:17;83:9,9; 84:11,20:137:2,8 shared-use (4) 81:18;83:10;84:11; 137:3 sharing (1) 138:19 sharp (1) 283:18 Sheet (5) 148:5,6,11,12,13 shop (1)108:11 shopping (7) 108:18;118:17; 122:4,10,11;123:11; 218:5 short (1) 226:3 shortage (2) 56:6,13 shot (3) 52:7,8;76:10 shots (1) 99:19 show (48) 11:23;17:24;18:11; 22:22;25:24;30:9;

34:14:35:6.11:38:17; 40:22:50:16:52:11.16: 60:25;62:2;72:23;74:1, 3:78:8:98:14:141:5: 142:6;186:15;198:15; 210:8;217:15;239:18; 250:7;252:14,15; 257:5;260:2;267:17, 24,24,25;268:1;270:9, 12;271:10;277:22; 278:1,21;279:6,10; 280:9;282:10 showed (13) 97:17;99:15;170:4; 220:25;222:2;230:7; 232:15;238:24;252:1; 253:9;273:13;277:17; 278:17 showing (52) 10:12;81:20;109:9; 198:19:199:2,13; 200:23,23;228:13,15; 232:6;234:22;237:3; 238:6,25;239:1; 242:15;246:24;249:2, 9,10,11;253:15,18,21; 257:10,11,12,13; 258:24,24;259:18,22, 23;260:4;261:2,5,6,21, 24;264:15,16;267:8, 15;268:12;270:1.5,15; 282:8.11.25:283:1 shown (31) 16:20,22;17:2;18:6; 33:18;53:9,23;58:13; 65:2;69:8;83:3;91:4; 136:8;139:7;142:4; 181:7,8;198:23; 219:23;220:23;222:12; 223:2;231:2;239:16; 243:5;252:12;253:10, 16:255:10:261:3:267:9 shows (31) 20:18;58:4,14;61:25; 62:1,1;65:14;79:24; 81:17;90:20;110:17; 113:25;114:1,1,3,16; 135:3;136:24;171:11; 176:22;179:3;180:22; 190:6;200:4;203:11; 246:22;247:19;249:22; 260:23;262:15;279:17 shrubs (1) 94:20 side (25) 17:24,24;39:5,15; 40:4;53:18;57:23;58:1; 78:13;112:4,6;127:22; 128:19;137:13;181:23, 25;183:6;188:18,18; 208:7;217:3,5,5; 218:15:239:24 sides (2)

6:9:205:22 sidewalk (4) 62:2;78:4;129:24; 139:20 sidewalks (3) 35:10;75:6;129:22 Sierra (2) 185:4,19 sight (1) 151:9 sign (1) 138:17 signed (4) 79:24;83:9;137:2,8 significance (10) 66:22,24,25;67:1; 68:2;186:12;206:14, 16;253:8;255:3 significant (6) 158:7;175:11; 209:17:210:8:248:14, 19 significantly (2) 34:21;193:9 signifies (2) 71:24,25 Silver (2) 4:8:138:23 SILVERMAN (64) 5:9,9:10:6:13:17,19: 18:23;19:1,19,22,25; 23:18.20.24:48:23: 49:1,3:62:17,19,24; 92:12;95:10;96:3; 98:22,23;99:8,10; 100:9,11;134:22; 143:18,20,22,23;145:1, 2,7;149:11;151:14,15, 16;152:7,8,25;166:7; 173:15:174:7.14; 180:2;197:3;204:5,7; 221:12,15;229:13,16; 230:9;237:13,18; 238:2;239:25;244:3,7, 14;251:19 similar (12) 42:4;55:21;192:3; 199:8;209:16;227:3; 233:9;272:1;277:15; 281:11;283:7,9 simulator (2) 184:10,11 single (1) 187:11 single-families (1) 150:18 site (30) 4:8;11:10,13,16; 13:15;16:15,22;17:16, 20,22,23;18:16;19:5,9; 20:10,16,20;35:12; 51:22;71:7;79:5;103:7, 7;114:22;124:23;

133:3,24;136:12; 264:19;282:12 sites (5) 18:4,11,17;19:15; 192:13 site-specific (5) 81:21,22;82:18;84:8; 89:8 siting (1) 26:23 sitting (1) 21:1 situation (3) 49:14;95:5,10 six (14) 56:12;88:12;97:17; 98:5,11;110:8;150:3,6; 162:14;165:14;241:10; 255:13;267:8;271:20 six-foot (2) 33:2;85:12 six-inch (1) 97:25 six-month (1) 158:4 sixth (1) 4:2 size (10) 16:8,9,23;17:17; 19:7,12:20:19:22:23; 70:23;146:10 skills (1) 155:20 slash (1) 169:21 slide (33) 198:12,19,22,23,23; 199:3;200:2;206:8,9; 216:18,21,22;221:12; 222:22;239:25;240:10; 241:4:243:5:247:4: 248:1,2:262:23; 269:20;270:4;271:2,7; 273:5;275:4;276:11, 12,20;279:8;282:16 slides (5) 171:8;182:5;222:4,7; 279:13 slight (1) 250:24 slightly (5) 46:7;104:10;149:5; 170:21;271:3 sliver (2) 269:3;275:7 slope (3) 75:25;76:19,21 slow (1) 218:11 small (26) 170:9;172:13,13; 175:2:176:1.13; 183:13,21;193:12;

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

232:22;233:11;235:12; 236:3,4;237:9;261:1; 262:5,7,11;263:1; 268:13,25;269:23; 270:18:273:23:278:16 smaller (1) 257:10 smell (4) 192:25;193:18,21; 280:5 smelled (1) 280:8 smoking (1) 181:12 smooth (1) 249:2 socially (1) 130:5 Society (1) 154:19 sold (4) 169:23;172:16; 200:24;233:17 solely (3) 140:19;143:21,22 solid (2) 94:17,17 Somebody (2) 9:11;166:15 somehow (3) 71:4:92:1:120:9 someone (1) 152:2 someone's (1) 99:4 sometime (1) 184:24 Sometimes (6) 9:2;95:8;157:6; 210:17;275:18;280:4 somewhat (5) 49:9:100:14;170:1; 175:19;240:13 somewhere (8) 57:2;72:15;73:12; 79:1;91:2;92:21; 146:18;241:4 sonic (1) 186:23 sonotubes (3) 96:14,17:97:19 sorry (52) 7:10;13:6;17:12; 19:17;22:1,8,19;26:16; 30:3;34:10;36:11; 43:12;59:4;61:14,18; 62:8,14;67:12;73:24; 74:7;75:3;83:13; 102:13;103:22;111:8; 113:18;114:16;115:4, 6,15;123:2,8;124:14; 128:14;129:13;150:2; 157:9;161:17;167:22,

	WHOLESALE CORI O	KAHON	I	[
23;214:24;216:21;	204:17	106:11:185:5	16,16;259:2,12;260:6,	180:4;188:5;190:22;
231:17;233:5;235:13;	speaker (1)	spot (11)	7,9,22,25;261:11;	229:17
236:12;237:7;251:25;	107:3	272:1,3,4,5;273:13,	262:3,5,6,19;263:12,	state's (1)
			20;264:5,9,10,14,14;	267:2
252:7;270:22;276:24;	speaks (2)	21;275:11,13,14,16,22		
282:13	47:18;81:12	spreadsheets (3)	267:11,13,22;268:1,4;	stating (2)
sort (8)	special (65)	228:14,15,23	269:2,19,25;270:7;	116:12;230:14
68:10;98:20;170:20;	4:5;9:17;13:10;	Spring (2)	272:1;273:14,15;275:6	station (160)
204:25;240:4;273:11;	15:15;16:4;21:10;	4:9;138:24	standards (54)	4:7;16:19,20;17:2,6,
274:23;283:21	24:22;25:14,15;31:16;	Springfield (1)	93:18;155:13;170:5;	17;18:7,8;21:4;22:3,7;
sound (1)	35:9,12,21,22;36:1,11,	157:23	173:16;176:22,23;	24:18;25:1,10,11;26:9,
152:23	14;40:3;43:11;44:1;	square (14)	177:24,25;186:4;	23;27:13;33:14;55:22;
SoundPLAN (1)	45:2;50:11,12,20;	16:4,5;18:16;19:14;	187:20,22,23,23;188:1,	69:2,22;70:17,20;71:4;
163:25	51:15;52:15;54:8;55:8;	20:13,22;100:25;	4,12;189:11,17,21;	79:7;87:17;88:17;94:7;
sounds (2)	68:13;69:5,13;70:9,10;	101:6,23;102:1;	190:1,7,12,13,24;	95:6;99:17;100:25;
130:13;153:1	86:18;87:3;93:4,7,8,	103:11;122:4,12,17	191:9;195:14,22;	103:8,9,12,16;105:14;
source (17)	12;94:24;95:21;101:3,	square-foot (1)	196:1,5,10,24;197:11;	118:16;119:15,21;
42:25;43:1;158:13;	6,22;102:1;118:23;	16:18	202:1,7;204:20;205:8,	121:3,25;122:24;
175:21,23;176:1;	125:11;132:4,6;133:1,	squeeze (1)	22,25;231:2;243:8;	123:11;124:5;125:15,
179:4;180:21;181:4;	6;136:11;140:10,11,12,	277:3	254:13,13;255:1;	22;128:2,12;130:9;
225:14;230:11;231:20;	13,24;142:7;143:2;	SR-26 (1)	256:16,22;258:25;	133:14;136:10,11;
237:9;243:8;248:15;	147:17;149:3,7;	80:11	262:2,9,10;270:10;	137:8;140:1,3;144:1,3;
271:12;272:17	153:22;160:8;174:12	St (1)	271:17,25;275:9;279:3	149:4,13,19;151:3,8;
source-category (1)	specialty (1)	192:17	standing (1)	163:13;169:25;175:1,
230:1	225:18	stable (1)	150:17	15,18,18,22;177:2,7;
sources (36)	species (1)	226:4	standpoint (1)	178:17,19,23;180:13;
158:12,14;203:12,	202:21	staff (26)	173:19	181:3,5;183:21,23;
16;206:22;207:2,18;	specific (22)	6:14;7:2;46:19;47:1;	stands (2)	190:5;192:3,20;
217:10;221:9;230:1;	11:16;13:15;61:21;	80:21;85:23;86:22,24;	243:5;251:25	193:17;194:19,19;
231:15;236:22;237:20;	65:12,13;82:2;91:2;	87:19;164:8,12;203:9;	star (1)	195:9;197:19;198:3,
248:13,13,15,20;	94:6;112:18;114:18;	227:25;228:1;233:4;	72:2	13,16,25;199:1,7,9,16,
260:19;261:5;263:23;	124:23;133:11,23;	245:11,14;247:22;	start (8)	18,22,24;200:4,7,8,24;
264:22;265:8;266:13;	134:2;135:8;142:3;	271:19,20,23;272:25;	8:8;60:23;153:2;	201:1,1,2,4,6;202:22;
267:8,13,15;268:12,21;	159:16;164:24;216:15;	273:20;278:24;279:12;	187:14;190:6;217:21;	203:23;209:9;210:14;
269:6,10,21,22;270:17,	226:21;248:8;268:4	284:2	276:7,22	211:16;215:16,21,22;
17;271:22;278:4	specifically (14)	staff's (3)	started (5)	225:13,18;229:3,4,8,
south (16)	29:3;62:2;83:9;98:5;	86:10;87:24;88:3	27:18;178:14;	11,12;231:8,9,11;
32:9;34:13,23;35:6;	112:13,19;114:15,20;	stage (7)	227:10;276:23,24	237:23;238:1;243:9;
39:15,15;40:2,3;41:2;	127:1;136:23;146:4;	65:7,13;230:2,2;	starting (2)	260:12,14,19;261:5,22;
73:12;74:17;78:14;	166:14;182:6;256:10	281:17,20;282:6	73:8;200:15	262:20;263:24,25;
217:2;228:17;282:12,	specifics (4)	stand (3)	starts (1)	265:4,5,16,17;266:9;
13	58:12;61:21;66:4;	196:22;251:22;254:7	61:23	268:16;269:5,7;
	142:8	stand-alone (1)	state (14)	270:23;271:23;272:4;
southeast (3)		53:23		
35:3;39:11;41:24	specified (1) 92:21		29:20;33:1,25;34:11;	273:21;274:2,7;275:7,
southern (14)		standard (123)	42:18;70:19;116:21;	21;277:14,15;278:3,5;
12:3;32:24;54:7,9;	specifies (2)	173:8,13,24,25;	121:19;124:3;154:9,	280:6;281:8;283:6
64:13;69:3;71:16;	168:9;248:12	174:1,2,3,4,20;177:24;	16;174:19;179:23;	station-only (1)
77:21;79:22;83:10;	speed (4)	179:19;183:9,10,14;	202:1	228:18
84:12;89:9,11;145:13	188:22;196:20;	185:11;186:3;187:19;	stated (6)	station-related (1)
southwest (7)	213:1;278:12	188:21;189:9;191:15,	16:4;29:18;125:12,	263:23
26:8;41:6;68:11;	spell (2)	15;196:3,12,19;197:7,	13;127:16;162:1	stations (30)
76:8;132:16;217:1;	251:19,20	8;205:20;207:4,9,16,	statement (24)	17:24;20:21,23;56:6,
219:8	spend (2)	21;220:14;226:18,19;	25:6,12,15,17;28:6;	8,12,16;57:7;124:6;
southwestern (8)	147:6;227:9	227:12,13,14,22;232:1,	101:6,18;103:19,23;	135:13,18;172:11;
62:11;66:21;69:10;	spent (1)	2;234:23,24;235:1,2,3,	104:5;110:4,18;	194:16;197:21;198:16;
71:17;73:20;77:15;	184:21	5,6,11,16,16,22,23,23,	113:10;170:25;172:6;	202:10,13,15,19;
142:9,25	spill (5)	25;236:1,2,6,8,9;	176:14;180:3;204:13;	207:19;208:6;229:6,
Soviet (2)	172:13;210:15,17,	237:19;238:5,19,20,21;	220:17;243:4;244:18;	21,24,25;230:6,15;
190:23,23	18,22	239:18,20;240:25;	272:10,15;273:18	231:1,4;249:15
space (1)	spilled (1)	241:1;242:11;246:19;	statements (1)	statute (4)
122:17	255:15	247:13;248:11;249:22,	34:5	95:20;98:18,24,24
speak (7)	spills (4)	25;250:1,3;253:16,17,	states (10)	stay (1)
18:23,25;19:19;	176:20,20;210:13,22	19,20,22,23;255:11,16,	34:21;42:21;122:16;	119:6
23:20;68:1;134:22;	spoke (2)	17;256:1,13,13;258:15,	158:6,10;179:23;	steadily (2)

239:9:268:22:275:23;

194:10:247:20 steady (1) 252:19 step (3) 70:14;205:3;210:9 Stephen (3) 39:8;257:14;258:6 stepped (1) 194:25 steps (2) 201:16;228:11 Sterling (25) 163:12;164:3,23; 192:2,20;193:1,16,24; 194:18;197:18,24; 211:24;212:11;232:16; 233:3;277:14;279:22, 25;280:5,14;281:5,6, 23;282:20,25 stick (1) 240:7 still (19) 11:4;13:12;32:24; 37:22;105:20,25; 146:11;176:14;185:15; 200:19;208:24;220:25; 226:24;239:14;241:2; 243:4,7;249:24;269:18 **Stop (9)** 5:9.14;7:13:10:3; 12:15;111:15;166:5; 223:14:283:18 store (1) 284:2stores (3) 108:4,12;122:12 straight (6) 72:24;76:2,10,22; 78:13:253:13 straightforward (1) 41:18 strange (1) 106:10 Street (23) 20:17;58:13;62:1; 65:21;74:17;128:19; 129:17;137:15,16,17; 138:2,4,8,16,19,19; 139:16,20;144:15; 149:2;151:12;185:5; 208:7 street-oriented (4) 59:1;60:10;65:1; 66:6 streets (3) 73:23;129:22,24 strike (5) 14:2;45:3;48:12; 102:13,13 strip (1) 94:19 strokes (1) 126:24

WHOLESALE CORPORT	KA
stronger (1) 282:7	SI
strongly (1) 88:19	SI
structure (6)	
49:23;50:1;51:12;	S
90:5,9;98:20	
structures (3)	
90:3;91:13;272:12	
stuck (1)	
97:23	
studies (9) 158:3,15,20,22,25;	
163:4;165:5;185:8;	S
230:24	0
study (20)	
156:16;157:25;	SI
158:4,5,11;160:8,16;	
163:6,8,23;164:2;	SI
170:18;180:22;193:22,	
23;211:3;258:21;	SI
275:24;280:4,18	
studying (2)	
160:11;229:24	SI
stuff (1)	
284:2	
sub (1)	SI
179:13	G
subject (9) 4:8;9:5;18:6,13;	S
43:25;44:16;100:24;	SI
133:1;166:3	ы
subjects (1)	
256:19	SI
submitted (7)	
11:12;36:3;46:22;	SI
60:7;63:11;75:9;85:20	
subpopulations (1)	SI
256:11	
subsequently (1)	SI
211:5	
subset (1)	SI
257:10	
substantial (1) 94:17	SI
substantially (5)	
190:6;198:11;	SI
214:12,18;275:5	5
subtracting (1)	
228:17	
successful (1)	
160:21	
sudden (1)	
192:11	
sufficiently (2)	
88:15;195:14	
suggest (1)	
242:14 suggested (6)	
suggested (6) 87:18;88:12,15;	
99:11;181:18;228:1	
suggesting (3)	
77:18;87:25;88:1	

uggestion (6) 79:2:207:24:209:3.7. 8:255:25 uggestions (1) 208:23 ullivan (23) 8:7;44:22;153:3,4, 12,14,20,25;154:1; 160:24;165:10;166:18; 168:1.25:177:11; 178:10;185:18;187:9; 200:2;235:13;238:12; 241:15;249:14 ullivan's (5) 10:13:163:14; 167:14;168:18;276:16 ummarize (1) 135:2 ummarizes (1) 187:10 ummary (7) 9:18;180:9;258:23; 277:17;279:8,16;282:1 ummer (3) 184:24;193:22; 280:17 ummertime (1) 280:17 unday (2) 7:6:234:5 upplemental (6) 5:25:6:7:33:6.7: 140:25;141:3 upplemented (1) 257:7 upplies (1) 54:21 upport (2) 195:9;202:8 upporting (2) 80:22.24 uppose (1) 49:4 upposed (5) 70:15;117:16,20; 196:6,7 ure (97) 12:19;13:8;18:25; 19:7,21;21:13,15; 22:10;23:1;26:12;27:6, 10;30:10;32:14;34:15; 37:7;38:19,25;40:13, 24;48:5,7,8,20;49:6; 50:14;53:16;58:4; 60:14,14;61:7;65:4; 69:6;70:4,17;74:3; 75:21;76:25;81:17; 82:25;84:2,19;90:3; 91:18;92:1;95:3;96:22, 25;98:17;99:20;105:3; 107:22;110:2,3,3,19, 21;113:24;114:15; 115:24;116:1,5,9,18;

124:16:127:4:129:5. 15:131:22:132:3; 133:2;137:13;144:8; 150:9,17,17;159:13; 161:3;173:3;178:15; 182:19;188:25;191:11; 200:9;207:18,25; 214:15;217:23;224:2; 242:23;247:8;251:24; 276:13;283:24 surface (7) 212:14,15,22;213:2; 217:2;274:16,17 surfaces (2) 183:3;259:9 surprise (2) 136:15,19 surrounding (4) 22:4;43:10;111:2; 271:14 surroundings (1) 271:12 Survey (1) 147:17 susceptible (1) 256:20 suspended (1) 158:25 sustain (2) 130:14:255:23 sustainable (1) 130:6 Swim (2) 257:13:258:5 sworn (2) 11:6;153:16 synonymous (1) 156:4 system (2) 23:21;163:21 Т table (19) 8:20;81:6;82:2,9,11, 14;83:2,8,23,23; 107:16;204:6;238:13; 240:5,21,22;242:6,8; 258:23 tables (1) 257:6 tag (1) 9.3 tailpipe (5) 176:8,21;198:10; 201:16;253:12 talk (22) 60:22,24;61:2,8; 64:13;65:12,14; 114:12;116:1;127:24; 133:17;168:5,7; 169:22;186:22;211:8;

120:20;121:15,16;

277:6,12;283:21 talked (6) 65:22;114:3;118:10; 160:3;183:12;224:11 talking (50) 12:19;13:19,23; 27:22;31:6;42:8;47:23; 48:10,21;53:21;61:6, 11,23;62:11;63:3,18; 74:13;88:4;91:10,11; 94:20;97:4;98:25,25; 113:9,13;114:13; 134:12;144:15;145:9; 175:20;176:6;177:18; 179:12;183:14,19,20; 237:20,21;242:17; 249:5;254:1,10;255:9, 16,20;265:3,12;269:6; 274:23 talks (6) 65:17;98:24;112:14, 19;113:23;114:12 tank (6) 47:14;210:15; 237:22;255:7,12; 281:18 tankers (5) 45:23;46:4,6;47:13; 48:2 tanks (10) 175:12.13.13: 176:16:213:20,24; 214:1;231:23;280:13; 282:10 Target (4) 39:7;195:22;220:18; 272:15 Target's (1) 221:5 tax (1) 121:20 tearing (1) 255:8 technical (17) 6:14;7:1;46:18;47:1, 16,18;48:15;80:21; 85:23;86:10,22,24; 87:19,23;88:3;247:22; 271:19 technically (6) 35:9;46:13;69:5,22, 23;244:17 technology (5) 176:8;213:14; 253:11,12;282:5 telling (3) 48:19;129:12;265:4 **Ten (2)** 238:21:283:3 tenants (1) 25:8 tend (7)

172:14;177:8;	89:7;98:11;107:22;	149:9;156:24;160:11;	together (8)	trademark (1)
205:10;209:14;210:6;	120:5,13;126:23;	162:6;163:4;164:23;	61:4;67:13;80:12;	202:12
243:15;253:3	139:24:144:10:152:8,	176:12:194:7:202:6;	94:18;194:1;203:8;	traffic (31)
tended (1)	14;167:2,14;168:2,18;	205:5,6;207:11,14;	205:19;226:21	45:7,8,11;46:3;
213:6	169:1,16;186:12;	224:20,23;225:19,23;	told (6)	49:11;50:19;51:1,14,
tennis (3)	203:21;224:1;273:10;	226:9,13;234:25;	136:15;152:17;	15;102:15,20;129:25;
74:22;75:4;257:13	276:16	235:25;243:19;249:14,	184:24;185:6;245:18;	185:8;214:14;215:19;
TEOM (6)	testing (6)	21;251:2;258:14,18;	247:1	217:25;232:7,8,9,11,
251:4,4,5,9,19,20	167:1;211:23;	263:15;266:13,15,16,	took (11)	21;264:23;265:17,19,
T-E-O-M (1)	232:15;257:24;279:22;	20,22;267:3;268:11;	192:17,17;207:13;	22;268:24;273:17;
251:21	280:21	271:20;276:25;277:1;	214:24;216:9;218:23;	275:16;278:10,12;
	tests (2)			283:8
term (7)	257:20,22	280:12;281:14,20;	228:22;234:1,4; 243:13,18	
6:3;27:21;56:25;		282:4,9		traffic-centric (1)
188:9;212:15;215:24; 228:12	Thanks (1) 197:13	three-and-a-half (1) 105:10	top (13)	70:3
			22:18;89:25;90:15;	tragedy (1)
termed (1)	thereafter (1)	three-foot (1)	108:7;110:13,22;	160:5
278:19	120:15	94:18	144:16;195:6;198:23;	trail (1)
terminus (1)	therefore (2)	three-kilometer (1)	236:25;252:22;265:4;	40:18
73:4	119:21;274:2	259:13	269:3	trained (6)
terms (47)	there'll (4)	three-year (3)	topic (2)	155:17,23;156:7,14,
49:8;55:3;69:21;	29:20;42:11,18;	228:5;243:20;248:25	102:14;179:19	15;164:13
97:7;98:16,17;118:19,	200:18	threshold (2)	topics (1)	training (7)
23;136:6;159:1;	thermal (1)	188:11;191:16	165:11	164:5,6,9,14,24;
160:13;161:13;163:24;	274:17	thresholds (2)	topographic (1)	165:1;166:2
170:8;192:8,16;198:5,	thin (1)	170:5;188:13	143:25	transform (1)
14,14;200:24,25;201:3,	89:13	throughout (6)	topographical (1)	180:21
11,24;202:23;203:3,	third (14)	38:1;96:18;158:9;	132:25	transit (2)
16;204:16,18;208:25;	30:10;34:20,20;35:4;	188:5;234:7;252:25	topographically (1)	58:17;124:5
214:11;216:8;217:24;	39:13;58:23;59:21;	throughput (1)	76:13	transition (1)
219:6;221:8;229:1;	60:16;113:16;115:1,9,	172:5	topography (3)	186:10
238:4;248:7;253:25,	12;163:11;165:7	throwing (1)	76:11;77:23;145:20	Transit-oriented (5)
25;257:24;261:6;	Thirty-one (1)	240:4	Toreno (1)	56:20,22,23;68:20;
267:25;268:4;269:11;	248:1	thumb (1)	39:17	126:21
274:7;277:13	Thomas (2)	170:10	Torrance (3)	transmitted (2)
terrain (11)	160:7,7	TIA (2)	39:19,20;73:24	8:11;104:20
94:16,25;95:15;	thoroughly (1)	102:24;103:4	total (14)	transportation (4)
133:5;193:10;209:11,	7:16	tidbits (1)	158:25;185:3;	56:24;128:21;274:4;
21;210:4,6;271:11;	though (10)	55:16	236:21;237:4,6;238:3,	275:15
275:24	25:17;61:15;73:22;	tie (1)	6,25;239:1,11,17;	trash (1)
terrific (1)	88:14;106:24;116:24;	61:4	261:3;265:20;267:11	97:22
74:6	168:14;234:13;255:19;	times (25)	totally (1)	trash-transfer (1)
tested (2)	273:22	54:4;98:6;129:7;	281:3	163:7
211:5;280:23	thought (17)	137:19;155:22;157:5;	totals (3)	travel (2)
testified (24)	27:15;61:15;88:6,7,	201:5,7,9;205:2;	237:3;261:24;267:9	138:25;263:25
16:12;29:23;30:16,	9;116:2;147:9;155:25;	206:12,13,16;214:14;	toward (2)	traveled (1)
18;32:19;47:9;57:21;	173:2;194:15;209:5;	218:22;220:19;225:10;	15:14;57:24	193:8
61:4;76:1,11;79:18;	222:13;224:7;237:1,1;	228:18;233:10;234:24;	towards (6)	traveling (4)
92:13;135:12;139:24;	265:2;276:23	235:23;236:1;255:11;	112:7;209:10;	128:13;263:24;
145:8;150:1;157:2,4,5;	thoughts (1)	273:15;275:15	215:13;228:17;274:8,9	274:10,14
163:16;164:19;166:3,	67:13	tiny (1)	towers (4)	traverse (1)
14;272:9	thousand (1)	175:23	134:5,18,20,24	128:17
testify (3)	238:21	tire (3)	townhomes (1)	traversing (1)
205:15;206:17;	thousandths (2)	51:6,16;55:1	78:23	136:3
245:25	179:9,10	TOD (3)	townhouses (2)	treat (1)
testifying (7)	threaten (2)	56:18,20,22	150:20,25	206:21
84:24;106:4,9;	235:11;243:7	today (15)	toxic (12)	treating (1)
167:18,21,22;182:3	threatening (1)	4:13;5:18;6:12;7:21,	157:13,19,20;	231:19
testimony (41)	262:8	22;8:6;9:11;10:12;	158:16;160:12,15;	treatment (1)
6:9;11:11,13,15,17;	three (57)	43:1;85:20;88:21;	161:23;162:11,13;	248:7
12:2,12;30:14,16;31:2;	35:5,13;38:8,17;	169:1;176:9;199:12;	165:17;166:21;188:9	treatments (1)
42:13;45:25;47:18;	72:24;73:1;80:12;88:7,	276:1	toxics (7)	243:10
48:15;49:17;55:19;				
40.1.1.47.17.17				
73:2;81:6;82:1,23;	12;128:7;130:2; 139:14;147:23,24;	today's (3) 201:8;205:9;223:16	158:2,4,5,13;202:18; 268:4;275:18	trees (6) 132:19,22;169:21;

16:278:11:280:16

PETITION OF COSTCO	WHOL
170:8,21;173:3	55:11
tremendous (4)	79:13
176:7;201:15;	107:2
208:11;216:12	113:2
tremendously (1)	131:2
220:20	178:1
trend (16)	248:4
190:2;198:15;	turned
199:18;246:18,23;	148:2
247:19;249:20;250:4,	Turning
6,8;251:13,25;252:17,	89:25
20,23,24	turnove
trending (1)	251:1
249:24	turns (3
trends (6)	68:16
201:11,13,23;249:2,	Twenty
2;252:15	59:10
triangle (1)	two (82
249:17	8:21;
tried (4)	20:21
184:23,23;186:8;	39:7,
204:21	65:24
tries (1) 191:1	81:20 16;13
trips (2)	147:6
61:5;103:1	158:2
trivial (1)	163:3
180:25	184:2
trouble (1)	201:9
18:24	212:1
truck (2)	217:9
220:8,12	16,17
trucks (15)	9,11,2
15:14;55:4;149:18;	16,22
151:17,18;169:7;	236:2
175:12;176:16,19;	251:3
208:4;219:12;220:7,9,	261:2
16;231:21	267:3
true (7)	20,23
173:17;176:14;	two-and
184:4;221:18;245:19; 250:7;272:5	201:9
250:7;272:5 truly (1)	220:1 two-and-a
205:7	278:1
trust (1)	twofold
224:22	280:1
truth (1)	type (4)
244:18	96:8;
try (8)	types (2
168:13;173:25;	60:23
196:7;218:6,8;222:3;	typical
226:3;255:5	181:1
trying (18)	233:1
19:2;21:17;22:8;	typicall
68:25;70:14;106:22;	159:1
116:9,11;119:18;	181:1
123:13;126:18;157:18;	
184:22;195:18;205:11; 208:25;224:8;239:6	
208:25;224:8;259:6 Tuesday (1)	ultimat
242:24	70:20
turn (25)	ultimat
0.25.10.10.51.18	47.2.9

	21 105 22 1
55:11;57:19,22;68:5;	21;185:23;1
79:13;82:5;84:16;	ultra (1)
107:23;110:5;111:5;	179:12
113:24;114:2,15;	ultrafine (9)
131:25;133:17;135:9;	173:8;174:1
178:10;198:7;241:18;	179:16,24;18
248:4;250:10;283:17	181:8;206:1
rned (1)	ultrafines (1)
148:24	255:20
urning (1)	undashed (1)
89:25	72:24
rnover (1)	undefined (1)
251:14	173:24
rns (3)	under (27)
68:16;194:4;281:21	11:4;21:11;4
wenty-nine (1)	48:5,6;58:23
59:10	72:2;82:14;1
vo (82)	169:16;170:
8:21;17:15,24;18:7;	234:24,25;2
20:21;32:23;35:2;38:2;	258:22;260:
39:7,7;44:24;46:15;	263:19;270:
65:24;73:23,23;76:20;	271:8,15,16
81:20;104:14;128:6,	279:3
16;130:1;133:18;	underestimate
147:6,23,24;156:24;	219:2,4;221
158:2;161:18;162:4,4;	underestimate
163:3;176:12;183:12;	217:20;255:
184:21;193:16,20,20;	underestimati
201:9;210:16;211:15;	220:17
212:17;213:17;214:23;	underground
217:9,15,15;218:1,13,	175:13;213:
16,17,18,25;220:1,3,5,	214:1;231:2
9,11,24;226:15;228:16,	281:18;282:
16,22;233:11,24;	underline (1)
236:2;239:8,9;246:20;	83:1
251:3,7,8;260:22;	
	underlined (1)
261:25;262:21;265:5;	82:15
267.2.277.12.201.14	undermine (1)
207.5,277.15,201.14,	71:1
267:3;277:13;281:14, 20 23·282·4 21	
20,23;282:4,21	
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4)	undermines (1
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21;	undermines (1 69:14
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21;	undermines (1 69:14
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10	undermines (1 69:14 understands (
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255:
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6;	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1 150:7
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1 150:7 underway (2)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116:
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10;	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10;	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10;	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2 Union (2)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U timate (3)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2 Union (2)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U timate (3)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2- Union (2) 190:23,23
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U timate (3) 70:20;86:23;237:11	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2- Union (2) 190:23,23 unique (3)
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U timate (3) 70:20;86:23;237:11 timately (8)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1 15:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2 Union (2) 190:23,23 unique (3) 22:3,6;24:17
20,23;282:4,21 vo-and-a-half (4) 201:9;219:19,21; 220:10 o-and-a-half-mile-an-hour (1) 278:12 vofold (1) 280:15 pe (4) 96:8;125:15,24,24 pes (2) 60:23;140:16 pical (7) 181:14;201:1,2,6; 233:19,20;271:23 pically (5) 159:18;170:10; 181:10;258:18;259:8 U timate (3)	undermines (1 69:14 understands (48:9 understated (2 217:11;255: understating (217:10 understood (4 86:1;99:20;1 174:14 understory (1) 150:7 underway (2) 115:23;116: unfair (3) 173:12,23;2 unhealthy (3) 255:19,21,2- Union (2) 190:23,23 unique (3)

91:2:208:9 9: 80:6,12,17; 8 22 46:6; 3;59:19; 120:24; 15;188:24; 48:12; 25;261:11; 7.25; ;276:25; e (3) :8 ed (2) 3 ing (1) (7) 20; 2:280:13: 10) () 1) (1) (2) 4 (1)4) 168:22;) 6 26:16 4 7

158:6.10:179:23; 180:4:188:5:190:22 University (22) 20:16;61:3;62:16; 80:9;111:25;127:20, 23,25;128:6,13,16,23; 130:1;154:15,17; 226:10:231:9:232:6: 260:18;264:1;265:20, unless (5) 50:24;92:20;120:15; 168:9,20 unlike (2) 172:11;272:2 unlikely (2) 170:19;189:10 unloading (2) 46:4;48:4 unprecedented (4) 198:16;199:13.24; 200:1 unruly (1) 186:19 unsafe (1) 88:15 up (82) 8:20;10:11,17;18:23, 25;23:13,25;36:6; 38:20:53:3,14:57:21; 63:20:73:23:75:22; 76:2.18.20.20.22:77:2: 78:20,20,24;79:1; 88:16;95:5,6;110:15; 117:4;124:12;134:22; 137:22;138:17;149:14, 19;151:21;158:1; 179:4;182:8,23;183:4, 7;194:6;196:1,22; 206:11;210:14;218:23, 23;220:12;226:6; 227:9;228:6,6,17; 232:21,24,25;233:1,11; 234:21,22;239:11,12, 19;240:24;241:4; 242:12,13;254:7; 255:8,8,15;257:9; 259:23;275:2;278:10; 279:11;283:15,16,25 updated (5) 213:11:235:24; 236:3;242:14;261:18 uphill (1) 78:23 upholding (1) 155:12 upon (21) 13:16;30:5;45:9; 162:17;170:17;172:5; 187:19;193:3;195:21; 203:12,23;206:21; 208:21;209:2;232:1; 257:21;264:7;267:2,

upper (3) 62:15;73:15;82:10 upstairs (1) 283:15 uptake (1) 250:24 up-zoned (1) 128:19 urban (30) 60:15,16,19;61:16, 17:121:11:238:5.9: 239:3,10,17;240:23; 242:8,10;259:6,12,17, 18,18,22;262:5;268:9, 10;270:4,15,25;271:15, 17;273:8;275:4 urban/rural (1) 273:11 urban-scale (1) 158:9 urban-type (1) 272:13 usage (1) 259:7 use (40) 28:13;33:6,7;38:23; 44:3;45:7;52:18;56:1; 68:23;69:13;90:11; 94:12,16:116:16; 141:1,11:147:11; 164:7;179:2;188:8; 190:19,19;191:22; 195:20;197:11;207:5, 24;208:19;209:4; 217:22;223:5;224:16; 225:25;226:3;235:24; 238:5;245:18;247:13; 272:13;284:7 used (36) 27:20;56:25;164:8; 168:3;171:21;184:9.9; 185:7,10,19,21;186:13; 187:21;194:17;209:12; 213:2;214:14;215:6, 13;228:8;233:20; 234:18,24;239:7,7; 243:10,22,25;251:20; 261:18;266:24;268:9; 275:18;278:10;280:24; 283:1 useful (1) 166:16 users (1) 28:20 uses (17) 56:21,23;59:1;60:11; 65:1;66:6;68:22;72:19; 112:17;122:16,21,24; 123:10;124:4;129:17, 21;140:16

Min-U-Script®

9:25;19:10;51:18;

using (20)

178:1;181:11;

263:6:268:1,19:

192:23;207:2;212:24; 214:17;218:19;219:19; 226:17;227:14;228:4; 232:1,14,15;235:21; 244:17;246:24;259:21, 25;278:11 usual (1) 5:21Usually (6) 151:8;202:13;229:8; 231:4;233:20;276:3 V Valley (3) 80:9;160:11,13 value (23) 43:10,14,17;192:6; 227:15;228:7;235:21, 24;238:9;239:16,22; 243:12,14,25;246:19; 251:7;252:8,12; 261:18;275:3,5; 277:19,19 values (28) 45:3;207:3,15;226:4; via (1) 233:24,25;235:10; 239:3;240:23;258:24; 259:25;260:25;261:2, 7;262:9;264:6;265:10, 11:266:6:268:17: 270:12;277:23;278:2, 6;279:6,23;280:1,9 vapors (1) 281:17 variety (1) 111:6 various (10) 6:23;107:16;158:22; 159:3:171:4:183:3: 201:17:210:5:258:25; 260:19 vastly (1) 108:4 vegetation (3) 78:15;149:15;150:4 vehicle (2) 213:11;231:21 vehicles (6) 175:8,10:211:10; 220:2;228:20;271:22 vehicular (7) 34:11,21;45:12; 54:15;84:22;85:8,9 vehicular-centric (1) 70:3vehicular-intensive (3) 68:22,23;69:13 Veirs (22) 4:8;19:6;29:10;61:3; 62:14;65:16,20; 109:10,15;111:25; 127:21,25;128:7,13;

130:2;226:10;231:9; 260:18:264:1:265:19. 22:268:21 vent (10) 213:23,23,24; 231:23,24;280:7,7; 281:24,24;282:18 venting (1) 236:20 vents (1) 282:9 verbally (1) 38:19 Versar (1) 157:23 version (6) voir (2) 8:21;36:8;101:12,14; 115:13;242:14 versions (1) 104:20 versus (8) 70:3:88:15:104:12: 169:7;178:23;184:10; 48:24 211:10;242:12 vertical (1) 132:17 130:9 vibrations (1) 43:24 vicinity (4) 144:2:177:4.7: 248:14 video (2) 168:18,19 View (19) 5:15:10:8:13:9; 66:10.16.20:68:17: 80:9;86:16;87:5;99:16; 108:23;127:7.7; 131:15;133:4;144:11; 152:11:166:8 View/Wheaton (1) 110:12 views (1) 99:15 viewshed (1) 150:24 violating (1) 195:25 violation (1) 186:2 violations (1) 170:4 Virginia (6) 154:3;157:23; 158:11;160:8;206:24; 267:5 visible (2) 133:14:151:4 vision (10) 29:16:66:8:113:8.9: 118:11;119:7,15,24;

120:9;125:23 visions (1) 61:20 visited (1) 54:11 visitors (10) 29:19,21;30:12,13, 20,25;31:1,11,22;44:16 **VOC** (1) 183:25 VOCs (4) 183:23;202:7; 213:17;268:4 voice (2) 20:3:23:25 162:16;166:5 volatile (7) 175:16;176:18; 184:1;202:4,14,24; 267:18 volition (1) volume (8) 23:22;24:8,9;169:22; 171:18,19;175:7;180:6 voluntarily (1) 160:17 voluntary (1) 212:18 votes (1) 117:9 W Wait (7) 147:10;169:6,8; 237:14,15;261:10; 265:1 waiting (4) 54:15;152:2;176:3; 271:22 walk (7) 75:21;76:19;78:25; 129:23;183:5;189:12; 263:11 walkability (1) 125:7 walk-along (1) 99:12 walked (2) 13:15;135:25 walking (3) 58:16;67:22;183:2 walkway (3) 76:4,13;79:12 walkways (1) 75:14 wall (118) 7:4;12:8,13,20,21; 13:2,9,13,13;14:7,11, 13,19,20,25;17:5,7,8, 19,21;18:3,10,19;19:8,

11,18,23;20:7,12,18; 21:3:73:4.5.9.12:74:4. 12,14,21;75:4,8,9,11, 16,18,21,22,23;76:7, 24;77:1,2,7,17;78:1,16, 18;79:3,7,9;90:14,17; 91:24;92:7,11,17,22; 93:2,4,6,10,11,15,17, 17,17;94:1,17,19;95:1, 6,6,11,12,14,16,21,21, 25;96:9,11,19,22,24; 97:1,5,14,23;98:1.12. 18,22,23,24;99:1; 133:9,11;151:4; 169:21,21;170:15,19, 20;193:7;278:18,19, 22;279:17 walls (1) 90:12 wall's (1) 14:9 wandering (1) 254:13 wants (4) 37:25;185:10;232:4; 257:8 Ward (4) 52:19;53:5;54:2,6 warehouse (29) 40:4,6,7;41:3,9,25; 49:22:50:1,7,21:51:2,7, 11.12.16:75:7:78:13: 122:2;150:15,25; 151:5,7;219:9;231:5, 19:248:18:268:15; 269:8;278:5 warm (1) 271:12 warmer (1) 274:16 Washington (8) 184:19:185:2,9; 228:3;246:21;247:16; 252:1;253:2 watching (1) 221:18 water (10) 134:5,18,20,24; 254:10;255:6,6,7,12,14 watershed (1) 145:20 way (42) 13:9;14:11,14;15:21; 56:2;70:19;77:1,2; 89:20;92:18;105:3; 107:25;112:4;119:6; 128:8;129:16,18,20; 137:8,22;148:22; 173:19;178:20;186:11; 187:15;196:25;205:18; 208:15;226:2;229:19; 235:18;236:1;239:11, 12;240:22;251:6;

271:16;274:14;275:3 ways (10) 58:18;97:9;129:21; 203:18;239:8,9;260:2, 23;268:8;275:15 Web (1) 201:21 Wednesday (5) 4:14:233:4:242:22; 279:14;283:14 week (9) 29:19,21;30:5,14; 31:1;43:5;62:19; 184:23:233:2 weekday (5) 30:1,12,25;211:24; 212:7 weekend (5) 30:2;211:24;212:7; 232:21:233:1 weeks (2) 99:15;184:21 weight (3) 167:2,5;205:16 welcome (4) 21:8;39:24;53:1; 55:14 well-known (1) 158:3 weren't (4) 184:22:189:1: 190:24;277:18 Wes (1) 233:4 west (19) 25:3;27:5;32:8; 34:13,23;39:5,6,10; 53:18,20;73:15;78:13; 158:11:160:8:216:4, 19,25;217:2,7 westerly (2) 50:16;149:6 western (2) 39:4;40:4 Westfield (32) 4:10;13:14;25:8; 28:3,7;38:22;57:25; 58:24;59:22;60:9; 64:25;65:18;108:2; 110:11:112:22:113:1, 1,3,3,8,10,23;114:1,4, 12,19;118:8,11,15; 119:7;121:11;124:9 Westlake (1) 19:16 westward (2) 112:7;149:6 What's (40) 13:18:18:10:52:11; 54:4;82:8;87:9;88:14; 93:3:114:8:119:11; 121:14;141:19;142:23;

146:19;151:17;159:12;	209:13,13;210:5;	113:18;115:15;116:5,	237:15	
160:14;179:11;185:12;	213:1,1	18,25;117:6,19;123:5,	wondering (1)	X
190:15;191:3;192:23;	window (2)	17,20;126:2,6,9,12;	69:20	
196:6;202:15;207:7;	144:4;283:18	130:12,16,19,22;	wooded (2)	x-axis (1)
212:14;216:1;223:2;	winter (1)	133:21;134:10,23;	193:10;274:10	249:10
232:2;244:6;246:5;	193:22	138:1,5,7,10,13,16,22;	woods (2)	249.10
248:10;251:3;253:8,	wintertime (2)	139:3,18;141:10,14,25;	149:25;150:7	Y
14;275:13;278:24;	280:6,16	144:25;146:12,15;	word (6)	^
281:15,17;283:1	wipe (1)	147:4,6,11,14,17,23;	7:25;72:19;105:2;	v-axis (6)
whatsoever (1)	255:15	148:1,6,13,15,18,20,22,	173:18;251:20;259:7	249:9;252:2,5,6,7;
219:3	wish (6)	25;149:2;150:17,23;	wording (1)	270:5
Wheaton (37)	5:18;6:10,18;95:9;	151:6,12;152:15;	95:19	year (13)
4:9,10;17:2;19:6;	106:13;148:19	153:8,10,12,16;156:15;	words (6)	154:2;170:1,3;
29:17;51:22;56:7;	wished (2)	157:8;160:25;161:12,	83:23;173:24;	197:17;200:5,6;211:5;
57:20,25;58:24;59:22;	6:7,21	19;162:20,23;163:6,	181:18;203:13;214:16;	214:18;215:3;224:23;
60:9,16;61:4;64:25;	wishes (1)	20;164:6,14,17,21,25;	277:4	232:16;234:8;253:3
65:5;119:15;120:9;	100:6	165:8;171:8,11,23,25;	work (17)	years (28)
121:11,11,12,18;124:7;	withdraw (1)	172:4,9,18,24;173:22;	47:3;115:2,17;	54:3;154:23,24;
125:23;129:15;134:5;	117:2 withdrawn (1)	174:17;175:15;176:4,	116:13;130:7;153:24;	155:4,4,6,8,21;160:11;
137:21;180:18;198:13; 200:4;201:6;226:12;	withdrawn (1) 140:12	6,17;177:6,19,22; 178:5,24;179:14,18;	154:7;162:23;163:9; 187:10,13,15;195:23,	176:10,12;194:7;
249:17;258:4;268:23;	140:12 within (49)	1/8:5,24;1/9:14,18; 180:8,15;181:4;	23;218:13;220:11;	195:8;197:18;198:18;
281:8,12	14:19;20:3;30:17;	180:8,15,181:4, 182:12,15,25;184:1,3,	23,218.15,220.11, 230:21	205:1;207:11,14;
whereas (1)	45:12,18;49:11;56:12,	12,14,16;185:13;	worked (10)	218:12;224:20,23;
103:8	23;65:22;67:2;69:18;	186:21;187:18;188:11,	27:15;131:9;157:17,	226:9;251:6;258:14,
Whereupon (4)	75:25;88:23;90:3,14,	15,19,21,24;189:3,5,7,	22;158:9;160:10;	18;281:14,20;282:4
57:14;153:5;241:13;	17;91:9,14;92:1,7,23;	19,21;190:2;192:12,	163:20;203:7;205:2;	years' (2)
284:13	93:15;108:5,6,6;	16;194:18;195:6;	210:23	225:19,23 yellow (7)
wherever (1)	109:12;110:24;111:6,	198:1;204:10;205:17;	workers (1)	58:5;65:23;67:3;
96:10	7,23;113:3;114:19;	208:2,15;209:22,24;	44:16	135:7;216:20,24;217:3
whichever (2)	118:16;122:16;124:5;	210:1,4,8,12;211:12,	working (6)	yields (2)
97:6;106:5	126:24;132:20,22;	20,22;212:4,24;213:9,	23:21;77:23,24;	171:18,19
whirl (1)	136:12,16;137:16,17;	23,25;214:2,6;215:9,	105:6;107:1;195:24	York (1)
109:3	138:7;144:2;152:19;	17;216:1;217:8,19,24;	works (6)	154:15
whole (7)	176:23;201:25;254:17;	219:10;221:14,18;	7:25;137:20,20;	You're (1)
62:24;85:21;116:12;	256:2	222:1,9;223:5,9;224:6;	174:3;205:18;226:2	106:23
126:22;132:10;145:20,	without (17)	226:23;227:8;229:14,	World (5)	young (1)
20	14:14;75:6;95:14,15,	18,23;230:21;236:8,16,	154:8;189:18,25;	256:19
Wholesale (1)	25;99:18;106:4,9;	21,24;237:3,6,9,25;	190:11,17	
4:3	128:12;129:6;171:20;	238:20,22,25;239:6,15;	worry (2)	Z
who's (5)	172:22;201:4;278:18,	240:5,9,16,19,21;	183:22,23	
6:17;10:12;164:12;	22,24;279:16	241:5,12,17,24;242:2,	worse (2)	zero (4)
184:19;247:10	Witness (373)	6,19;243:4;244:24; 246:17:247:2415-24;	188:18;189:1	88:12,15;283:4,5
whose (2) 59:5;258:16	11:6;12:4,17,23;	246:17;247:2,4,15,24;	worst (5)	zone (33)
wide (8)	13:1,20,22;14:1,4,12, 17;15:5,25;18:23,25;	248:2,4,7;249:7,9; 250:1,3,11,13,19,22,	218:20;225:2,5; 250:10;283:3	29:9,14;55:9;90:4;
33:2,17;85:13;86:4;	19:2,23;20:7;22:12;	24;251:2,21,24;252:4,	worst-case (2)	91:12,14;94:13,14;
132:15;139:14;141:1;	23:4,12,17;24:2,4,7,9,	7,10,12,14,24;253:15,	224:17;225:1	114:2,23,24;119:1,2,2;
143:8	14;25:4;27:2,6,10,25;	18,25;254:25;256:3,6;	worth (3)	120:14;121:12,14,19;
wider (1)	28:3,5,9;29:6,8;31:8,	257:21,24;258:1,4,7;	205:16;225:19,23	122:23;123:9,10,12;
272:3	19;33:21;36:11,23;	259:5,24;260:2,4,13,	write (2)	124:4;125:8,9;127:15;
widest (1)	37:1,9,12,22,25;38:4,	16,21;261:11,16,20;	4:19;148:18	128:17;130:4;131:4,5;
132:16	15,25;39:2,6,10,13,17,	262:2,13,17,22,24;	writing (2)	132:5,7;140:15 zoned (4)
width (7)	20,23;41:20;42:1;	263:2,4,9;265:7,14,19,	242:15;244:23	4:10;122:25;123:12;
33:20,21,23;132:8,	47:22;48:2,9,19;53:16;	25;266:5,9,18;267:19,	written (2)	4:10;122:25;125:12; 124:11
13;138:25;141:4	59:10;60:14;61:10,13,	22,24;268:7;272:9;	32:17,18	Zones (6)
widths (1)	16,18;62:21;63:23;	273:1,4,7;274:6;276:5,	wrong (5)	112:9,18;115:2,17;
132:13	64:6,8,20;65:10;66:3;	14;277:6;280:23;	92:9;95:12;119:12;	121:22;131:10
Willard (1)	67:12,15,17;72:12,18;	281:4,7,11;282:13	251:10;273:3	Zoning (39)
76:17	74:11,19,21;76:9,17;	witnesses (1)	wrote (1)	4:5;18:9;19:11;
Willard's (3)	77:5,7,9,12,17,22;78:1,	8:5	26:1	26:12,19;28:21;43:9;
144:8;146:16;149:9	4;90:18;99:9;105:5;	wonder (6)		44:14;45:5;57:2,4;
wind (5)	109:21,23;111:10;	86:1,11,21;91:6,8;		90:6,9;110:22,23;
	1		l	l

111:4,4,4,17,18;	252:10	169:19,25;170:3;	104:3;105:10	198:20
112:11,15;113:25;	10.8 (10)	171:12;188:21;189:9;	16 (4)	1970s (1)
115:22;116:20;117:3,	179:8;188:22;228:4,	200:25;227:14,17;	4:7;103:9;216:3,4	175:21
8,9;122:3,5,19;123:18;	6,8;244:2;246:24;	247:14;249:23;250:4;	160 (1)	1972 (1)
124:10;126:15;130:4;	247:17;256:12;267:16	261:11;262:6;271:19;	16:12	154:15
133:12,13;140:15;	10.80 (1)	273:20	163 (1)	1980 (2)
168:15	257:3	12,646 (1)	7:2	154:20;201:14
ZTA (1)	10.81 (2)	260:6	163f (1)	1980s (1)
106:11	256:12;257:3	12.1 (3)	36:7	199:15
	10.8-microgram (1)	189:8;227:15;246:24	164 (1)	1990 (1)
0	261:17	12-07 (3)	7:3	201:14
	10.9 (1)	26:13,14;106:11	165 (1)	1990s (3)
01 (5)	267:15	121 (5)	7:1	199:7,17,23
	10/2012 (1)	51:19;52:1,2,12;53:6	166 (1)	
179:6,21;183:14;				19th (5)
206:15;255:18	38:13	12-million-gallon-a-year (2)	5:25	238:16;242:1,2;
06 (3)	10:00 (1)	201:4;229:12	167 (1)	283:14;284:12
51:22;249:1;270:23	279:1	13 (24)	6:17	1-and-a-half (2)
07 (1)	100 (9)	60:23;61:15,16,25;	1675 (3)	199:6,23
249:1	121:15,16;219:13,	62:14,14;63:23;64:6,	238:7;239:1,20	1-and-a-half-million-gallon (3)
<u></u>	14,15,17,22;220:4;	11,13,15,17,19,21;	168 (1)	199:6,16;200:7
1				
1	275:6	65:8,9;66:7,18;129:21;	7:5	1-and-a-half-million-gallon- (1)
	100,000 (2)	151:18;182:11;263:3;	169 (2)	200:23
1 (6)	61:5;226:14	265:12;267:9	8:13,23	1-and-a-half-million-gallon-a-year (1)
4:12;100:24;137:14,	100-microgram-per-cubic-meter (1)	13,500 (6)	16th (2)	198:24
14,25;138:3	267:10	29:20,25;30:12,14,	138:19:257:7	
1,000 (2)	102 (8)	20,25	17 (17)	2
239:21;255:11	38:7,9;40:2;74:9,10,	13-12 (1)	9:5,15;43:8,23;	
1,095 (1)	11;78:7;134:3	4:4	72:14;80:24;101:14;	2 (24)
224:22	10c (1)	13-and-a-half-foot (1)	132:18;133:3;142:4;	26:7;34:25;52:23;
1.12 (1)	169:18	151:19	144:14;151:10;239:3,	94:12;101:5,5,13,19,
271:4	10x (2)	14 (1)	12,20,22;241:1	20;137:14,15;138:6;
1.18 (1)	220:16,22	56:18	17,500 (4)	147:18;148:5,6,11,11,
270:22	10x'd (1)	148 (1)	30:2,3,20;31:3	12,13;152:21;205:21;
	220:18	101:5	17.3 (1)	
1.2 (2)				216:3;279:24;283:6
122:17;283:6	11 (12)	1488 (1)	252:12	2,000 (2)
1.84 (1)	5:24;82:8;83:5;	264:3	170 (3)	189:12;239:22
218:22	101:13;132:18;133:3;	15 (14)	9:15,19;80:20	2,001 (1)
1:00 (2)	142:14;144:14;146:24;	44:9;105:11;170:14,	170a (2)	189:13
152:18,21	251:5,6;262:4	22;193:13;206:8,9;	80:23;81:1	2.02 (1)
1:07 (1)	11- (2)			
		715.6.7777.177177	171 (3)	
		215:6;227:12,17;	171 (3)	271:5
153:5	143:24;146:1	249:23;250:4;267:9;	142:13,13,17	271:5 2.5 (17)
1:15 (1)	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21;
1:15 (1) 276:21	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6;
1:15 (1)	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21;
1:15 (1) 276:21	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13,	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14,	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10;	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14,	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22;	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25;
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19;	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5)	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5) 238:6,20;239:18;	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19; 264:8	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7 157 (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14 190 (2)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14 2001 (1)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5) 238:6,20;239:18; 260:9;264:6	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19; 264:8 11a (2)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7 157 (2) 218:23;220:23	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14 190 (2) 132:17;264:14	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14 2001 (1) 252:16
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5) 238:6,20;239:18; 260:9;264:6 10,000-microgram-per-cubic-meter (1)	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19; 264:8 11a (2) 103:5;173:7	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7 157 (2) 218:23;220:23 15a (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14 190 (2) 132:17;264:14 195 (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14 2001 (1) 252:16 2002 (1)
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5) 238:6,20;239:18; 260:9;264:6 10,000-microgram-per-cubic-meter (1) 264:9	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19; 264:8 11a (2) 103:5;173:7 12 (19)	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7 157 (2) 218:23;220:23 15a (2) 242:3,4	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14 190 (2) 132:17;264:14 195 (1) 224:22	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14 2001 (1) 252:16 2002 (1) 53:4
1:15 (1) 276:21 10 (45) 4:10;6:8;22:11,14; 57:12;63:3;129:7; 158:24;169:19;170:13, 22;179:7;183:15; 191:19,20;193:13; 195:25;205:1;211:14, 18,19;212:3;220:7,7, 13,19;225:7,9;231:21; 232:19,20,20;234:19; 247:14;249:19;250:7; 255:17,17;268:2; 274:11;276:8;277:4; 283:2,3,3 10,000 (5) 238:6,20;239:18; 260:9;264:6 10,000-microgram-per-cubic-meter (1)	143:24;146:1 11.0 (1) 267:15 11.3 (1) 251:9 11:00 (2) 57:12,13 11160 (1) 4:8 11-19PDF (1) 104:22 112 (2) 241:18,22 1-12 (4) 238:13;240:5,22; 242:6 1145 (4) 238:7;239:1,19; 264:8 11a (2) 103:5;173:7	249:23;250:4;267:9; 274:11 15,000 (2) 263:19,21 150 (2) 57:20,20 151 (1) 63:6 152 (2) 148:10,11 152a (1) 36:9 152b (3) 101:13;148:14,21 152c (5) 37:3,6,8,9;50:14 153 (1) 37:7 157 (2) 218:23;220:23 15a (2)	142:13,13,17 17-313 (1) 83:6 17f (1) 163:15 17-foot (2) 143:25;146:1 17s (1) 146:24 18 (6) 79:16,18;151:10; 232:20;263:3;265:12 18,000 (3) 29:19;30:13;31:1 18.0 (1) 252:10 19 (2) 4:14;103:14 190 (2) 132:17;264:14 195 (1)	271:5 2.5 (17) 158:23;179:13,21; 180:5,14;186:1,6; 246:23;250:3;255:21; 260:24;261:4;262:3; 265:13;267:11,14; 271:24 2:00 (3) 276:22,23,24 20 (18) 6:25;21:16;45:6; 157:5;169:14;185:8; 196:21;216:3,4; 232:18;234:25;235:21; 239:23;240:24,25; 242:12;273:14;275:6 2000 (2) 199:10;201:14 2001 (1) 252:16 2002 (1)

199:22;249:1,3,10	140:11	35 (3)	44 (2)	58 (1)
2006/2007 (1)	2794 (1)	158:7;253:15;267:13	19:15;20:7	216:22
200:15	24:22	35-county (1)	440 (2)	59 (1)
2007 (2)	28 (29)	158:5	149:10,12	216:21
225:3;249:1	16:15,23;57:22,23;	35-microgram/cubic (1)	441 (2)	59-B-2.06b2 (1)
2009 (1)	65:3,6,23,24;66:1,21;	260:25	149:8,12	133:10
243:10	109:16,19;133:18,25;	36 (3)	442 (2)	59-C-4.350 (1)
2010 (5)	134:18;135:1;234:23;	20:16;262:23;263:16	149:4,5	124:3
187:14;201:14,14,	235:1,14,15,16,21,22;	36,800 (2)	442.7 (1)	59-C-4.351 (2)
			149:7	
14;251:5	236:24;237:19,23;	101:6,23		122:7,16
2011 (4)	239:2;242:11;264:17	365 (1)	45 (4)	59-G-1.21a5 (1)
243:11;246:23;	28.6 (1)	215:3	19:15,17;20:8;42:20	43:9
248:5;253:23	267:13	37 (1)	4500 (2)	59-G-1.21a6 (1)
2012 (14)	28.7 (1)	155:3	260:8;264:6	43:22
22:19;203:5;204:1;	267:13	37,754 (3)	46 (1)	59-G-1.21a8 (1)
228:6;238:16,16;	29 (10)	16:5,18;100:25	15:1	44:14
241:18,25;242:1,2;	17:16;58:20,23;	379 (1)	46-foot (3)	59-G-2.06 (2)
249:4,10;250:4;257:6	59:11,17;66:17;	32:14	12:7;75:10,11	4:6;94:11
				,
2013 (21)	103:20,24;104:6;	37e (1)	47 (1)	59-G-2.06a2 (1)
4:12,13;9:15;37:11;	242:13	142:19	20:10	45:5
147:20;175:22;176:7;	290 (2)	38 (11)	4700 (1)	59-G-2.06b2 (2)
179:7;186:10;198:2;	280:11;282:18	113:24,25;126:16,	264:6	94:1;132:1
199:2,14;201:7;231:1;	2nd (1)	17;154:24;155:4,6;	48 (1)	5th (1)
243:9;249:18,21;	186:10	217:24,25;270:4;273:5	19:5	225:3
250:5,19;251:16;257:7	100.10	39 (14)	49 (1)	223.3
	3		19:5	6
2014 (6)	5	111:3,16,25;113:25;		0
175:22;190:5,6;		114:3;126:16,17;	4th (1)	
198:4;250:5,6	3 (26)	127:14;232:15;239:7,	36:3	6 (6)
2020 (4)	22:24;30:10;32:5;	11;271:2;275:4;276:12	4x (1)	4:12;34:10,19;
198:20;199:3,20;	37:2,2,3,3,10;80:1,2;	395 (2)	281:22	102:19;198:22,23
200:5	81:7;82:2,9,11;83:23;	186:1;275:17		6.8 (1)
2025 (1)	137:10,14,17;138:15;	396 (2)	5	267:9
			J.	201.9
/111.3	120.2 10.1/7.18.	32.714		600 000 (1)
201:8	139:3,19;147:18;	32:7,14	5 (2)	600,000 (1)
20650 (1)	148:6,13;205:22;	3a (5)	5 (2)	122:11
20650 (1) 19:9	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6;	62:12;276:3	122:11 60s (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1)	148:6,13;205:22;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21
20650 (1) 19:9	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6;	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10	122:11 60s (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12,	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2;	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8;	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14;	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24;	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6;	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6;	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6;	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7)
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16;	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21;	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20 40-some-odd-feet (1)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4:12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 14:15	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19 26th (2)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2) 193:17,18	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4 (6) 1 9:17;111:6;220:6,6; 2 32:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 3 1:25;259:2;260:6; 2 63:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 1 4:15 42 (2)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2) 277:20;279:4	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7; 277:24
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19 26th (2) 4:12;154:2	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2) 193:17,18 33 (2)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4 : 12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 14:15 42 (2) 110:5;232:2	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2) 277:20;279:4 55 (2)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7;
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19 26th (2)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2) 193:17,18	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4 (6) 1 9:17;111:6;220:6,6; 2 32:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 3 1:25;259:2;260:6; 2 63:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 1 4:15 42 (2)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2) 277:20;279:4	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7; 277:24
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19 26th (2) 4:12;154:2	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2) 193:17,18 33 (2)	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4 : 12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 14:15 42 (2) 110:5;232:2	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2) 277:20;279:4 55 (2)	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:21 65/daytime (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7; 277:24
20650 (1) 19:9 21 (1) 121:18 23 (1) 4:12 230 (2) 280:13;282:19 24 (4) 37:11;147:20;215:2; 232:19 24,000 (1) 31:11 24-hour (7) 232:23;234:14; 253:14,16,19;260:24; 267:11 25 (3) 63:3;185:8;196:21 258 (2) 32:8,14 25-mile (1) 122:7 260 (1) 282:19 26th (2) 4:12;154:2 270 (2)	148:6,13;205:22; 206:15 3,000 (1) 224:25 3.2 (1) 270:9 30 (11) 17:23;18:16;54:3; 132:15;158:24;206:12, 13,16;235:14;270:24; 278:13 300 (1) 279:24 300-foot (2) 140:16;280:8 31 (3) 51:22;246:22;248:2 317 (1) 282:20 32 (13) 232:19;234:24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 235:1,25;236:18,24; 238:1;239:4,10,16; 240:24;242:12,13 320 (2) 193:17,18 33 (2) 110:22;155:8	3a (5) 103:20,24;104:1,6; 162:7 3b (2) 162:7,7 3-million (2) 199:17,22 3-million-gallon-per-year (2) 199:1,9 4 4 (4) 4 : 12;33:1;89:8; 241:11 4:00 (1) 241:10 40 (6) 19:17;111:6;220:6,6; 232:15;234:19 40,000 (4) 31:25;259:2;260:6; 263:20 40-some-odd-feet (1) 14:15 42 (2) 110:5;232:2 43 (5)	62:12;276:3 5:00 (1) 277:10 5:02 (1) 284:13 50 (1) 122:12 500 (1) 124:5 50-gallon (2) 255:7,12 51 (3) 19:9,10,14 52 (4) 89:6,9;114:16,16 52,000 (1) 19:14 53 (8) 84:16;89:6;114:15, 15,19;115:1,5;192:5 530 (5) 238:6,25;239:18,21; 240:24 54.3 (2) 277:20;279:4 55 (2) 89:25;90:15	122:11 60s (1) 175:21 61 (8) 68:5;71:14;133:18; 134:1,2;135:9;136:6; 142:4 62 (1) 277:24 63 (1) 218:12 631 (1) 4:9 64 (2) 82:9,11 65 (1) 277:23 66 (4) 81:5;83:20,24;137:1 67 (7) 79:13;83:20,23; 136:24;139:7;242:7; 277:24 7

PETITION OF COSICC	J WHOLESALE CORPO	KATION	
107:24;148:7			
7.12 (1)			
270:8			
7:00 (1)			
279:1			
70 (3) 122:15:271:10:			
132:15;271:19; 280:18			
73 (1)			
193:24			
74 (2)			
154:17;270:8			
8	-		
9 (15)	-		
8 (15) 22:2,9,10;23:11,15,			
16;58:14;108:7;			
109:18;142:13;200:2;			
272:18,20,24;274:1			
8.4 (1)			
251:9			
80 (1) 280:13			
800 (1)			
35:4			
80s (3)			
157:17;229:25;			
230:22			
8100 (4) 224:12 14 15:225:0			
224:13,14,15;225:9 82 (1)			
264:15			
84 (2)			
214:19;218:21			
86g (1)			
146:24	_		
9			
9 (2)			
34:10;218:2			
9:30 (2)			
4:16;283:20			
90 (5)			
216:5;217:8;218:2;			
228:18,19 91 (1)			
264:16			
92 (3)			
82:5,6;83:2			
95 (1)			
221:21 95c (2)			
95c (2) 169:2;221:23			
96 (1)			
220:12			
98th (1)			
253:19			
99.27 (1)			
213:16			