Volume 2 ALLEGHENY COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT * * * * * UNITED STATES STEEL : CORPORATION, a Delaware : corporation, : Appellant, : Appeal of Enforcement : Order #180601 versus : ALLEGHENY COUNTY HEALTH : DEPARTMENT, Air Quality : Program, : : Appellee. : * * * * * Verbatim hearing transcript of hearing held at At Clack Health Center, Building 7, 301 39th Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on December 4, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. BEFORE: MAX SLATER, ESQUIRE, Hearing Officer ADELMAN REPORTERS 302 Torrey Pine Drive Mars, Pennsylvania 16046 Phone 724-625-9101; Fax 724-625-9133

1 APPEARANCES:

JASON K. WILLIS, JR., ESQUIRE - Assistant Solicitor 2 Allegheny County Health Department Building 7, 301 39th Street 3 Pittsburgh, PA 15201 4 For - Allegheny County Health Department 5 MARK K. DAUSCH, ESQUIRE MICHAEL H. WINEK, ESQUIRE 6 Babst Calland 7 Two Gateway Center 603 Stanwix Street, 6th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15222 8 For - U.S. Steel Corporation 9 DAVID W. HACKER, ESQUIRE 10 U.S. Steel Corporation 600 Grant Street, Suite 1500 11 Pittsburgh, PA 15219 12 For - U.S. Steel Corporation 13 Also Present: Michael Parker, Esquire 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	INDEX TO WITNESSES	
2		
3	Witness:	Page
4	Dean DeLuca Direct examination by Mr. Willis	291
5	Cross-examination by Mr. Dausch Bedirect examination by Mr. Willis	419 526
6	Recross-examination by Mr. Dausch	555
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX TO EXHIBITS		
2	Exhibits:	Offered	Admitted
3	ACHD Exhibits:		
4 5	Exhibit 11 - Calculation guidance	341	345
6	Exhibit 12 - Presentation made by Ed Peresie	351	358
8	Exhibit 13 - Penalty calculations	358	368
9	Exhibit 14 - Packet (pages 1 & 2)	368	374
10 11	Exhibit 15 - Spreadsheet compliance data	374	377
12	Exhibit 16 - Historical compliance data	377	379
13 14	Exhibit 17 - Data summary (14596-14608)	380	382
15	Exhibit 18 - E-mail	385	388
16 17	Exhibit 19 - Keramida document	395	397
18	Exhibit 20 - Keramida document	397	404
19 20	Exhibit 21 - Keramida document	405	408
21	Exhibit 22 -	408	409
22 23	Exhibit 23 - Keramida document	409	410
24	Exhibit 24 - Keramida document	410	418
25	(Exhibits were not provided to cour	t reporte	er)

1	PROCEDINGS OF DECEMBER 4. 2018	291	293 Development Construction
2	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Let's go on the record.		2 O. How long did you have that position?
3	It is Tuesday, December 4th, 2018. This is day two of		A. A total of about two and a half years between the
4	the hearing, United States Steel Corporation versus	4	two companies.
5	Alleghenv County Health Department.	5	0. And prior to that, what did you do?
6	For the record, could counsel identify themselves	6	A. That's when I are dualed college from Bucknell.
7	again?		0. What did you graduate from Bucknell, what was
8	MR. WILLIS: Jason Willis for Allegheny County	8	vour degree?
9	Health Department.	0	A Civil contromental excipeering
10	MR DINGH. Mark Daugh for [1 S Stee]	10) O Okay When did you graduate?
11	HEADING OFFICER SLATED: Will any witness who is	11	
12	testifuing today, place raise their right hand to be	12	And have you had any formal education bound
13	testifying coday, prease larse cherr right hand to be	12	Reproduction beyond
11	(A)] potential uitnosses upro dulu supro bu the	1.0	
15	(All potential withesses were dury sworn by the	15	
16		10	Q, what would that be?
17	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. WIIIIs, you may	10	A. I got an MaA.
10	proceed with your first witness today.	1/	Q. From?
18	MR. WILLIS: I WILL CALL Dean DeLuca.	18	A. Argosy University.
19	DEAN DELUCA, called as a witness, being	19	Q. Okay. When did you get that degree?
20	previously sworn, testified as follows:	20	A. I graduated about 2012
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION	21	Q. 2012, okay.
22	BY MR. WILLIS:	22	A to get the exact year.
23	Q. Hello, Mr. DeLuca. Could you state your full	23	Q. Beyond your formal education, have you had any
24	name for the record, please?	24	experience or training with respect to steelmaking or
25	A. Dean DeLuca.	25	coke oven operation?
-			
1	\mathbf{O} . Can you tell me what your current occupation is?	292	A. Through the Allechery County Health Decembert. I
2	A. Air collution control menager, enforcement chief.	2	went up to Canada for a week-long training on blast
3	O of what division?	3	furning on user and role more -
Δ	A Allochers Conta Halth Department		THE BUT PICE Sin unit and ming to have to
5	A Are you a part of the Air Quality Program?	5	more up homeires the size is blacting
6		6	Steak up because the art is mascing.
7	• You long have you had that position?		Could you report your angupr? You upre talking
8	A about fine news	8	about Canada training
a	A lod prior to that what was your job?	9	A York Throws the Allechers Cambr Health
10	A I was make for the framework III	10	A. Testi. Hitotgi de Allegiesiy Courty Heard
11	A. I was all All genery County Health Department?	11	Department, there was a week-inky training at theorem
12	Also with Arregneny County Health Department?	12	university, one year was for plast runades and there
12	A. Also with the Allegherry country result begardient.	12	Were covere the following year. That was in 2014 of
14	Q. And prior to that, what was your position?	14	. La.
14	n. 1 was an Erginder 11 and 1 was a trainee also	14	A herek long. There a full the same the fact the
10	with maatth begartment.		A week tong. It was a rull day every day for the
10	And when ald you begin that?	16	rive days and some scurr in the evening also.
1/	A. I started December of '08.	17	Q. And what was the nature of that training? What
T.8.	Q. And that's your begin date for your employment	18	was the subject matter?
19	with the county?	19	A. The first class was about blast furnaces and the
20	A. Yes.	20	second day was about coke ovens, and people came from
21	Q. Okay. And prior to your employment with the	21	various countries to it.
22	county, what did you do?	22	Q. Was anybody from the industry involved in that
23	A. I worked in construction management.	123	training?

2.5

A. Yes.

 Q_{\cdot} . Do you remember who or what companies or

24

25

Q. For?

A. Declava (phonetic) and RDC, Residential

	20	15		205
1	organizations?	1	at 10 p.m. The morning after, we will look at the	291
2	A. Vasco, ArcelonMittal, SunCoke, a couple names	2	complaints that occurred off-shift and they will look at	
3	that I won't be able to remember from Australia, I	3	the urgency of them.	
4	believe DTE Energy. I forget all the companies, maybe	4	If we receive multiple complaints from an area	
5	60 ar 70.	5	about a specific odor, an issue like that, and it seems	
6	Q. For each of the companies?	6	like it might be continuing at that point, they would go	
7	A. Each of the trainings.	7	out first thing in the morning, maybe even go there	
8	${f Q}.$ Oh, each of the trainings, okay. And with	8	before they come into the office, see if the episode is	
9	respect to those trainings, did you were you trained	9	still occurring, and then respond accordingly to that	
10	with respect to the operation and maintenance of the	10	one.	
11	coke oven?	11	If it is something that is a short-term episode	
12	A. That was part of it. It covered how to operate	12	that is more of a filing saying, "Okay, we got more	
13	them, which wasn't directly related to the position for	13	complaints in this area," for the future, in case more	
14	me at the time. It was about the inner workings of the	14	things come up in the same area, to try and see and	
15	blast furnaces and coke ovens, environmental	15	respond to them, it is difficult to respond to a	
16	performance, different technologies that some people	16	short-term episode that happens off-shift.	
17	around the world were using.	17	Q. Why is that?	
18	Q. Was there any discussion about the chemistry of	18	A. Because the inspectors aren't going to find out	
19	the coke-making process?	19	about it immediately. They are not going to be able to	
20	A. A little bit of it. Unfortunately, because I	20	respond immediately. If it's an episode that will last,	
21	never took organic chemistry, some of it did go over my	21	we'll say, five to 10 minutes, they are not going to get	
22	head. You know, there was a lot of chemistry involved	22	there.	
23	in it.	23	On top of that, even if it's during the shift, it	
24	Q. That's fair enough. I'm going to switch gears a	24	may be difficult for them to even get to that area or	
25	little bit, and I'm going to be switching gears guite a	25	vicinity while the complaint is still occurring.	
	296	5		298
1	bit through your testimony, so be prepared to pivot a	1	${\sf Q}.~$ I see. Again, shifting gears little bit, we	
2	little bit, if you would.	2	the Allegheny County Health Department has a civil	
3	Could you explain to us and to the Hearing	3	penalty policy. Are you familiar with that policy?	
4	Officer the complaint system that the Allegheny County	4	A. Yes.	
5	Health Department has for the reception of the			
6		5	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{Are you familiar with the policy which existed}$	
7	complaints?	5	$\ensuremath{Q}\xspace$. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018?	
	Complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then	5 6 7	Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018?A. Yes.	
8	complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or	5 6 7 8	Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018?A. Yes.Q. Could you explain the difference between the	
8 9	complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our	5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What 	
8 9 10-	complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system.	5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current 	
8 9 10- 11	complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. 	
8 9 10- 11 12	Complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It 	
8 9 10- 11 12 13	Complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has - goes into a 	
8 9 10- 11 12 13 14	Complaints? A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the 	
8 9 10- 11 12 13 14 15	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or PA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. 	
8 9 10- 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or PA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EFA or EA DEP, we manually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. It incomporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or PA DEP, we manually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their response to complaints. Do we have overnight	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. It incorporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into that also. That was used for years, we'll say I 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their response to complaints. Do we have overnight inspectors?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. It incorporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into that also. That was used for years, we'll say I don't know how many. And then 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pernsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or PA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their response to complaints. Do we have overnight inspectors? A. No.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has - goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. It incomporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into that also. That was used for years, we'll say - I don't know how many. And then But the newer one does incorporate the affect on 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or PA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their response to complaints. Do we have overnight inspectors? A. No. Q. So what happens if there is a complaint at 10	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has - goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It incorporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into that also. That was used for years, we'll say - I don't know how many. And then But the newer one does incorporate the affect on the environment more so. It affects all the Air Quality 	
8 9 10. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. We have — it's an Oracle program and then people can enter complaints either through the phone or through the website now. That gets put into our centralized complaint system. If we receive complaints from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA or EA DEP, we menually input them into that same system, and then the inspectors or the enforcement engineers who are related to it can get into that system and review the information in there and respond to the complaints accordingly. Q. Now, you mentioned the inspectors and their response to complaints. Do we have overnight inspectors? A. No. Q. So what happens if there is a complaint at 10 p.m.?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Are you familiar with the policy which existed prior to 2018? A. Yes. Q. Could you explain the difference between the prior policy and the current policy? What A. The current Q. I'm sorry. Sorry, go ahead. A. The current is policy much more formalized. It is a public document that has goes into a description, a lot of it about what can be done, all the different factors of Article 21 that go into that penalty calculation. The older policy was more of a short guidance. It was the penalty calculation factors that were used. It incomporated a lot of the factors of Article 21 into that also. That was used for years, we'll say I don't know how many. And then But the newer one does incomporate the affect on the environment more so. It affects all the Air Quality Program, both there were two guidances, one for coke 	

Г

L		299		301
	1 all in one policy. And that policy - it goes through		l whenever I was an air quality trainee, he was the	
	2 all the factors. It is more of a descriptor too for the		2 enforcement chief/program manager. So at that time, he	
	3 person who is doing the calculation. Anybody in the Air		was my boss. And we used that penalty calculation	
	4 Quality Program can do it. They can use that policy and		4 spreadsheet at that time.	
	5 go through and come up with an amount at the bottom of		\tilde{Q} . Okay. Were you ever allowed to deviate from that	
	6 it.		5 guideline or policy in the past?	
	7 Q. Okay. With respect to the policy that existed		7 A. Yeah, we could.	
	8 prior to 2018, you mentioned that it was a guidance.	5	Q. Were there occasions in which you did?	
	9 Why do you think that is?	1	A. Yes. Because that policy did not account for the	
1	0 A. There was never as far as I saw, there was no	10) EFA HEN model, the economic benefit model, so anything	
1	1' formal long-duration policy. It was a one page or two	1:	that came up using that HEN model would have been a	
1	.2 page, if it was referred to as a "policy," - I don't	12	deviation from that guidance policy.	
1	.3 know the terminology of it - but it was only one or two	13	Q. Could you explain what a BEN model is?	
1	4 pages. The new policy is maybe 15 or so. So it is much	14	A. I'm sorry. It's an EPA model that is used to	
1	5 more descriptive than the previous policy was.	15	determine economic benefit from companies.	
1	.6 Q. So the current policy is more comprehensive than	16	The way that the previous guidance was, it was	
1	.7 the prior policy?	17	one of the factors in it. And the current — the	
1	.8 A. Yes.	18	current policy has it being one of the factors and the	
1	9 Q. Okay. With respect to the prior policy or	19	additional potential addition for economic benefit if	
2	0 guidance, was it ever formalized in terms of a	20	that's not enough.	
2	1 calculation spreadsheet or anything that could be used	21	So the economic benefit model is something that	
2	2 to describe how that process operated from the back end?	22	the EPA or somebody that worked for the EPA created this	
2	3 A. Yeah, that's what it was it was a calculation	23	system a while ago. You input the information relating	
2	4 spreadsheet and it had two separate — it is an Excel	24	to that violation and then that system will output an	
2	5 file with two separate tabs: one had the description of	25	economic benefit, and that's what the EPA uses for	
	1 it and one had the calculation of it. So that was the	300	economic benefit for violations.	302
	2 policy previously.	2	O. And when you say "economic benefit," what do you	
	3 Q. Oh, so the policy was actually just a spreadsheet	3	mean by economic benefit?	
	4 with	4	A. The amount that the company benefitted or an	
	5 A. It was a spreadsheet and then guidance factors,	5	individual benefitted from that violation.	
	6 yeah.	6	Q. Okay.	
	7 Q. And the factors were the same. Are those the	7	A. So, for example, if you were supposed to install	
1	8 same factors that would be found in Article 21?	8	control equipment and you didn't install control	
1	9 A. A lot of them are, yes. It just doesn't	9	equipment, that program would input the amount of the -	
11	0 incorporate all of them.	10	the cost of the system, how long you were in	
1	1 Q. It does not incorporate all of them?	11	noncompliance, and then it would come out with an amount	
12	2 A. It incomporated the majority of them. I can't	12	of different factors that go into the back end, but	
1:	3 remember if it was all of them or not, because I haven't	13	Q. Does that model take into consideration the	
1	4 used it in a while.	14	assets or net worth of a violator?	
1!	5 Q. Before you were the chief of enforcement, who was	15	A. That one does not, but another EPA program does.	
10	6 your predecessor?	16	Q. What is that?	
1.	7 A. Ed Peressie.	17	A. It is ABLE, ability to pay. And then it has one	
18	3 Q. And do you know who preceded Ed Peresie?	18	for individuals called INDIPAY. So those all take into	
19	9 A. Jim Thompson.	19	- the initial EEN model is just this is what the	
20	Q. And to your recollection, did Jim Thampson became	20	penalty should be, and then the second step is do they	
21	l deputy director sometime after?	21	have the ability to pay if the company brings up that	
22	A. Yes.	22	objection, and that would be the INDIPAY or the ARLE	
23	3 Q. Okay. Do you know how Jim Thompson operated with	23	models.	
24	a respect to enforcing the penalty policy?	24	Q. I see. You're familiar with Article 21	
25	A. I can speak to my time here because he was my	25	regulations with respect to coke ovens, correct?	
	-			
-				-

		303	30
1	A. Yes.		1 Steel Clairton?
2	${\sf Q}.$ And with respect to our penalty assessment, do we		A. Yes, there are currently two full-time coke oven
3	base those penalty assessments on visible emissions?	:	3 inspectors.
4	A. That is definitely one of the factors used. It		Q. When are they there? What are their work hours?
5	is a frequent one. For coke ovens, visible emissions		A. Normal working hours, seven to three.
6	are a big part of it.		5 Q. Seven days a week?
7	If you are talking specifically about Method 9,		7 A. Five days a week.
8	not all violations are Method 9; because if we are just	8	Q. Both of them, five days a week?
9	counting leaks, it wouldn't be Method 9. But it is		A. Conzect, yes.
10	emissions which are visible.	10	Q. With respect to Keramida, what's their purpose?
11	Q. Okay. Do you have another method in mind that	11	A. They do the EPA-required Method 303 inspections.
12	would take that into consideration?	12	They every battery in the country every coke oven
13	A. Well, if you are looking at the percent leaking	13	battery in the country has to be inspected on a daily
14	standards for the doors, lids and officiales, those ones	14	basis, and then Method 303 is the way to do that.
15	don't read quarity, just is there a leak there. Method	15	And Keramida is the ACHD contractor that
16	22 is one of the ones that they do use for is there a	16	completes those inspections. They do those inspections
17	leak or not.	15	seven days a week, all the types they have to do, at
18	O. Do we does the does article 21 contemplate	18	esch of the 10 batteries at Clairton.
19	onacity standards at all?	10	O I see Do we have Keramida? Are they one of our
20		20	contractors or are they a contractor of II.S. Steel?
21	O Doog it do that with respect to cake error?	21	A they are entranted by Allerberg County, and U.S.
22		21	Shoel your Allochers Contactor who your Karanich
22	O What are these standards?	22	O coup are reinhurged by U.S. Steel for the
20,	A Detries Detries and the life multiplication	24	Q. So we are removined by 0.5. Steer for the
24	A. Pushing. Pushing and travel for pushing both	24	
25	have opening standards, has a multi-opening standard for	20	
		304	306
1	door leaks. Charging doesn't have opacity. Lids and	1	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. With respect to the observations that are
2	man and a set the second state of the second s		
	officates do not have opacity, and then soaking has	2	made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does
3	ourrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has opacity.	2	made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well,
3 4	opacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric	2 3 4	made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you?
3 4 5	Quality. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance?	2 3 4 5	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes.</pre>
3 4 5 6	A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the	2 3 4 5 6	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily?</pre>
3 4 5 6 7	 contrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would 	2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8	 carrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly?</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 corrected by the operatory, and then soaking has cparity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	correakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has opacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 carrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't eee. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking.</pre>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 carrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks?</pre>
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 correaces do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻	<pre>carrakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining campliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is acaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't ees. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17 18	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17 18 19	 christee do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be — Keramida is the Method 	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports?</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17 18 19 20	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is acaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be — Keramida is the Method 303 contractor. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yesh. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports? A. Correct, yes.</pre>
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17 18 19 20 21	 cartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't ees. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be — Keramida is the Method 303 contractor. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports? A. Correct, yes. Q do they bring those reports in for just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁻ 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 chirakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be — Keramida is the Method 303 contractor. And then U.S. Steel also employs somebody to do readings per the 2016 Consent Judgment for pushing and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. bo they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports? A. Correct, yes. Q do they bring those reports in for just themselves? How does that work? So it's once a month
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 chartakes do not have opacity, and then soaking has cpacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is acaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't see. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be — Keramida is the Method 303 contractor. And then U.S. Steel also employs somebody to do readings per the 2016 Consent Judgment for pushing and soaking. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports? A. Correct, yes. Q do they bring those reports in for just themselves? How does that work? So it's once a month they bring in their reports for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ⁵ 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 christee do not have opacity, and then soaking has opacity. Q. Do you know why opacity would be used as a metric for determining compliance? A. It's a surrogate for emissions coming out of the source, whether — if it is soaking emissions, it would be the emissions coming out. You use what you can see as a surrogate for what you can't eas. So if there's an opening and emissions are coming out and they are visible, you use that as a surrogate for both visible and non-visible emissions. Q. And how do we get the data with respect to visible emissions? How do we know when there has been a visible emissions event that would cause a penalty? A. Inspection data. Q. Who is doing the inspections? A. It could be ACHD, the county inspectors, coke oven inspectors. It could be - Keramida is the Method 303 contractor. And then U.S. Steel also employs somebody to do readings per the 2016 Consent Judgment for pushing and soaking. Q. Okay. Now, let's back up a little bit. ACHD has 	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 made for visible emissions by ACHD employees, how does that what do they do in terms of getting the well, let me ask you: do they report back to you? A. Yes. Q. Daily? A. No. Q. Weekly? A. Every payday, they would come and enter all the inspection data into the system, and then that gets updated every - so every two weeks, generally speaking. Q. Every two weeks? A. Yeah. Q. Do they both come in every two weeks to A. No, they would alternate. So one person would come at one time and then the other one, and then they would alternate back and forth. Q. With respect to the inspection reports that they generate, they do generate inspection reports? A. Correct, yes. Q do they bring those reports in for just themselves? How does that work? So it's once a month they bring in their reports for A. Well, them bring in each other's reports. Every

		307			309
1	document manager scans them into the system as time		1	against U.S. Steel?	
2	allows, and then we will have access to them once they		2	A. As far as I'm aware, they were; and in the	
3	are scanned into the system.		3	records I saw, it said that.	
4	Q. So if I'm understanding this correctly, every two		4	Q. Okay. How long does it take you and I mean by	
5	weeks, one of the two inspectors will came in and drop $% \left({{{\left({{{{\left({{{c}} \right)}}} \right)}_{i}}}} \right)$		5	"you," your group, the enforcement group to develop a	
6	off the reports for both of them?		6	quarterly penalty assessment for U.S. Steel in any given	
7	A. Yes.		7	quarter, roughly?	
8	Q. To the document control manager?		8	A. It depends on the number of violations how long	
9	A. Yeah. It would be nice if we had the electronic		9	it takes, really. If there are one dozen violations,	
10	system to do it, but that's what we have.		10	it's going to take a lot less time than it does if	
11	${f Q}.$ Okay. With respect to Keramida, how do we get		11	there's 150 of them.	
12	information from Keramida regarding their inspections?		12	But if you are looking at the duration on a	
13	A. Keramida submits daily Excel sheets that are - I		13	calendar-wide — the first quarter, we will just use as	
14	don't know if they are audited, and I don't believe they		14	an example, ends the end of March. We would get the	
15	are audited, but daily Excel sheets to U.S. Steel and		15	data mid-April, end of April would be the latest we	
10	ACHD with the inspection data for that day, and then we		16	would get all of that data, and then it takes time to	
11/	get a monthly summary report of all of that from		17	analyze that. So the earliest we could would be maybe a	
10	Keramda.		10	month and a half after the end of a calendar quarter.	
120	Q. To your knowledge, do you know whether or not		19	Q. I see.	
20	daily information to U.S. Stool2		20	A. In that range. O So for and lot is be specific. For the fourth	
22	A Yesh The MOD incorption give U.S. Steel?		21	Q. So for and let's be specific. For the fourth	
22	cheets at the end of the day. There every them from what		22	quarter of zor, to have a full data set for purposes of	
2.4	L'm told, and then I know that Keramida's sheets are		24	January?	
25	also sent over to U.S. Steel at the same time that 2000		25	A Yesh mavine - yesh I don't know what time in	
			20		
-					
		308			310
1	gets them.	308	1	January, mid to late January.	310
1 2	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I	308	1 2	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior	310
1 2 3	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel	308	1 2 3	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to	310
1 2 3 4	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Karamida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel	308	1 2 3 4	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter?	310
1 2 3 4 5	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day	308	1 2 3 4 5	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah.	310
1 2 3 4 5 6	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality	308	1 2 3 4 5 6	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay.	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah.	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer.	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramide have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch. no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>gets them. Ind then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeah. The only exception to the same day would</pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm soury. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest,	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I forget is the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes.	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>gets them. Ind then something happened with I forget I forget is the something happened with I forget I forget is not the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position to the same day? </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>gets them. Ind then something happened with I forget I fon't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position as enforcement chief for how long now? A beat fine year. </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Correct Evidence? A. Yee. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>gets them. Ind then something happened with I forget I fon't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position as enforcement chief for how long now? A. About five years. </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Are you aware of the 2016 Consent Judgment? 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	gets them. And then something happened with I forget I forget is the variable have an agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 p.m. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position as enforcement chief for how long now? A. About five years. Q. And during those five years, have you issued another used for the same the you issued another used the charter used the same they have to do as an off the same the same they have to do as an forcement chief for how long now?	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Are you aware of the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	<pre>gets them. Ind them something happened with I forget I don't know the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 pun, and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position as enforcement chief for how long now? A. Mout five years. A. And during those five years, have you issued quarterly penalties against U.S. Steel? </pre>	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment? 	310
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 gets them. Ind then something happened with I forget I forget is the with the details of the agreement, but U.S. Steel and Keramida have an agreement also where U.S. Steel will get the Keramida data earlier than the next day after it's QC'd so that the non-quality assured quality control data at the end of the shift, generally maybe an hour after the shift instead of after it's been quality controlled, so they can get the information sconer. Q. Okay. So in both cases, inspectors are providing U.S. Steel with data with respect to their inspections the same day? A. Yeeh. The only exception to the same day would be if Keramida finishes their shift at, like, 11 or 12 pm. and then it takes them an hour, so they have to do it the following morning; but that would be the latest, yes. Q. Okay. Now, you said you've been in this position as enforcement chief for how long now? A. Mout five years. Q. And during those five years, have you issued quarterly penalties against U.S. Steel? A. Yes. 	308	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you ever been asked to accertain whether or 	310
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	<text><text><list-item><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></text></text>	308	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	 January, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you ever been asked to ascertain whether or not they are, U.S. Steel. is in compliance with that 	310
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	<text><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></text>	308	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	 Janary, mid to late January. Q. So your actual enforcement exercise for the prior quarter would generally begin in the month subsequent to that quarter? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. A. Maybe two months after, but yeah. Q. So there would really be no way for you to calculate a full quarter in that quarter? A. Ch, no. Q. So and let me finish my thought here. A. I'm sorry. Q. But if we are talking about the fourth quarter of 2017, there's no way you could generate a penalty for the full quarter of 2017 until January of 2018? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Have you issued penalty assessments against U.S. Steel since the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. Have you ever been asked to ascertain whether or not they are, U.S. Steel, is in compliance with that 	310

		311			313
1	judgment?		1	salf-directed on where to go beyond those.	
2	A. Yes.		2	Q. Okay. Have there been more inspections since	
3	Q. And to the best of your knowledge, U.S. Steel has		3	you've became enforcement chief?	
4	been in compliance with that 2016 Consent Judgment?		4	A. Yes.	
5	A. Correct.		5	${\sf Q}.$ Could you give me a sense of the scale in terms	
6	Q. Okay. And I'm sorry, I have to apologize for		6	of what it was like before versus now?	
7	bouncing all over the place, but I want to get all of		7	A. Looking at some of the historical data, it looked	
8	this in the record.		8	like there was maybe 10 times as much, something in that	
9	Are you aware of what the Allegheny County Health		9	range. I have to look at the numbers specifically, but	
10	Department's statute of limitations is with respect to		10	there is a big difference between before and after.	
11	the penalty assessment?		11	O. Okay. I may have asked you this, but every	
12	A. Seven vears.		12	single quarter since you've been employed by the	
13	0. Which is to mean we could look back seven years		13	Allegheny County Health Department, there has been a	
14	to assess a penalty?		14	renalty assessed against ILS Steel?	
15	A That's the way Time been told upon it can go		15	A Yosh upp	
16	had seen years from the date of the violation to the		16	O Okay and over the past two years since you've	
17	annet date		17	been muticuing the performance in terms of compliance	
10	\mathbf{O} is it to observe if the because strong of a		10	been reviewing the periodiance in tents of calibratice,	
10	Q. So II we observed II we became aware of a		10	have you not toed an increase in visible enitssion	
19	violation which occurred in 2012, we would be able to		19	observations?	
20	assess a penalty against that violation?		20	A. Violations, yes. I'm not sure about the actual	
	A. Yes.		21	number of inspections, if that's changed in the last	
22	Q. And if we were to do so, would we use the penalty		22	year or two.	
23	policy in place in 2012 or would we use the current		23	Q. But you've noticed an increase in violations?	
24	penalty policy?		24	A. Yeah.	
25	A. The current penalty policy.		25	Q. Okay. Any way you can quantify that? Did it go	
1.1					
1	Q. Why would we do that?	312	1	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000?	314
1 2	Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the	312	1 2	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the	314
1 2 3	Q. Why would we do that?A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected	312	1 2 3	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know	314
1 2 3 4	Q. Why would we do that?A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use.	312	1 2 3 4	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we	314
1 2 3 4 5	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've 	312	1 2 3 4 5	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties	314
1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so.	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry.</pre>	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeeh. Whenever I had started off, there were a 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offtakes. There's socking. And then 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offtakes. There's soking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the battery, is what I was told. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offtakes. There's soaking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the battery, is what I was told. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's north there's coefficients. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the battery, is what I was told. From the hillside, you can see a lot of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offtakes. There's socking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opecity doors. There's lids. There's offitakes. There's socking. And then men-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opecity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 ⁻	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of direction. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offfakes. There's soaking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 ⁻ 21	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Mave you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of direction. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's dofftakes. There's soaking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they reviewing? What are they inspecting for? 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 ⁻ 21 22	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of direction. 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly sumation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types? How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doars. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offtakes. There's soaking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they reviewing? What are they inspecting for? 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 ⁻ 21 22 23	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the penalty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Have you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of direction. And then I looked at it more and said, "Well, we need to have at least one inspection of every — for every type of battery a month." So there are those 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's officakes. There's socking. And then mon-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they reviewing? What are they inspecting on Batteries 1, 2 and 3. 	314
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the pealty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Mave you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Okay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of direction. Mad then I looked at it more and said, "Well, we need to have at least one inspection of every — for every type of battery a month." So there are those inspection types. Ten batteries each morth at least one 	312	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doors. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's offfakes. There's soaking. And then monimpection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they reviewing? What are they inspecting for? A. They are doing pushing and soaking on Batteries 1, 2 and 3. Q. And why aren't we making those inspections? 	314
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	 Q. Why would we do that? A. I don't even know if we would be able to find the pealty policy from 2012, but it is the policy effected at the time of the calculation that you use. Q. Okay. During your tenure with the county, you've been privy to the inspection regime, how inspections were done by ACHD inspectors from the time that you started until now. Mave you instituted or are you aware of any changes in how inspections are done? A. Is this specific to coke ovens? Q. Yes, specifically with respect to coke ovens. A. Yeah. Whenever I had started off, there were a lot of inspections that would be more visual and not actually recorded. It was seeing the state of the plant and, I guess, they would somehow coordinate with the plant to say, "Ckay, I see emissions on Battery 3," and that type of battery a month." So there are those inspection types. Ten batteries each month at least get inspection types. Ten batteries each month at least get inspection. 	312	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	 from two to 10, 10 to 1,000? A. It would be hard to just because of the inspection types. On a quarterly summation I know like the non-stipulated penalties, which is what we write the orders up for, the non-stipulated penalties maybe three or four years ago had 10 or 20 violations and now it's at 150 or so. Q. You mentioned penalty types. How many penalty types are there? Or inspection types are there, sorry. Not penalty types but inspection types? A. I mean, just going through, there's charging. There's pushing, and travel is a part of pushing. There's doars. There's high-opacity doors. There's lids. There's differes. There's socking. And then non-inspection would be COMS, Continuous Opacity Monitors. Q. And you mentioned that U.S. Steel has their own inspectors for compliance with the 2016 Consent Order? A. Yes. Q. And you mentioned that what are they reviewing? What are they inspecting for? A. They are doing pushing and socking on Batteries 1, 2 and 3. Q. And why aren't we making those inspections? 	314

		315		317
1	judgment.		requirements are there requirements? Let me ask you	
2	Q. Okay. Did we make use of that data beyond the	2	that, first of all.	
3	stipulated penalties that were contemplated in the 2016	3	A. It is not a regulation. It is only a manual.	
4	Judgment, Consent Judgment?	4	${\sf Q}.$ So we could deviate from that as well?	
5	A. Not as far as I'm aware.	5	A. As far as I know, yes. It's not a regulatory	
6	Q. Okay. You mentioned that we increased our number	6	requirement.	
7	of inspections. Can you detail the manner in which	1	Q. The source testing manual is not a regulatory	
8	those inspections are done? It sounds as though that	8	requirement?	
9	has been changed somewhat?	9	A. No.	
10	A. Any given day, the ACHD inspectors would complete	10	Q. Is it a regulation?	
11	a full set of inspections, soaking, all the sheets. So	11	A. No.	
12	each sheet has a set of inspections on it. Pushing will	12	Q. I don't know if I asked you that directly,	
13	have pushes on it. Soaking has three ovens with a push	13	but who adheres to the source testing manual, Keramida?	
14	side and coke side. They would do a complete sheet	14	A. Keramida does not.	
15	every day.	15	Q. Do our inspectors?	
16	Q. Now, when you say	16	A. Our inspectors use the source testing manual,	
17	A. In	17	yes.	
18	Q. I'm sorry, just to clarify, when you say	18	Q. Is that one of the distinctions between our	
19	"complete set," are we talking about each inspection	19	inspectors and the Keramida inspectors?	
20	type?	20	A. One off many, yeah.	
21	A. Yes,	21	O. Okay. Are there any limitations in the source	
22	O. Okay, So they are supposed to do one of each	22	testing manual that Keramida inspectors do not have in	
23	type of inspections a day?	23	terms of our inspections?	
24	A. One sheet of each type, yeah.	24	A. Any limits in the - sorry, can you say that	
25	O. I'm sorry, go ahead.	25	again?	
	unes se dou contentante a resolución part			
1 2 3	A. Yeah. So it's, like I said, the pushing and the soaking; and then the topsides, which are lids and	1 2	$Q. \ \ $ Are there any limitations in the manner of our inspections under the source testing manual that	318
4	offtakes and doors. Q . You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they	3	Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or	
4	Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors?	3 4 5	Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they	
4 5 6	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. 	3 4 5 6	Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have?	
4 5 6 7	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or 	3 4 5 6 7	Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah.	
4 5 6 7 8	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of 	3 4 5 6 7 8	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So 	
4 5 6 7 8 9	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yes, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual 	
4 5 6 7 8 9	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yes, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12.	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yes, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yee, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yee, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Mathed 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheny County 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In meanly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yees, they don't have to follow the manual. So yees, they have — they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Welking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a coke-side yard 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheng County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. Q. Is that used with respect to the Clairton Coke 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yees, they have — they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a ooke-side yard equivalency. That's calculated if they are reading from 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. Q. Is that used with respect to the Clairton Coke Works? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a coke-side yard equivalency. That's calculated if they are reading from the borch, which is only a few feet from the doors as 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a manual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. Q. Is that used with respect to the Clairton Coke Works? A. Yes, there is a coke oven section in the source 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a ooke-side yard equivalency. That's calculated if they are reading from the bench, which is only a few feet from the doors as apposed to 25 feet. 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a menual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. Q. Is that used with respect to the Clairton Coke Works? A. Yes, there is a coke oven section in the source testing manual. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yee, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a coke-side yard equivalency. That's calculated if they are reading from the beach, which is only a few feet from the doors as apposed to 25 feet. Q. Okay. Well, let's take a step back. We are 	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 offtakes and doors. Q. You're aware the EPA limits the NESHAPs as they are used by the Keramida inspectors? A. Yeah, correct. Q. Would you say that our inspections are more or less stringent than theirs in terms of A. Our inspections are the Article 21 regs versus Method 303 regs. Q. Okay. So let me ask you this then: in terms of the Article 21 regulations versus federal requirements, are ours more stringent than federal requirements? A. In nearly every case, yes. Q. Okay. Are aware of the source testing manual? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe that for me? A. It is a menual used by the Allegheny County Health Department to describe different ways to conduct inspections or tests. Q. Is that used with respect to the Clairton Coke Works? A. Yes, there is a coke oven section in the source testing manual. Q. Okay. And how do those inspections and 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Keramida is not subject to? A. Are you saying do we have restrictions or anything listed in the source testing manual that they don't have? Q. Yeah. A. Yee, they don't have to follow the manual. So yes, they have they can do things that the manual would not allow, I guess, is one way to put it. Q. Okay. What would that be? A. Walking within 25 feet of the doors is one, the most obvious one. Q. Of the doors? What doors? A. The source testing manual has a condition in there of 25 feet, at least, from the doors to read doors that are leaking. The Method 303 does not have that because they have to read every side of every battery. So what they have for the shedded side is a coke-side yard equivalency. That's calculated if they are reading from the bench, which is only a few feet from the doors as proposed to 25 feet. Q. Okay. Well, let's take a step back. We are talking specifically about Battery B now. Battery B has 	

1	the shed on the coke side, correct?	319	1	A. The 2018 one?	32:
2	A. Yes.		2	0. Yes.	
3	Q. And that shed is closer than 25 feet from the		3	A. Yes.	
4	door of the coke side of the battery?		4	Q. The one that is on appeal currently.	
5	A. Yeah, it may even extend beyond 25 feet. But the		5	A. Correct.	
6	shed is only six inches or a foot from the battery and		6	Q. And we said in that order and correct me if	
7	extends over the hot car area.		7	I'm wrong we have a condition for a maximum of 10	
8	Q. Is there any reason why we would not be able to		8	door leaks. Using the coke-side vard equivalence	
9	get any closer to make those observations?		9	standard, we aren't talking about strictly 10 door	
10	A. Wall, ACHD inspectors, you can get to the bench		10	leaks?	
11	and read from the bench; but beyond the bench and meet		11	A. No, it's not strictly 10 door leaks.	
12	that 25-foot requirement, it would be unsafe.		12	O. It could be subsequently more than 10 door leaks?	
13	O. It would be unsafe?		13	A. Correct.	
14	A. With the hot car movement, yeah. If the hot car		14	O. Okay. Did you give any consideration let me	
15	was to completely stop. I'm sure there's a way, but		15	ask let's back this up a little bit.	
16	0. So because of the source testing manual's 25-foot		16	You helped in the development of the enforcement	
17	minimum distance requirement, we do not do those		17	order currently under anneal?	
18	inspections on that side, on coke side of Battery B?		18	A Correct	
19	A Ownert		19	O Did you give consideration to the standard by	
20	O Because there's a limitation a physical		20	which we would apply to the onke-side battery doors?	
21	limitation at the plant that prevents us from doing so?		21	A Yes	
22	A Barred 25 foot use		22	O Okay During that assagement did you look at	
23	 Dit the Method 303 inspectors the Kerzmide 		23	the number of leaks that were on that side of the doors?	
24	inspectors, can make some readings from that coke side		24	A Pictorically upph	
25	of Pottory P2		25	\mathbf{O} on that side of the battom?	
		320			322
1	A. Yeah, they have to.		1	A. Yeah, and the coke side of Battery B, the number	
2	$Q,\;$ They have to. And they report those to us?		2	of door leaks historically, yes.	
3	A. Connect.		3	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. What did you see with respect to Battery	
4	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. You mentioned something about the coke		4	B's coke-side doors and their emissions?	
5	side or the yard equivalency. Could you explain that?		5	A. The number of leaks increased a lot in 2017, in	
6	A. I think it's called coke-side yard equivalent. I		6	that range. I don't know exact months when they started	
7	may be slightly off in the name. But what that does is		7	going up. But 2016 or '17, the number of leaks on a	
8	it allows for a six-percent reduction in the number of		8	monthly basis increased a good bit from the past years.	
9	leaks observed when observed underneath a shed or from		9	${\sf Q}.~$ And by "a good bit," are we talking percentages	
10	the bench.		10	or are we talking	
11	So in Battery B at Clairton's case, they have 75		11	A. If you're looking at the monthly total of the	
12	coke-side doors. So the six percent is a reduction of		12	daily coke-side yard equivalencies, they increase from	
13	four and a half doors from the number of observed leaks.		13	the range of 10 or so to — it varied, but maybe 50.	
14	Q. So 10 leaks is not necessarily 10 leaks?		14	Q. Fifty?	
15	A. Correct.	1	15	A. Yeah. I mean, it varies month to month, but	
16	${\sf Q}.$ Could that number be reduced to zero at any		16	yeah.	
17	point?		17	${\sf Q}_{*}$. Were the numbers on the coke side subsequently	
18	A. On a daily basis — well, if you are subtracting		18	greater than the number on the push side?	
19	off four and a half every inspection that's completed,		19	A. The number of leaks, yes.	
20	if you have four or less leaks, that becomes zero.		20	$Q.\ $ And were the number of leaks from the coke side	
21	$Q.\ $ Oh, okay. So you could have four leaks and then		21	subsequently greater than the number of coke-side leaks	
22	that gets reduced to zero?		22	with respect to the other batteries?	
23	A. Yeah.		23	A. Yes, I didn't specifically look at that. But	
24	Q. Okay. So in our enforcement order you're		24	because the other batteries aren't under a shed, they	
25	familiar with our enforcement order, aren't you?		25	wouldn't have the coke-side yard equivalency. So I	

1		323		32
	would have to do a more thorough analysis on that one.		${\sf Q}.$ Okay. So there is visible emissions that are	
2	But there was Battery B — yeah, there would have		2 accounted for in the 2016 judgment?	
3	to be a lot more leaks on that side, but I can't confirm	1	A. Yes.	
4	that with any numbers. I'd have to look at that.		Q. But it is strictly limited to what again?	
5	${\sf Q}.~$ We do inspections with respect to the coke side	5	A. Pushing and soaking of 1, 2, 3.	
6	on all of the other batteries with the exception of	(Q. Just those batteries for just those portions of	
7	Battery B?		the process?	
8	A. Connect, yes, 'cause that's the only one with the	8	A. Connect.	
9	shed.	9	Q. Okay. And have you in the penalties that were	
10	${\sf Q}.$ That's the only one with the shed. And based on	10	assessed between or following the 2016 Consent	
11	your reading of those exceedances on those sides, can	11	Judgment and the order that's currently on appeal, have	
12	you say whether or not there are more than the rest of	12	you made efforts to ensure that there isn't any overlap	
13	the facility on the coke side versus Battery B?	13	between the penalties?	
14	A. Well, any leaks on that scale would potentially	14	A. Yeah, and I've already reviewed the engineer's	
15	lead to violations on other inspections on the other	15	data for the quarterly summaries. I checked to make	
16	batteries.	16	sure there's not soaking of 1, 2, 3 or pushing in that	
17	So if you are having - I don't know the exact	17	quarterly enforcement.	
18	numbers, but we'll say, like, 200 leaks on the ooke side	18	${\sf Q}. \ $ Thus far, have we penalized for any of those	
19	one month and like 15 or 20 on the push side, this is	19	violations that were contemplated under the 2016 Consent	
20	for Battery B, so those 200 leaks over the monthly basis	20	Judgment?	
21	would likely lead to a lot more violations on the other	21	A. Not that I recall, no.	
22	batteries than it would on Battery B because we don't	22	Q. Okay. You're aware that as a part of the 2016	
23	count those. We don't count any leaks on the Battery B	23	Consent Judgment, U.S. Steel was to make certain repairs	
24	side shed for our enforcement.	24	to oven walls and its batteries?	
25	Q. Why is that?	25	A. Yeah, to do inspections and then repair as the	
		324		326
1	A. Because we are using the source testing manual on	1	inspection is noted.	
2				
	this one.	2	Q. And to your understanding, has that been done?	
3	this one. Q . But the regulations would basically require us to	2	Q. And to your understanding, has that been done?A. As far as I know.	
3 4	this one. Q . But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation?	2 3 4	Q. And to your understanding, has that been done?A. As far as I know.Q. Is there a completion date for that project?	
3 4 5	<pre>this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lemient on this one. We</pre>	2 3 4 5	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties 	
3 4 5 6	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for 	2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be - 	
3 4 5 6 7	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Connect. We are more lemient on this one. We don't enforce we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Connect. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has 	
3 4 5 7 8 9	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lemient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeah, there's noticeable improvement. 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lemient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Connect. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeah, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any inoticed any decrease of compliance with respect to 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the OCMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lemient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yas, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeeh. There has definitely been an 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doars. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment versus the enforcement order? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeah, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment yous the enforcement order? A. Yesh, because the 2016 Consent Judgment focused 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the OOMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an impressed number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment versus the enforcement order? A. Yesh, because the 2016 Consent Judgment focused on the CONS and the 2018 order was on the actual 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeeh. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment versus the enforcement order? A. Yesh, because the 2016 Consent Judgment focused on the CONS and the 2018 order was on the actual inspection data. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeah, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going up but the visible emission 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to rake that observation? A. Correct. We are more leadent on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment focused on the CONS and the 2018 order was on the actual importion data. Q. So the stipulated penalties were strictly for the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be - actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeeh. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going up but the visible emission performance is going down? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce — we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment versus the enforcement order? A. Yesh, because the 2016 Consent Judgment focused on the CONS and the 2018 order was on the actual importion data. Q. So the stipulated penalties were strictly for the CONS in the consent judgment? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Udgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going up but the visible emission performance is going down? A. It seems so, yeah. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to make that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment versus the enforcement order? A. Yesh, because the 2016 Consent Judgment focused on the CONS and the 2018 order was on the actual inspection data. Q. So the stipulated penalties were strictly for the cONS in the consent judgment? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be - actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeah, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going up but the visible emission performance is going down? A. It seems so, yeah. Q. Are you aware of any larger coke oven facility in 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to rake that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment focused on the COMS and the 2018 order was on the actual inspection data. Q. So the stipulated penalties were strictly for the coMS in the consent judgment? A. And the pushing on all of the batteries and soaking of 1, 2, 3, and COMS. And I think there is a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be - actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeah. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going up but the visible emission performance is going down? A. It seems so, yeah. Q. Are you aware of any larger coke oven facility in the world? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 this one. Q. But the regulations would basically require us to rake that observation? A. Correct. We are more lenient on this one. We don't enforce - we choose not to write violations for those, when in reality, they are. Q. So technically, there are several unaccounted for violations with respect to the coke side of Battery B? A. Yes, for the doors. Q. You've reviewed the 2016 Consent Judgment and you reviewed our enforcement order that's on appeal before it went out. Did you check to make sure that there wasn't going to be any conflict with respect to the penalties that were imposed in the consent judgment focused on the COMS and the 2018 order was on the actual inspection data. Q. So the stipulated penalties were strictly for the COMS in the consent judgment? A. And the pushing on all of the batteries and soaking of 1, 2, 3, and COMS. And I think there is a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Q. And to your understanding, has that been done? A. As far as I know. Q. Is there a completion date for that project? A. Not definitively, but the stipulated penalties start kicking in. So the assumption would be — actually, I don't know the specific date. Q. Okay. In your review of the COMS data that has come in over that period of time, have you noticed any improvement? A. Yeeh, there's noticeable improvement. Q. And during that same period of time, have you noticed any decrease of compliance with respect to visible emission observations? A. It seems so, yeeh. There has definitely been an increased number of violations since that 2016 Consent Judgment of visible emissions. Q. So it's fair to say that on one hand, the COM performance is going down? A. It seems so, yeeh. Q. Are you aware of any larger coke oven facility in the world? A. Twe been told there's a big one in Italy and I'm the world? 	

		327			329
1	Q. You're sure there are some in China?		1	that enclosed at all?	
2	A. I don't know that for certain, but because of how		2	A. Not entirely. I mean, there's openings	
3	much steel China is producing, I'm sure they have big		3	throughout it. There are openings on both ends. There	
4	coke plants over there. I don't know.		4	are access doors, maybe some cracks in the roof and	
5	Q. Okay. So you're just speculating on China?		5	whatnot. It's not fully enclosed.	
6	A. Yeah. I've heard about another large one in		6	Q. Can you imagine a system or a manner in which you	
7	Italy. I don't know the exact size of it.		7	could enclose at least the sides of the battery for that	
8	Q. Let's see. And you've mentioned the Veolia		8	shed not battery, the shed?	
9	inspection. We don't enforce off of the Veolia		9	A. There would be ways to enclose it, but it would	
10	inspections?		10	have to allow for the movement of the hot car to go	
11	A Vaolia that's the importions that do the		11	through the one side particularly	
12	ruthing and solving on 1 2 3. Those goes go to the		12	So is there execting that could be rat on the	
13	stimulated produces for the 2016 (prosent Judgment		13	ataida that would amate a better antum? Yos them	
11	O Dut up don't make sume of that dots for any other		11	ditales dat will cleate a better capture: les, dete	
15	Q. But we don't make sure of that data for any other		15	13.	
15	purpose?		15	I'm just picturing those things that are always	
10	A. We don't enforce on it separately, no.		16	on garage doors or large doors, like the clear plastic	
1/	Q. Was the intent of the order to address any sulfur		1/	things that go down. Even something like that would	
18	compounds beyond sulfur oxide?		18	contain a lot more of the emissions.	
19	A. The 2018 arder?		19	Q. An air carrier?	
20	Q. Yes.		20	A. If there is a better draw on the air, that would	
21	A. It would be for visible emissions and sulfur		21	also capture more of the emissions, the top of it.	
22	axides. Stuff cames out of it, out of the coke battery,		22	$Q.\;$ If there was an enclosure in the manner of an air	
23	out of the leaks and whatever, of other sulfur		23	curtain, let's say, would that help with the collection	
24	compounds. H2S is the one that I know of and then that		24	of particulate matter?	
25	converts to SO2.		25	A. Any way you are increasing capture, you are going	
1 2	Q. I understand. Can you think of a currently, there is no control device for the Battery B with		1 2	to decrease the emissions coming out. Anything you capture is going to go through that bag house. So if	
3	respect to gaseous emissions; is that correct?		3	you increase the capture percentage, you are going to	
4	A. No, there's not.		4	decrease the amount of emissions.	
5	Q. There's a bag house for Battery B; is that		5	Q. Are you familiar with operation of the bag house	
6	correct?		б	for Battery B in terms of its capacity or its design?	
7	A. Correct, yes.		7	A. None of the details on it.	
8	Q. And that bag house is picking up what?		8	Q. But you would expect that, under normal	
9	A. Particulate matter and controls that.		9	operations, that it would collect the particulate matter	
10	O. SO2 is not a particulate matter?		10	that's being emitted from the battery on the coke side?	
11	A. It is not.		11	A. Yeah. They do stack testings required to meet a	
12	$\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{r}}$ So it does not control for SO22		12	certain efficiency, typically in the high 90s, and to	
13			13	most that officiary stary two years prohably for a	
14	O Do you know of any control for SO2 or garcour		14	more same test. So it shald be collection at a high	
15	Q. Do you know of any control for Soz of gaseous		15	officiency. Well the content is different form	
10			10	eliciency. Well, the capture rate is mineted. If di	
17	A. The scrub is the most common one.		10	contection. The contection rate is going to be rairly	
1/	Q. Can you describe a scrubber?		17	high for that bag house.	
18	A. Bubbler, basically. You got liquid coming down,		10	Q. If there was an exceedance of door leaks or	
19	mostly water with something else in it, and dirty we		19	excessive door leaks, would it capture all excessive	
20	will call it dirty gas going up, and then it bubbles	2	20	door Leaks?	
21	through and ecrubs it clean; and then on the way out, it	2	21	A. The shed?	
22	is clean gas going out the top, cleaner gas.	2	22	Q. In terms of the emissions, yeah, the shed.	
23	Q. But there isn't one for Battery B?	2	23	A. The shed -well, it would capture whatever	
24	A. There is not one there.	2	24	emissions are captured by that shed. If you have an	
25	$\mathbf{Q}.$ With respect to the shed that's on Battery B, is	2	25	excessive amount of emissions, it can go out the	

		331			333
1	outsides, go through the cracks, go into the open side	~ 1	1	${\sf Q}.$ Could you explain why they were missed in 2017,	
2	away from the hot car. It can find openings if it		2	the third quarter?	
3	overwhelms the shed.		3	A. The engineer missed the column on the sheet when	
4	So if the shed capture of airflow, if isn't		4	they were doing it and then I think - yeah, then there	
5	enough, any of those excesses would go beyond it and		5	was the issue with the Battery 15 doors from Keramida	
6	they would not be captured. I think that's what you're	1	6	that carried over also.	
7	asking.		7	Q. Could you explain that Battery 15 problem?	
8	Q. Yes, that's what I'm trying to figure out. And		8	A. As good as I can. In the middle of 2017 okay.	
9	you kind of touched on this earlier. Could you explain		9	In the first half of 2017, ACHD was enforcing as per	
10	a NESHAP inspection versus a SIP inspection and who does		10	Article 21 for door leaks, which says that you have to	
11	it?		11	exclude the door overs from the last oven charged.	
12	A. ACHD does Article 21's inspections.		12	anything obstructing from view.	
13	Method 303 (sic) does Method 303 inspections, and then		13	And then after meeting with U.S. Steel, we	
14	we take those Mathod 303 inspections and ownare them to		14	determined we want to on back to the source testing	
15	the article 21 standards		15	manal until the entropy testing manal until the entropy	
16	O We igno violations bread on these cheeventiens?		16	finalized The source besting name is an aire to	
17	Q. We issue violations based on those observations?		17	rinalized. The source testing manual says minus two,	
10	A. If those exceedences are violations, year.		10	not from the last oven charged.	
18	Q. Okay. We discussed earlier the fact that you		18	So that would change - 11 there were two leaks	
19	helped develop the enforcement order that's on appeal		19	from the last oven charged, it would be the same in the	
20	currently.		20	manual and regulation; however, if it was zero or one	
21	One of the conditions is, again, no more than 10		21	from the last oven charged, then it would not be the	
22	door leaks on the Battery B coke side using the yard		22	same and we would be less stringent from the regulation,	
23	equivalent; am I correct with that?		23	and then that was changed in the middle of 2017.	
24	A. I believe the term is coke-side yard equivalent.		24	On Keramida — 'cause Keramida enters all thair	
25	${\sf Q}.$ Thank you. Had you looked at any data prior to		25	data directly into a tablet which goes into their	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. What kind of data did you look at? A. I looked back at a few years of data from the Method 303 reports and then summarized those to the monthly coke yard equivalency number and then compared it and came up with a number based on that, based on what U.S. Steel had done in the past. Q. Okay. So this is all historical data showing 		3 4 5 7 8 9 10	created — 'cause they were subtracting as per Article 21, not as per the source testing manual. So there were a couple violations that got they would put in there — because there were violations of Article 21, but they way we are enforcing it is by the source testing manual currently. So those couple of violations we took out. And then, I can't remember the timeline of it,	
11	that this was an achievable condition?		11	but there was a discrepancy in their calculations on 15	
12	A. Yeah. I mean, it may have been historically to		12	versus source system manual Method 21. Unfortunately, I	
13	even just the previous month to two or three years or so		13	can't remember all of the details on it.	
14	back.		14	Q. Okay. But basically, we decided to operate under	
15	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. I want to talk about the actual civil		15	the paradigm established under the source testing manual	
16	penalty and what it covers. Do you recall the		16	as opposed to Article 21?	
17	inspection types that brought about the violations for		17	A. For those door leaks, yes.	
18	the order on appeal?		18	$Q.\ $ For those doors, for those door leaks. Did we do	
19	A. That would have been charging, doors, high-		19	that unprompted?	
20	opacity doors, lids, offtake and soaking on non-1, 2,		20	A. Keramida brought it to our attention that there	
21	and 3.		21	was an issue.	
22	O. And for what quarters did that cover?		22	Q. Well, I mean, the initial change, that decision	
	C THE FOR MERCE AND CHECKED				
23	A. Fourth quarter of 2017, first quarter of 2018,		23	to adhere to the source testing manual versus Article	
23 24	A. Fourth quarter of 2017, first quarter of 2018, and then some that were missed from third quarter of		23 24	to adhere to the source testing manual versus Article 21?	
23 24 25	A. Fourth quarter of 2017, first quarter of 2018, and then some that were missed from third quarter of '17.		23 24 25	to adhere to the source testing manual versus Article21?A. Oh, no, sorry, that came from a U.S. Steel	

1		335		337
1	meeting, a meeting with U.S. Steel.		1 A. I don't know the exact quarter that it changed;	557
2	Q. Who initiated that meeting?		2 but in that range, yes, the violations increased.	
3	A. I don't remember.		3 Q. Okay. Could you say that since the 2016 Consent	
4	Q. Did we reach out to U.S. Steel and offer that?		4 Judgment, that the violations have gone up?	
5	A. I don't remember who actually set up the meeting.		5 A. Yeah.	
6	I know it was a meeting between us and U.S. Steel to go		6 Q. That's what you testified to already, okay.	
7	over the current issues at the time.		7 A. Yeah.	
8	And then from that meeting, they, U.S. Steel.		8 0. I may have asked you this, but let me figure this	
9	brought up the source besting manual and then the		9 out. In your development of the or your	
10	Banneylyzmia DED; and then from that meeting, we devided		0 participation in the enforcement order that is currently	
11	the time anima to an hadre to the minute two. I don't know		1 on arreal had you discorred whether or not there was a	
12	who asked for the meeting		2 eiv-month period in which II S. Steel had fewer than	
13	\mathbf{O} Well who asked for the minus two?		3 10 10 or fever I will say 10 or fever violations	
14			A using the colorada used equivalence?	
15				
16	Q. Okay. And that's under the source testing		5 A. wherever I was going back through data, it was	
17	Manual, the minus two?		0 2010, I believe, that had mine or the tweive months	
1/	A. Correct.		/ where they were below the 10 or - they met that	
18	Q. So they wanted us to adhere to the source testing		8 condition, they were at 10 or below for nine of those 12	
19	manual?]	9 months, and the other months were just slightly above	
20	A. They also brought it to Pennsylvania DEP, which	2	0 it.	
21	is different than Article 21 or the source testing	2	1 Q. And following the issuance of that order, have	
22	manual. Pennsylvania DEP says minus two representing	2	2 you found any additional information which would suggest	
23	the last oven charged.	2	3 that they could have reached that six-month requirement	
24	So those two the source testing manual and the	2	4 on the	
25	PA DEP regulation was brought up by U.S. Steel, yes.	2	5 A. Yeah, I went back and did a couple more years,	
1		336		338
1	Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the	336	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from	338
1 2 3	Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct?	336	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis,	338
1 2 3	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly 	338
1 2 3 4	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. 	338
1 2 3 4 5	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me samething about the emissions caming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is caming out 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, 	336	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 	336	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are 	336 1 1 1 1	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? 	336 1 1 1 1 1	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeeh. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Yeah, it was around 300. 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic.	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Yeah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me samething about the emissions caming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is caming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Yeeh, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Yeah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, it's not typical. 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Veah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, "what do you mean? 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low orke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeeh. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight.	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Yeah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, "what do you mean? A. Going back a few years. Like, I would say — I 	336 	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight. MR. DELUCA: Can you ask it again? 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Veah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, "what do you mean? A. Going back a few years. Like, I would say — I mentioned earlier, maybe like in the range of 10 or 20 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low coke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight. MR. DELUCA: Can you ask it again? 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, it's not typical. Q. And by "historically," what do you mean? A. Going back a few years. Like, I would eay — I mentioned earlier, maybe like in the range of 10 or 20 non-stipulated penalties per quarter, and now it's 150 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight. MR. DELUCA: Can you ask it again? EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Yeah. Do you know what is coming out of those 	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Veah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, "what do you mean? A. Going back a few years. Like, I would say - I mentioned earlier, maybe like in the range of 10 or 20 non-stipulated paralties per quarter. 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low ooke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeeh. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me samething about the emissions caming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight. MR. WILLIS: Q. Yeah. Do you know what is coming out of those doors when there is an actual door leak?	338
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Well, the PA DEP is an actual regulation but the source testing manual is not, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And to the extent that U.S. Steel asked for that accommodation, we gave them that accommodation? A. Correct. Q. And that accommodation benefitted U.S. Steel, correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Was it safe to say for those three quarters that are the subject of this enforcement order, primarily the third quarter of 2017, fourth quarter of 2017 and first quarter of 2018, that there are approximately 300 violations in that order? A. Veah, it was around 300. Q. Okay. Is that typical for U.S. Steel? A. Unfortunately, the last few quarters have been in that range. Historically, "what do you mean? A. Going back a few years. Like, I would say - I mentioned earlier, maybe like in the range of 10 or 20 non-stipulated penalties per quarter. Q. So again, prior to the 2016 Consent Judgment, 	336 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 going backwards to 2014 and '15, and the same trend from 2016 where there were low violations on a monthly basis, low orke-side yard equivalency door leaks on a monthly basis, yeah. Q. Okay. Now, you're an engineer, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you said you weren't really up on your organic chemistry, but maybe you could explain to me something about the emissions coming out of those doors. If there's a door leak, do you know what is coming out of that door? MR. DAUSCH: I will object to foundation just because of his explanation that he didn't have an organic chemistry background or understand this exact topic. MR. WILLIS: But he also said that he had training in Canada with respect to the chemistry. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll overrule the objection but take it as to weight. MR. DELUCA: Can you ask it again? BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Yeah. Do you know what is coming out of those doors when there is an actual door leak? A. Specifically, no. I think probably the best way 	338

		339			341
1	pollutants, whether it be hydrogen sulfide, SO2, BM,		1	$Q.\ $ Okay. Now, when you developed the or worked	
2	BIEX, naphthalene. There's a whole bunch of different		2	on the order that is currently under appeal, did you do	
3	chemicals that could be coming out of it. I don't know		3	any analysis with respect to the baseline for the 2018	
4	the exact stipulation or the composition of all of it.		4	first quarter?	
5	But coke oven emissions by itself is a hazardous		5	A. Analysis of the baseline?	
6	air pollutant and those other HAPs located in that.		6	$Q.\;$ Yeah, did you determine what that baseline would	
7	Sorry, HAPs is hazardous air pollutants.		7	be prior to issuance of that order?	
8	So there are other HAPs coming out of it,		8	A. Oh, not prior to it.	
9	basically just a toxic mix of emissions.		9	Q. Did you do it afterwards?	
10	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Would it be fair to say that raw coke oven	1	.0	A. Yes.	
11	gas would be coming out of a coke oven through a door	1	.1	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Do you know what that number is?	
12	leak?	1	.2	A. 98.152, approximately.	
13	A. Yes.	1	.3	Q. Okay. I'm going to move into the exhibits. We	
14	Q. Okay. Could you — is it safe to correlate the	1	4	have quite a few, so give me a second.	
15	amount of coke oven gas coming through a door leak with	1	.5	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure.	
16	the well, let me back up.	1	6	BY MR. WILLIS:	
17	Say there's an increase of emissions coming from	1	7	Q. I will start with the one I just gave opposing	
18	door leaks. Could you say that there would be a	1	8	counsel this morning. This is going to be ACHD 11, I	
19	correlation between that and an increase of coke oven	1	9	believe. Do you recognize this document?	
20	gas coming through that door leak?	2	0	A. Yes.	
21	MR. DAUSCH: Can I have a continuing objection to	2	1	Q. Did you create this document?	
22	all of the questions on this topic or would you prefer	2	2	A. Yes.	
23	that I object to every question, because I would have	2	3	Q. Do you remember when you created this document?	
24	the same objection for the foundation?	2	4	A. A couple months ago.	
25	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Yeah, your continuous	2	5	Q. Okay. So it was after the issuance of the	
1	objection is noted, Mr. Dausch, but I have the same		1	enforcement order?	542
2	ruling.		2	A. Yeah, it would have to be, because June '18 is	
3	MR. DAUSCH: Thank you.	:	3	listed here and June '18 wasn't done by the time the	
4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: I will overrule it but		4	issue was order - or the order was issued.	
5	consider it as to the weight of what Mr. DeLuca is	5	5	Q. Okay. Can you tell me what we're looking at?	
6	saying.	e	6	A. This is the summation of Battery B coke-side door	
7	MR. DAUSCH: Thank you.	5	7	leaks and pusher-side door leaks from the Method 303	
8	MR. DELUCA: I'm sorry.	6	8	monthly reports, along with the calculation of the coke-	
9	By MR. WILLIS:	9	9	side yard equivalent.	
10	$Q.\;$ If there is an increase in door leaks, could you	10	0	Q_{*} Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is the	
11	correlate that to an increase in emissions of coke oven	11	1	number that's used for compliance with respect to	
12	gas?	12	2	Battery B and the enforcement order?	
13	A. Most likely, yes. If you have more leaks, the	13	3	A. For this enforcement order, yes.	
14	assumption is you are going to have more emissions	14	4	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And as you noted, the last one that's on	
15	coming out of those leaks, treating all leaks equally.	15	5	here is from June 2018; is that correct?	
16	There's a lot of possibilities of what could	16	6	A. Connect.	
17	happen in reality. You could have one leak with just	17	7	Q. That number for the number of door leaks is 15.5?	
18	billowing emissions coming out or you could have five	18	3	A. For the yard equivalent, yes.	
19	small leaks, and that one small leak could have more	19	Э	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. In looking at this sheet, could you show	
20	emissions.	20)	me any six-month stretch in which U.S. Steel was at or	
21	But without counting for the actual number of it,	21	L	under 10 door leaks on the coke side, or the coke-side	
22	it's just how many leaks are coming out. We assume more	22	2	yard equivalent?	
23	leaks equal more emissions coming out. In this case	23	3	A. Yeah, towards the top, April 14th - well, April	
24	with the raw coke oven gas, there would be more raw coke	24	1	2014, May, June, July, August, September. So those six	
05				the second se	

		343			345
1	side yard.		1	goes down to zero. So on a 30-day month, you can have	
2	${\bf Q}.$ Okay, so just based on this, it is achievable for		2	up to 120 leaks count as zero. It depends on how those	
3	them to get 10 or fewer leaks on the coke-side doors?		3	leaks occur.	
4	A. I mean, I think it was achievable for the past		4	So to get to two, there are a couple different	
5	history showing the six consecutive months, but this		5	ways you can get there; but the easiest example would	
6	shows that it was done in the past.		6	be, there are five days — or sorry, there are four days	
7	Q_{\ast} Okay. And in looking at that period of time, are		7	where there are five leaks because each of those five	
8	you aware of any order from the Allegheny County Health		8	leaks count as a half.	
9	Department which would require them to maintain that		9	So you have five leaks converted to a half, times	
10	door leak standard?		10	four days, that's two leaks. Then the rest of the days	
11	A. No.		11	of that month would have been at four or less leaks.	
12	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. So this is all on their own operation		12	Q. Okay.	
13	without any enforcement effort by us?		13	A. I think that explains it, but I'm not positive.	
14	A. Connect, yes. It is the typical operation trying		14	${\sf Q}.~$ And let's see. On the other end of the spectrum,	
15	to minimize leaks, I'm assuming.		15	if you look down at October of 2017, there are 209	
16	Q. Okay. And in scanning this sheet, it looks as		16	actual leaks and that jumps to 74.5 using the coke-side	
17	though from 2014, with some notable exceptions in 2014,		17	yard equivalency door leak standard?	
18	that on the coke-side yard equivalent with the door		18	A. Connect.	
19	leaks, are there many of these that exceed that		19	Q_{\star} Okay. I apologize, Dean, we're going to have to	
20	standard?		20	go through quite a number of documents here.	
21	A. For which time period?		21	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the	
22	Q. Just looking from 2014 through January of 2017.		22	admission of ACHD 11?	
23	A. The majority of them are definitely under 10.		23	MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	
24	Some of them are at zero.		24	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 11 is admitted.	
25	${\sf Q}.$ Well, from the period of January '14 to January		25	BY MR. WILLIS:	
1	'17, could you count for me how many times they would	344	1	$\mathbf{Q}.$ Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the	346
1 2	'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit?	344	1 2	Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5.	346
1 2 3	'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014,	344	1 2 3	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or 	346
1 2 3 4	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10.</pre>	344	1 2 3 4	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. 	346
1 2 3 4 5	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many?</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that?</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes.</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here?	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 — no,</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct?</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. 	.346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 — no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 — no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 — no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yesh, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at — if you will take a	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Gkay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? 	.346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>'17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeeh, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 coke-</pre>	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 coke-side door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeeh, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Gkay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? 	.346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; is that correct? 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? A. Ch, it would have been after the issuance. 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeeh, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; is that correct? A. Correct, yes. 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? A. Ch, it would have been after the issuance. Q. After the issuance? 	.346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two — there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 — no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at — if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; is that correct? A. Correct, yes. Q. Could you explain how you go from 102 actual door 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Gkay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? A. Ch, it would have been after the issuance. Q. After the issuance? A. Correct. 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeah, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; is that correct? A. Correct, yes. Q. Could you explain how you go from 102 actual door leaks to two? 	344	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Okay. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? A. Ch, it would have been after the issuance. Q. After the issuance? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Do you recall having any conversations 	346
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 '17, could you count for me how many times they would have exceeded that limit? A. Yes. One, two - there are 11 months in 2014, 2015, and 2016 that exceeded 10. Q. How many? A. Eleven out of those 36. Q. Eleven out of those 36. And following January of 2017, it looks like it goes up; am I correct in that? A. Yes. Q. And, in fact, after November of 2016 no, sorry, December of 2016, there is no other occasion in which it would hit that standard again; is that correct? A. Yeeh, every month then from January of '17 'til June of 2018 was greater than 10. Q. Okay. Now, looking back at if you will take a look at August of 2014, it says that there are 102 cokeside door leaks. Yet, the coke-side yard equivalent door leaks using the standard that we are using as a metric for their compliance in the future is only two; is that correct? A. Correct, yes. Q. Could you explain how you go from 102 actual door leaks to two? A. Well, because of the coke-side yard equivalency, 	344	1 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. Dean, if you take a look at in the binder, it's going to be under Exhibit Number 5. A. Volume 1 or Q. Volume 1. A. I'm assuming all the tabs are the exhibit numbers? Q. Yes. A. Okay. USS Exhibit 5? Q. Yes. What are we looking at here? A. This is the calculation of the first quarter of 2018 compliance numbers, as an example, for the order and as the baseline for the order. Q. So this represents the measure, the metric by which U.S. Steel must comply in order to avoid the hot idling? A. One of the metrics, yes. Q. One of the metrics, okay. Can you explain well, first of all, when did you develop this document? Is this before or after the enforcement order? A. Ch, it would have been after the issuance. Q. After the issuance? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Do you recall having any conversations with U.S. Steel as to how we figured out these numbers? 	.346

		347			349
1	them how the calculation was going to be completed for		1	A. Yeah.	
2	each of the batteries that were performing and then also		2	Q. That's a pretty good number, wouldn't you agree,	
3	to show what the baseline percentage was, and this is		3	in terms of COM compliance?	
4	the baseline percentage.		4	A. It's I mean, it's above 99-percent compliance;	
5	Q. So this was provided to U.S. Steel as a matter of		5	however, in that same number, there are 130 or so	
6	their request?		6	violations — or excuse me, hourly exceedences.	
7	A. Yes. It was also needed to be done regardless in		7	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And with respect to the inspections, the	
8	the future because the order needed to have a baseline		8	compliance percentage as of that first quarter was	
9	calculation.		9	96.920, and that is over how many inspections?	
10	${\sf Q}.$ I understand, okay. Could you walk us through		10	A. It looks like about 5,500.	
11	how you came to this 98.152?		11	Q. 5,500?	
12	A. Okay. I tried to be as descriptive as I could		12	A. 5,500.	
13	with the steps being listed on here also for reference.		13	${\sf Q}.$ So how many violations would that be across 5,500	
14	And, unfortunately, it's on two sides of the same sheet.		14	inspections?	
15	I can't read them both at once, but it would be		15	A. Let's see. There is - maybe 160.	
16	the summation of all of ACHD inspections. Then the	1	16	Q. 160, okay. So the inspection compliance	
17	bottom lists the different types of inspections, and	:	17	percentage is a good deal less than the compliance	
18	then it would be the sum of the compliant inspections		18	percentage for the COMS; is that fair?	
19	from ACHD, so taking out those ones.		19	A. Yeah, two and a half percent, whatever that is, a	
20	And then summing up the Method 303 inspections,		20	percent less.	
21	which if you're looking at Step 3 on the back, it has	2	21	Q. And hypothetically, if the COMS were to remain	
22	it ends up being 44 per day, and then the Method 303	2	22	the same and we were looking for improvement, the	
23	compliant inspections from that summing up.	2	23	improvement would come from the inspection compliance?	
24	And then Step 5 is the actual calculation where	2	24	A. If the OOM stays at 99.384, in order to improve	
25	you are just summing up the compliant the ACHD	2	25	compliance, yeah, the inspection compliance numbers	
		348			350
1	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant	348	1	would have to increase.	350
1 2	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD	348	1 2	would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible	350
1 2 3	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then	348	1 2 3	would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions?	350
1 2 3 4	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage	348	1 2 3 4	would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah.	350
1 2 3 4 5	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage.	348	1 2 3 4 5	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is	348	1 2 3 4 5 6	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is	348	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten	348	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity	348	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours	348	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the	348	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 .1 .2	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard.	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 5 .4	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 100 11 12 13 14 15 16	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 5 .6 7	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 4 .5 .6 7 .0	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance	348	1 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 3 .4 5 .6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 3 .4 5 .6 7 8 9 .0 .1 .2 3 .4 5 .6 7 .8 9 .0 1.2 3 .4 5 .6 7 .8 9 .0 1.2 3 .4 5 .6 7 .8 9 .0 .1 .2 .3 .4 5 .5 .6 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 .5	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0.0 1 2 9 0 1 2 9 0 1 2 1 2 9 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible enissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 .2 .3 4 5 .6 7 8 9 .0 1 .2 .3 4 5 .6 7 8 9 .0 1 .2 .3 4 5 .6 7 8 9 .0 1 .2 .3 4 5 .6 7 .8 9 .0 1 .2 .3 4 .5 .6 .7 .7 8 .9 .0 .1 .2 .5 .5 .0 .1 .2 .1 .2 .2 .1 .2 .2 .1 .2 .2 .1 .2 .2 .1 .2 .2 .1 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2 .2	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our norming break now? 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then duride that by two.	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our morning break now? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we're trying to find the 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACRD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by ten or each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then during that by two. Q. Okay. In looking at the plant-wide continuous opacity monitor section, it says that the COM compliance 	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible enissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our morning break now? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we're trying to find the document. 	350
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by tenor each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then yous combine those two by doing the total by two. Q. Okay. In looking at the plant-wide continuous opacity monitor section, it says that the COM compliance percentage is 98.384. 	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 .0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0.0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 3	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. WILLIS: Okay. MR. WILLIS: Okay. MR. WILLIS: Okay. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our norning break now? MR. WILLIS: Take the break now? 	350
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	 compliant inspections, plus the Method 303 compliant inspections, and dividing that by the sum of ACHD inspections, plus Method 303 total inspections. Then that gives you the inspection compliance percentage portion of the total compliance percentage. And then the second portion of the calculation is for the plant-wide continuous opacity monitors, which is summing the number of clock hours, multiplying by tenor each battery has their own continuous opacity monitor. There are 10 batteries, so the number of hours times 10. Then the number of hours where they did not meet "they" being U.S. Steel did not meet the 20-percent standard. Just the total clock hours, minus those exceedances, divided by the clock hours, and then that gives you the COM compliance percentage portion of the total number, and then you combine those two by doing the compliance percentage of the inspection compliance numbers, plus the COM compliance numbers, and then divide that by two. Q. Okay. In looking at the plant-wide continuous opacity monitor section, it says that the COM compliance percentage is 98.384. Q. Ob Lin course: 90.284 	348 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 2 3	 would have to increase. Q. And the inspections are solely concerning visible emissions? A. Observed emissions, yeah. Q. Okay. I have another document here. This is a presentation. I don't think that's in the book. I will give you guys a second to look through that. That document begins on 13655. MR. WILLIS: Again, we have the two-sided issue that, hopefully, we can resolve in the final day. MR. DAUSCH: Was this previously in discovery? MR. WILLIS: Yes. I mean, the Bates number so far I believe we have it in there somewhere. It relates to questions about presentations. Do you have it in the book? MR. DAUSCH: We don't have it in the book. We are trying to find it. MR. WILLIS: Okay. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Do you want to take our morning break now? MR. WILLIS: Take the break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Does that work for you? 	350

		351			353
1	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Let's go off the record.		1	inspectors would be looking for in terms of visible	
2	(The hearing recessed at 10:22 a.m. and		2	emissions?	
3	reconvened at 10:37 a.m.)		3	A. Yeah, 'cause if it's steam, it wouldn't be	
4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Let's go back on the		4	opacity.	
5	record then.		5	Q. Okay.	
6	BY MR. WILLIS:		6	A. You wouldn't read the steam.	
7	Q. Okay. Dean, if you would flip to the first		7	${\sf Q}.$ And in looking at this document, is this document	
8	inside of the first page of ACHD013655, do you know what		8	based on any sort of EPA method or any methodology for	
9	that document is?		9	making that observation? You can take a look at the	
10	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Are we marking this as		10	document.	
11	ACHD 12?		11	A. Yeah, I was going to say, I haven't really I	
12	MR. WILLIS: Yeah, 12, I believe we are at 12.		12	mean, I recognize that smokestack appears to be from our	
13	MR. DELUCA: A presentation done by Ed Peresie.		13	EPA Smoke School for Method 9 certification.	
14	BY MR. WILLIS:		14	${\sf Q}.$ And you are referring to a page. What page are	
15	Q. Concerning?		15	you looking at?	
16	A. Coke oven emission regulations.	1	16	A. A few of them, actually, but 013656 has two	
17	$Q.\ $ Okay. And I'm showing this to you for the		17	separate stacks; one with white smoke and one with black	
18	benefit of the record and for Mr. Slater. Visible		18	smoke.	
19	emissions are observed on a gradient of from zero to		19	Q. Okay.	
20	100; is that correct?		20	A. But those appear to be the ones from the Smoke	
21	A. Connect.		21	School, which would make sense for Ed to get those ones.	
22	$Q.\;$ And there's a difference between smoke and steam;		22	Q. What is Smoke School?	
23	is that correct?		23	A. Smoke School is Method 9 recertification, which	
24	A. Connect.		24	is done every six months to and then at that point,	
25	Q. And could you describe what that difference is		25	you field certify it to ensure compliance with Method 9.	
1		352			354
1	between smoke and steam?	352	1	${\sf Q}.$ Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke	354
1 2	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of	352	1 2	$\ensuremath{Q}\xspace.$ Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School?	354
1 2 3	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color	352	1 2 3	Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever	354
1 2 3 4	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there.	352	1 2 3 4	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. 	354
1 2 3 4 5	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to	352	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam	352	1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity,	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time.	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steen coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, smoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steen coming out. Stean typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, smoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically engined to ano. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, smoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steen coming out. Steen typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steem. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate.	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yesh, everybody from enforcement goes. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation?	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yesh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obriously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story: but exemptory from enforcement goes. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeah, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, smoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steem coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steem. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yesh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. There have farming plumes. There are all different and the types. 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yees. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeeh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white moke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demandation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. There have faming plumes. There are all different ones. If it is a detached plume, that means it doen't 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeah, everybody from enforcement goes. Coviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing anoke, anoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plune. So the plune comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plune types. Sometimes they — they have detached plunes. There have farming plunes. There are all different comes. If it is a detached plune, that means it doesn't actually combenes until after the stack. The 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yees. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeeh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. Q. For Method 9? 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the ways to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. There have farming plumes. There are all different to come. If it is a detached plume, that means it doesn't actually condense until after the steam. The detached plume the steam of the steam. 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yees. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeah, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. Q. For Method 9? A. Recertified, yes. 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, smoke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the vays to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. There have faming plumes. There are all different comes. If it is a detached plume, that means it doesn't actually combase until after the steak. The demarcation just occurs where the steam ends and then after that would be any emissions. 	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yes. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yesh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obriously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. Q. For Method 9? A. Recertified, yes. Q. Okay, sorry. On the next page, which would be 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 between smoke and steam? A. Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white smoke is the one that's hardest to discern the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically comes out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the smoke. It's one of the yous to differentiate. Q. Where's that demarcation? A. It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Stretc have farming plumes. There are all different to the types. Stretches until after the steak. The image it doesn't actually comesee until after the steak. The steam is is the steam is in the steam is in the steam is is interested is interested. It is is interested is interested is interested. The steam is is is interested is interested is interested. The steam is is is is interested is interested is interested is interested is interested is interested. The steam is is is is is interested is interest	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yee. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeeh, everybody from enforcement goes. Obriously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story: but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. Q. For Method 9? A. Recertified, yee. Q. Okay, sorry. On the next page, which would be 13657, 	354
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	between snoke and steam? A Whenever you are observing moke, moke can be of any color, white, black, blue. It can be any color there. The white snoke is the one that's hardest to discorn the difference between the two. You have steam coming out. Steam typically cones out at high opacity, 100 percent, not all the time. What you look for is set demarcation after the plume. So the plume comes out. If there is a set line where it all stops, then that's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the steam. Then if it continues onward, then it's the steam. Then if it gaps. Sometimes they — they have detached plumes. There are different plume types. Start demarcation? A It can be anywhere. There are different plume types. Start have faming plumes. There are all different to the stually contense until after the steak. The demarcation just occurs where the steam ends and then atter that would be any emissions" is this a	352	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Who in ACHD goes through that goes to Smoke School? A. All of the enforcement staff and then whoever would like to from other sections. Q. Oh, that would include permitting and planning? A. Permitting and planning can if they want to. I don't know the requirements. Q. Okay. Has that happened in the past, where folks from permitting and planning have gone to Smoke School? A. Yee. Q. Okay. But your employees are specifically required to go? A. Yeah, everybody from enforcement goes. Obviously, if you are on vacation that week, it is a different story; but everybody from enforcement goes. Q. How often do they go? A. It's every six months, typically April/October. Q. So twice a year, they have to be certified? A. Correct. Q. For Method 9? A. Recertified, yes. Q. Okay, sorry. On the next page, which would be 13657, A. Okay. 	354

		355	35	,7
1	It seems to be a picture, a cartoon even.	1	1 been seen at the Clairton Coke Works?	
2	A. Yeah, it does look like a cartoon. This is		2 A. Yes.	
3	describing the sun angle, and the sun has to be in that		3 Q. From the doors ever, the battery doors?	
4	140-degree angle behind you.		A. I didn't check the numbers. I don't know for	
5	So you can't be looking directly into the sun,		5 certain.	
6	and it has to be in that line whenever you are doing		6 Q. You don't know?	
7	Method 9.		7 A. I know that there have been high-opacity doors.	
8	Q. Why is that?		3 I don't know if specifically 100 percent has been	
9	A. Well, unless the sun is not out that day. But		listed.	
10	whenever you look directly into the sun, I believe it's	1	Q. What do you mean by "high-opacity doors"?	
11	because the - the opacity changes, where it gets	1	A. Sorry. High-opacity doors are opacity greater	
12	stronger when you are looking into the sun, I believe.	1	2 than the standard, the 40 percent standard or the 30	
13	I forget exactly which direction it goes.	1	percent standard for Battery C in Article 21. There	
14	I just remember that Mathod 9 requires it to be	1	have been a lot of violations of that. I know that they	
15	in that 140-degree angle, unless it is completely	1	have been up to 80 and 90. I just don't know for	
16	overcast, and then the sun wouldn't matter 'cause you	1	5 certain if any were 100. They have been close, at	
17	can't locate it.	1	least.	
18	${\sf Q}.~$ So if you were outside of that 140-degree angle,	1	Q. Okay. For purposes of this	
19	you could get a misreading of the	1	MR. WILLIS: For introducing this document and	
20	A. Yeah.	21) in all fairness to U.S. Steel, a lot of this document	
21	Q of the plume?	2	does not pertain to their facility I would limit its	
22	A. Connect. And it wouldn't be following Method 9,	23	introduction solely to page 13717, which seems to be the	
23	again, unless it's overcast.	23	end of that generalized information regarding	
24	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And on the next page, there seems to be	24	MR. DAUSCH: So which number?	
25	some distinction between two different stacks. Could	25	MR. WILLIS: It is the page that says	
1	you explain this?	356	350 "Questions." It is 13717. So although it goes on to	3
2	A. Yeah. Those are images of a 20-percent opacity	2	13769, we're not going to consider those for purposes of	
3	plume and a 60-percent opacity plume.	3	introduction into evidence.	
4	${f Q}.$ Do you have any idea why those particular numbers	4	MR. DAUSCH: Okay.	
5	were selected?	5	MR. WILLIS: This is Number 12, I believe.	
6	A. Probably because of Article 21 standards, which	e	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is this part of the same	
7	are actually stated at the bottom, "For a period of	1	document that Mr. DeLuca was just looking at?	
8	three or more minutes in any hour up to 20 percent or 60	8	MR. WILLIS: Yes. Oh, I'm sorry, yes, you	
9	percent at any time." That's the Article 21 standard.	9	already designated this one.	
10	Q. Is any part of U.S. Steel Clairton Coke Works	10	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Yeah.	
11	subject to that standard?		MR. WILLIS: Thank you.	
12	A. The continuous opacity monitors, the stacks.	12	MR. DAUSCH: Just so I understand, you are	
13	Q. The stacks. And just so we can go through this	13	offering it just for the purposes of what he discussed	
14	quickly, I'm looking on 13660. It's a little opaque and	14	to demonstrate opacity concepts, not because it's	
15	you can't really read it, but it says, "25 percent."	15	related to any specific U.S. Steel plant or issue?	
16	A. Yes.	16	MR. WILLIS: Correct.	
10	Q. The subsequent page says "50" and then "/5" and		MR. LAUSCH: Then no objection.	
TR	then "IUU." Can you explain what we are looking at		HEARING OFFICER SLATER: SO ACHD 12 is admitted.	
19		19	MK, WILLIC, IIMANK YOU.	
20	A. HILS I HERN, THERE are pictures of operity	20	DI FIR. WILLED:	
21	Lium a Stack, like again probably oliging Shoke School,		A This is Volume 12	
22	answers what 20 percent operatory looks like and then 50	22	O Volume 1 Can vou describe what we are looking	
20	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL PROPERTY A REAL PRO	123	. VOLUME I. COM YOU REPORTED WHELE WE ALE LOUALING	
24	percent charity and its percent charity and then too	24	at here?	
24	percent quarty and is percent quarty and then two percent quarty.	24	A This is useh there are the recally	

	359		
1	calculations for this order.	1	Then those numbers carry back up to the subtotals
2	Q. Is this penalty calculation using the 2018	2	and the total civil penalty, and you make sume that the
3	penalty policy?	3	total civil penalty amount is less than the maximum, the
4	A. Yes.	4	25,000 per violation per day. If it's greater than that
5	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Could you describe what we are looking at	5	number, you have to reduce it to 25,000 per violation
6	in some detail? I'm looking to understand exactly how,	6	per day.
7	for each of these violations, you calculated the	7	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And is this the spreadsheet that's used
8	penalty.	8	for every penalty calculation out of your Department?
9	And in looking at it and correct me if I'm	9	A. Yes.
10	incorrect on this number but there are 18 different	10	Q. Okay. So irrespective of coke ovens or coke
11	violation types?	11	facilities, this would be used for any facility that's
12	A. There are 18 columns.	12	in violation of Article 21?
13	${\bf Q}.$ Eighteen columns. And each column represents a	13	A. Yeah, this is for open burning, stack test, coke
14	type of violation?	14	ovens.
15	A. Or a different severity for that specific	15	Q. Okay. Was this spreadsheet also used with
16	violation. For example, the first three columns are all	16	respect to the penalty policy which existed as of 2017?
17	charging, so they're all going to have the same	17	A. The well, there was a spreadsheet. It was
18	standard. One of them is for major, moderate, and then	18	different than this.
19	low.	19	${\sf Q}.$ Oh, there was a spreadsheet but different?
20	Q. Can you explain major, moderate, and low?	20	A. Yeah. Well, the 20 — the 2018 penalty policy
21	A. Typically when I go through these, I have the	21	has a spreadsheet that matches with the 2018 penalty
22	penalty policy also and look at them both concurrently.	22	policy, and the previous spreadsheet was different than
23	I can do that, but with less detail I can do it without	23	this 'cause it predated the policy.
24	that. I can explain what they are generally.	24	$\mathbf{Q}.$ I see. And in looking just at these
25	$Q.\;$ We're going to get to the penalty policy, but if	25	spreadsheets, it right above where it says "civil
_			

2.5

you can just give me a general understanding as to what 1 2 we are seeing here. We will get to the details with how you calculated each of these with respect to the penalty 3 4 policy, but I want an overview of what we're looking at. 5 A. Okay, yeah. What this would be, this is the 6 violations which are put into any order. There is a 7 calculation spreadsheet to determine the penalty amount 8 for those violations listed in that order. In this 9 case, like you said, there are 18 separate columns. 10 There are different inspection types with different 11 sevenities. The sevenity -- the major sevenity has a 12 higher penalty than moderate severity than a low 13 severity. So that increases the penalty. 14 The potential for harm is the other factor. So 15 the potential for harm number in the severity of 16 violation gives you a range of maximum/minimum penalty, 17 and then that's the subtotal prior to the adjustment. 18 And then beneath that, there are adjustment 19 tables specifically to the source or the situation at 20 hand for the order. You use those adjustment factors 21 based on the policy. 22 There is a separate one for high-opacity doors 23 because in the penalty policy, it's specifically listed 24 for being separate. And the rest - the remainder of 25 them use the first table adjustment.

penalty" in the yellow box, there's an amount that says 1 2 "maximum penalty amount." What is that? 3 A. The first sheet has 350,000. Q. Okay. And the second sheet? 4 5 A. 3,725,000. Q. And the third sheet? 6 7 A. 3,975,000. 8 Q. Okay. What does that represent? 9 A. That is the statutory limit of the 25,000 per 10 violation per day. So if you have 100 violations, the 11 maximum would be 100 violations times the 25,000. 12 Q. I see. So basically, it is the regulatory 13 maximum by which we can impose a penalty? 14 A. Correct. 15 Q. Okay. And that would apply across the board 16 irrespective of the facility? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Okay. And you would agree that the actual civil 19 penalty is substantially less than the maximum 20 admissible regulation? 21 A. Correct. 22 ${\sf Q}.~$ We're going to come back to that, so hold that to 23 the side. 24 If you would turn to Number 18 in the same

binder, can you tell me what we are looking at here?

361

		363	365
1	A. This is a draft order for the fourth quarter of		1 Q. Actually, take a look at this. This is going to
2	2017 for the U.S. Steel Clairton violations.		2 be ACHD 13. Can you describe what we are looking at
3	$Q.\ \mbox{Am}$ I correct this is dated May 10th, 2018?		3 here?
4	A. Correct.		4 A. Okay, let me just look at it real quick here.
5	${\sf Q}.~$ And this is attributable to the fourth quarter of		5 Q. Sure.
6	2017?		6 A. Yeah, this was an e-mail I sent out to the
7	A. Correct.		7 enforcement staff after we had the new penalty policy
8	Q. You said "draft." Why do you say it's a draft?		8 finalized.
9	A. 'Cause we didn't issue it.		9 I wanted everybody to go through — everybody in
10	Q. Do you know why we didn't issue it?		10 the section to go through the actual policy and to see
11	A. We were looking at issuing it and then determined		11 what numbers they came up with individually, and then
12	that the — we needed something beyond just a penalty.		12 with doing it consistently, seeing what the differences
13	So we have a connected action. So we looked at what the		13 were.
14	corrected action would be, and that extended it beyond		14 Q. Okay. And what's the date of this?
15	one initial draft.		10 A. My e-mail was sent out repruary stn.
17	Q. Okay. And the corrective action that you are		16 Q. February 8th?
10	referring to, is that found in the enforcement order?		17 A. February stn or 2018.
10	A. Correct.		10 c. okay, fou would agree that was before the
20	Q. And that's the June 26th, I berreve, enforcement		20 A Yesh the third guarter for Clairton was at the
21	A Yesh definitely late ime		21 and of March constina
22	O Okay And correct me if I'm wrong but there is		Ω So this work had already been done prior to the
23	a two-month gap between this draft and the actual		issuance of the penalty attributable to the third
24	issuance of that enforcement order?	2	24 guarter of 2018?
25	A. A month and a half, two months, yeah.	2	25 A. Yes.
		364	366
1	${\sf Q}_{{\sf \cdot}}$ Can you explain what went on during that time		1 Q. And the purpose of this was to ensure consistency
2	period for that delay?		
-2	period for child detay.		2 in application of the penalty policy?
5	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the
4	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is.		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before
4 5 6	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the
4 5 6 7	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. 		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 ram way, entire if surpose had a different
4 5 6 7 8	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. 		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started poing
4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that 		 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sume everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it.
4 5 6 7 8 9	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it	1	 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. 0. And could you read that last paragraph for me,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the	1	 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sume everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, 1 please?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we ware waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. 	1111	 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. 0 Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, 1 please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there	1 1 1 1	 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. 0 Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, 1 please? 2 A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third 	1 1 1 1 1	 2 in application of the penalty policy? 3 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sume everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. 0 Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, 1 please? 2 A. The one that starts with, "Again"? 3 Q. Yes, please. 4 M. "Again, please do this independently and send it
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? 	1 1 1 1 1 1	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday aftermoon. Not having discussions
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 2 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the 4 enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before 5 using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the 6 same page with it in at least reading everything the 7 same way, seeing if someone had a different 8 interpretation for us to discuss before we started going 9 through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, 1 please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hach't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hach't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we cen see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we ware waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeeh, we would have had to note it before because it want out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sume everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above."
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeeh, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? A. Other than prior to the order issuance, no. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hach't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above." Q. Okay. So again, this was the purpose of
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? A. Other than prior to the order issuance, no. Q. Okay. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hach't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above." Q. Okay. So again, this was the purpose of the them doing it independently was to make sure that
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we ware waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it want out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? A. Other than prior to the order issuance, no. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Do you have that? 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above." Q. Okay. So again, this was the purpose of the them doing it independently with each other?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? A. Other than prior to the order issuance, no. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Do you have that? MR. DAUSCH: No. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	 in application of the penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hach't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sure everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we cen see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above." Q. Okay. So again, this was the purpose of the them doing it independently was to make sure that they were doing it consistently with each other? A. Yee, across the section.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. We've had analysis of what the corrective action would be, determining what that correct action is. And then by the time we finalized all that and came into agreement with it, the first quarter of 2018, we had all that information already there. So we decided to put the fourth quarter of 2017 and the first quarter of 2018 into one order. So that delayed it another, I don't know, duration, but it delayed it further because we were waiting to put the first quarter of '18 into it also. Q. Okay. And by that time, had you noted that there had been some sort of error with respect to the third quarter penalty assessment? A. Yeah, we would have had to note it before because it went out as part of that order. Q. Do you remember when that error came to light with respect to the third quarter? A. Other than prior to the order issuance, no. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Do you have that? MR. WILLIS: That's for you. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy? A. Yeah, it was a penalty policy that the enforcement engineers hadn't seen before. So before using that, I wanted to make sume everybody was on the same page with it in at least reading everything the same way, seeing if someone had a different interpretation for us to discuss before we started going through with it. Q. And could you read that last paragraph for me, please? A. The one that starts with, "Again"? Q. Yes, please. A. "Again, please do this independently and send it back to me by Monday afternoon. Not having discussions with anyone about this calculation is important so I/we can see the variation penalty amounts, especially because this violation has more subjectivity than any others will. All the relevant information is above." Q. Okay. So again, this was the purpose of the them doing it independently was to make sure that they were doing it consistently with each other? A. Yes, across the section. Q. Okay.

T

		367	369
1	wasn't looking for identical amounts, just the same		1 Q. Okay. Again, using 2016, because that's the
2	procedure,		2 beginning of the consent judgment, and at least with
3	MR. WIILLIS: I would introduce just this first		3 respect to Q1 of 2016, how many non-stipulated
4	page. For whatsver reason, there are just additional		4 violations were there?
5	documents that were attached to it that should not have		5 A. Q1 of '16 is an interesting quarter. There are
6	been.		o only there are four listed there. That was because
7	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: The first page of A13?		7 the consent judgment affected anything of which the
8	MR. WILLIS: Yes.	8	B Department would have been aware of as of the date of
9	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection, Mr.	5	by the judgment, would not have been stipulated through the
10	Dausch?	10) quarterly enforcement.
11	MR. DAUSCH: Are the pages after it the	13	Q. Okay. What effect did that have?
12	attachment to the e-mail?	12	A. That decreased the number of violations. It
13	MR. WILLIS: Oh.	13	discounted anything from January and February and then
14	BY MR. WILLIS:	14	parts of May I'm sorry, parts of March.
15	Q_{\star} Answer that. I suppose that could be the case,	15	Q. And is that because there was a penalty
16	Are these the actual attachments? I hadn't realized	10	5 contemplated to cover those?
17	that.	17	A. I don't remember exactly. It had something to do
18	A. I know the first one is not. Let me go through	18	with the wording of the 2016 judgment.
19	the rest.	19	Q. Okay, fair enough. I'm not going to press your
20	Q. Okay.	20) mind on that.
21	MR. PARKER: The following page, ACHD4905, has	21	But you would agree that by the third quarter of
22	some Excel spreadsheet attachments. So I believe those	22	2017, which this order contemplates, that number had
23	are the attachments to the e-mail on the following page,	23	substantially increased?
24	not the e-mail from	24	A. Yes.
		368	370
1	being Exhibit 13.	1	A. In the third quarter of '17, correct.
2	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A13 is admitted.	2	Q. And those were not captured by the 2016 Consent
3	BY MR. WILLIS:	3	Judgment?
4	Q_{\star} Could you take a look at this packet that I'm	4	A. No, these are just the ones that are not
5	about to give to you, sir?	5	stipulated penalties going through the quarterly
6	MR. WILLIS: What are we up to, 13?	6	enforcement.
7	COURT REPORTER: 14.	/	Q. In terms of consistency, these are still the same
8	MK. WILLIS: 14.	8	violations which you would have issued a penalty for
10	BY MR. WILLIS:	9	prior to the 2016 consent Judgment?
10	Q. There's a lot in here, but I would like to sort	10	A. Prior to 2016, year, those would be the same ones
12	or go through it. What are we looking at on the first		as they would be in 2015, year.
12	page, 11 you could describe it for me, please: That	12	Q. Okay. Now, Thip the page, what are we looking
11	A Char: This is a table and a graph of the matter	1.0	A main is the mighting of the granterly
15	A. Usay. This is a cause and a graph of the million	15	A. His is de calculation of the quartery
16	an formation was were encoured unough the granterry	15	aning had until the first guarter of 2014
17	Mainten plant from first guarter of 12 - til the first	17	These are facility-wide compliance numbers?
10	anarton of 118	10	Δ Yeah this is the compliance The compliance indicates:
10	And what does it represent?	10	exercitically states have to do the calculation. So this
20	A. The mather of molations which would have been	20	is that calculation per the policy.
21	penalized into quarterly enformenent actions, and then	21	O. Per the current policy?
22	the right is simply a bar chart with the number of	2.2	A. Per the 2018 policy, ves. And it is backdated to
23	violations with a trend line.	23	previous months, yes.

24

25

Q. And what is the trend?

A. Increasing number of violations.

Q. So you applied the 2018 policy against 2015, 2016

25 violations and 2014 violations in this sheet?

		3/1			373
1	A. In this sheet, yes. But those orders would have		1	MR. WILLIS: That's all I have on that one.	
2	already been sent out prior to the penalty policy.		2	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the	
3	Q. Okay. So this is an inaccurate representation of		3	admission of ACHD 14?	
4	the compliance percentages?		4	MR. DAUSCH: My suggestion would be that we make	
5	A. Did you say "inaccurate," or		5	just the first page of this an exhibit, ACHD 14 which	
6	Q. Is it inaccurate because we are using a different		6	was the front and back, because the others are already	
7	penalty policy for those years?		7	exhibits.	
8	A. I'm not sume what you mean by that. I mean,		8	MR. WILLIS: Yeah, I was trying to figure out a	
9	these numbers here are if 2014 had the 2018 penalty	- 1	9	plan.	
10	policy I will just use an example.		10	MR. DAUSCH: We have the correct exhibits for the	
11	The first quarter of 2014 has a compliance of		11	other ones. I'm not sure that we know that those are	
12	99.39 percent. That is the compliance if the 2018		12	the final versions. So exhibit USS 14 has the	
13	penalty policy had been effective then, and it showed		13	spreadsheets that were for all of the dates at issue.	
14	that the plant exceeded that 99-cercent threshold that's		14	MR. WILLIS: Wait a minute. This one is a draft.	
15	listed in the penalty policy		15	It has notations on it.	
16	O so that's actually pretty good I mean we are		16	MR DAUSCH. It's mine This is the final	
17	looking at 2014 01 and it looks as though they were at		17	THE PROOF, IT STUDE, THIS IS ON THAT	
18	100 km at 2014 gr, and it 100 ks as though they were at		19	MD WILLIG, This is where?	
10	bish surban is 00.20 second		10	MR. WILLIS: IIIS IS WRETE:	
19	A comment		20	MR. LEUDON; 14.	
20	A. contect.		20	MR. WILLUIS: 14?	
21	Q. correct? That's employing the current policy?		21	MR. LAUSCH: Tean.	
22	A. Yeah, to the - to the inspections that occurred		22	MR. WILLIS: So you're saying that these are	
23	at that point if the 2018 policy had been there.		23	already in 14?	
24	Q. All right. If you look to 13877 all the way		24	MR. DAUSCH: Un-huh (affirmative,)	
25	through 13882, could you describe what we are looking at		25	MR. WILLIS: Okay, that's fair.	
1 2	here? A. Okay. These are the inspections for the fourth		1 2	MR. DAUSCH: So just the first two pages. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. So yeah, ACHD 14	
3	quarter of 2017 that were violations at Clairton.		2		
4			3	is admitted with the note with just the first two pages.	
5	Q. By inspection type?		3	is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS:	
	Q. By inspection type?A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each		3 4 5	is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going	
6	Q. By inspection type?A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the		3 4 5 6	is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document?	
6 7	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming 		3 4 5 6 7	<pre>is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it</pre>	
6 7 8	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same 		3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven</pre>	
6 7 8 9	Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order.		3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I 	
6 7 8 9 10	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't 	
6 7 8 9 10	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. 	
6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I dich't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? 		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this?</pre>	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13862 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. O. Do we always give them a breakdown of the 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file viewer the coke oven inspectors enter the information. 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 L6	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the number of inspections, number of compliant inspections. 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13862 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Kistorically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the 		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I dich't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the runber of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the compliant percentage and this is broken 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. By inspection type? A. Connect, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the perartment is not taking any action with respect to 		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I dich't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the number of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the compliant percentage and this is broken down in the Excel format for each battery in a plant 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yeah. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the Department is not taking any action with respect to soaking at batteries 1. 2 and 3? 		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the runber of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the compliant percentage and this is broken down in the Excel format for each battery in a plant total. 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13862 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Kistorically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the Department is not taking any action with respect to soaking at batteries 1, 2 and 3? A. Correct. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I dich't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the runber of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the compliant percentage and this is broken down in the Excel format for each battery in a plant total. Q. Is this just for 2018? 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the Department is not taking any action with respect to soaking at batteries 1, 2 and 3? A. Correct. Q. Is that because of the 2016 Consent Judgment? 		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the number of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the Excel format for each battery in a plant total. Q. Is this just for 2018? A. It just has January, February, March, and April 	
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Q. By inspection type? A. Correct, as inspection type, and then within each inspection type by date. And these would just be the violations that would have been put into the — assuming that they are the same version, these would be the same ones put in the order. Q. And at the top of 13882 it says, "Exhibit A." Is this something that would have gone to U.S. Steel? A. Yes. Q. As a part of a penalty? A. Yesh. Q. Do we always give them a breakdown of the penalties as we assess them? A. Historically, yes. I believe this one may have been missed with the orders. I think I sent it in after, but I'm not positive. Q. And at the bottom of 13882, it indicates that the bepartment is not taking any action with respect to soaking at batteries 1, 2 and 3? A. Correct. Q. Is that because of the 2016 Consent Judgment? 		4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 3 4 25	 is admitted with the note with just the first two pages. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. All right. Can you take a look at what is going to be Exhibit 15? Did you generate this document? A. I created the spreadsheet and then transferred it over for the 2018 calendar year, and then the coke oven inspectors enter the data into the spreadsheet. So I created the actual spreadsheet itself, but I didn't enter all the data. Q. Okay. What are we looking at, if you can help describe this? A. Okay, yeah, 14441, this is part of the Excel file where the coke oven inspectors enter the information. And listed on here on the left side is simply the data entry portion of it. And then the right side, as an example, this is Clairton Battery B and the months, the number of inspections, number of compliant inspections, and then the compliant percentage and this is broken down in the Excel format for each battery in a plant total. Q. Is this just for 2018? A. It just has January, February, March, and April for 2018. At least no inspections were dree here in 	

		375		377
1	May.		1 anything else.	
2	Q. Can we take away from that the fact that this is		2 Q. Oh, okay. So for purposes of compliance with the	
3	just solely this was generated or created after		3 enforcement order, this would be incomplete data?	
4	well, after the issuance of the enforcement order on	1	4 A. Connect.	
5	appeal?		5 Q. Okay.	
6	A. Depends on how far it goes, 'cause the order		6 MR. WILLIS: I would admit that.	
7	would have been issued the order was issued June 28th		7 HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to A15?	
8	and this appears just to go to the end of April. So I'd		8 MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	
9	assume all the data in here would have been entered		9 HEARING OFFICER SLATER: AL5 is admitted.	
10	prior to the order.		10 BY MR. WILLIS:	
11	Q_{\star} Could you review the full document and go through		Q. For whatever reason, the Bates labeling is	
12	this?		12 upsidedown on this document. Take a look at that.	
13	A. In detail?		HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This will be A16?	
14	Q. Just scan		4 MR. WILLIS: 16, please.	
15	A. Just scroll through?		5 BY MR. WILLIS:	
16	Q. Yeah, just scroll through.		Q. Can you tell me what we are looking at here with	
17	A. And I'm just checking to see if it's the same		17 these documents?	
18	timeframe?		A. This is historical compliance data for the U.S.	
19	Q. Yes, please.	:	9 Steel Clairton plant for pushing and travel. I don't	
20	A. So it looks like it goes up until April 30th for	1	20 think anything else would be on that. Okay, yeah, so	
21	the doors. Yeah, so this is January 1st, 2019 until	1	1 pushing and travel compliance data for U.S. Steel	
22	April 30th, 2018, the coke oven inspections for ACHD's	2	2 Clairton from 1989 to 2017.	
23	entries into the Excel sheets.	2	Q. Take a look at, for an example, page 14581 to	
24	${\sf Q}.~$ Is it fair to say that this presents the	2	4 A. Battery 13?	
25	compliance percentages for each of the inspection types?	12	Q_{\star} . Is that what that represents? I'm looking at the	
		376		378
1 2 3	A. Yeah, for the months listed.Q. Is it broken down by battery?A. This	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. D. From 2014 to 2016 is that chart saving that 	378
1 2 3 4	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? 	378
1 2 3 4 5	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first. 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeeh. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 	378
1 2 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. 	378
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for charging. So 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 96.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for charging. So this is split up by inspection type. 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. These numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for charging. So this is split up by inspection type. Q. Ch, okay. 	376	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for changing. So this is split up by inspection type. Q. Oh, okay. A. Yeah, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for changing. So this is split up by inspection type. Q. Oh, okay. A. Yeah, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACED and then 1 and 2. So that's what I meen by that. 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for changing. So this is split up by inspection type. Q. Oh, okay. A. Yeah, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACHD and then 1 and 2. So that's what I mean by that. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first stast; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. That would be the plant total for charging. So this is split up by inspection type. Q. Oh, okay. A. Yeah, Like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACD and then 1 and 2. So that's what I mean by that. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good representation of what would be the baseline on a per- 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 done by ACED for that year, for those two years. Q. Similarly on ACHD014584, it looks as though there 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. Yeah, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACHD and then 1 and 2. So that's what I mean by that. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good representation of what would be the baseline on a perinspection type basis? 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 98.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 done by ACHD for that year, for those two years. Q. Similarly on ACHD014584, it looks as though there 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yesh, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first steet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. Yeah, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from 200 ch, okay. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good representation of what would be the baseline on a perinspection type basis? A. For ACED's partion, yeah. 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 96.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 done by ACHD for that year, for those two years. Q. Similarly on ACHD014584, it looks as though there was a dip from 2014 to 2016 and the pushing compliance? A. Yeah. Are you looking at 19 battery? 	378
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yesh, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first sheet; but other than that, yesh. Q. The first sheet? A. Yesh, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2, Battery 3. And this 14441 starts at Battery 2. That's the only difference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one that A. Yesh, like 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACHD and then 1 and 2. So that's what I meen by that. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good representation of what would be the baseline on a perinspection type basis? A. For ACHD's portion? 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeah. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 90.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a — the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 done by ACHD for that year, for those two years. Q. Similarly on ACHD014584, it looks as though there was a dip from 2014 to 2016 and the pushing compliance? A. Yeah. Are you looking at 19 battery? Q. Yes. 	378
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	 A. Yeah, for the months listed. Q. Is it broken down by battery? A. It is. Q. Okay. A. It seems like it might be missing the first steet; but other than that, yeah. Q. The first sheet? A. Yeah, 'cause typically, I have this set up where it goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2. That's the goes by plant total, then Battery 1, Battery 2. That's the one ydifference. Q. The plant total numbers, those were encapsulated in a prior exhibit, I believe. Did you recall the one totat A. Yaah, Jike 14446 shows the Clairton doors from ACD and then 1 and 2. So that's what I mean by that. Q. Is it fair to say that this is a good representation of what would be the baseline on a perionspection type basis? A. For ACD's portion, yeah. Q. Just for ACHD's portion? A. Yeah. This is not incorporating Yeramida or 	376 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 chart that is next to the table. A. Okay. Q. From 2014 to 2016, is that chart saying that there is decreased compliance in terms of percentages? A. Yeeh. If you look at the tables on the left and then match them up with the charts, you have 2014 for Battery 13 pushing was 96.1 percent compliant; and then 2015, it was 94.7; and then down to 86.7 in 2016. Q. Okay. And just so we have a — the percentages are fairly high; you would agree with that? I mean, it looks like for 2016, the percentage is 86.7 percent; and then 2017, which did not make its way on the chart, is 97.5 percent compliant; is that correct? A. Those numbers are, yes. Q. Okay. And that's over 128 inspections for 2016 and 120 inspections for 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for that inspection type? A. That would be pushing inspections on Battery 13 done by ACHD for that year, for those two years. Q. Similarly on ACHD014584, it looks as though there was a dip from 2014 to 2016 and the pushing compliance? A. Yees. A. Yees. 	378

Γ

		379		381
1	Q. And again, over those years, you're looking at	1	A. Connect.	
2	over 400 inspections from 2014 to 2017 or 2016 per	2	Q. So based on 2014, there was decreased compliance	
3	the chart?	3	over 2016-2017?	
4	A. Yeah, 2014 to 2016, there is a total of greater	4	A. Yeah. 2014 was better than 2015, which is better	
5	than 400 inspections.	5	than 2016, and then 2017 was better than 2016 but still	
6	Q. But along with that, there are about 100 and	6	worse than '15.	
7	estimating I'm sorry, for that same period, there is	7	Q. And worse than '14?	
8	approximately 340 violations?	8	A. Connect, yeah, '14 was definitely the best.	
9	A. Compliant inspections.	9	Q. Moving to moving backwards, we are going to go	
10	O. Oh, compliant inspections? Thank you for	10	to 14599. This is regarding Battery 3, soaking	
11	correcting that.	11	compliance percentages.	
12	A. About 60 or so violations, 60 or 70.	12	A. Okav.	
13	O. Okay If we flip to 14587, this is Battery C	13	Q. Would you agree that over 2014 to 2017, there was	
14	which is I believe the newest hatten/?	14	at least a decrease in compliance percentare?	
15	A Correct that's the perset	15	A Vog	
16	 Okry And up have protive high compliance purpose 	16	• Not for Battory 2 socking there are a	
17	there as uply compared?	17	decrease in section compliance percentage?	
10	A many and an analysis that the TO and OT	1/	decrease in soaking compliance percentages:	
18	A. Inese numbers are greater than the 78 and 87	18	A. Yean. Battery 2 was a decrease each year,	
19	percent than the other batteries.	19	actually.	
20	MR. WILLIS: Okzy, that's all I have with those.	20	Q. Okay. Moving again backwards to 14597, would you	
21	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the		agree that there was a decrease in compliance percentage	
22	admission of ACHD 16?	22	from 2014 to 2017 for soaking at Battery J?	
23	MR. DAUSCH: No objection,	23	A. Yeah, another decreasing compliance percentage.	
24	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 16 is admitted.	24	Q. Now, taking that as a whole, if we were to look	
25	MR. WILLIS: For this exhibit, we are only	25	at the entire facility, would you agree, and this is in	
		380		382
1 2	concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page.	380 1 2	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant-	382
1 2 3	concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS:	380 1 2 3	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant-wide?	382
1 2 3 4	concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600	380 1 2 3 4	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance.	382
1 2 3 4 5	concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay.	380 1 2 3 4 5	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you.	382
1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document.	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct?</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13.</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17?	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections,</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Fattery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted.	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct?</pre>	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. BY MR. WILLIS:	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yesh, the inspections increased by 15. The 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1.</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit?</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yesh, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit?</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yesh, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plant- wide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does.</pre>	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does. Q. Do you pay attention to work practices as a part 	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does. Q. bo you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? 	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeeh, our section does. Q. Do you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? A. It's not typically part of the quarterly 	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Ckay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? A. Correct. Q. And the preceding year in 2016, which was also 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does. Q. bo you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? A. It's not typically part of the quarterly enforcement. It is a condition of Article 21 that could 	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Okay. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? A. Correct. Q. And the preceding year in 2016, which was also subject to well, scratch that. 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 1?? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section closs. Q. bo you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? A. It's not typically part of the quarterly enforcement. It is a condition of Article 21 that could be enforced. 	382
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 22 22 22 22	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Caray. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yesh, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? A. Correct. Q. And the preceding year in 2016, which was also subject to well, scratch that. In 2016, you had 159 inspections that resulted in 	380 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. V.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does. Q. Do you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? A. It's not typically part of the quarterly enforcement. It is a condition of Article 21 that could be enforced. Q. If you are aware of an issue with respect to work 	382
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	 concerned about 14596 through 14608. I will try to clean that up in post and take care of that cover page. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. This is going to be 17. If you look at 14600 A. Caray. Q. For 2014, there was only one violation per 165 inspections; is that correct? A. Yes. This is Battery 13. Q. Thank you. Yet, in 2017, we had 180 inspections, 28 or so or 15 or so more inspections. Yet, there were 24 violations; is that correct? A. Yeah, the inspections increased by 15. The violations increased by 23. Q. Okay. Similarly, on the preceding page or the subsequent page, 14601, concerning Battery 14 soaking compliance, in 2014 there was 120 inspections but only one violation? A. Correct. Q. Yet, in 2017, there were 195 inspections and 27 violations? A. Correct. Q. And the preceding year in 2016, which was also subject to well, scratch that. In 2016, you had 159 inspections that resulted in 36 violations; is that correct? 	380 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	 reference to 14596, there was a decrease in the compliance percentage with respect to soaking plantwide? A. Yeah, there was a decreased compliance. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: That's all I have for that document. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the admission of ACHD 17? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 17 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look to Exhibit 30 in the binder? I think it's Volume 1. A. U.S. Steel Clairton's permit? Q. Yes, sir. As the chief of enforcement, did you enforce the permit conditions which are that exist in this permit? A. Yeah, our section does. Q. Do you pay attention to work practices as a part of that? J. It's not typically part of the quarterly enforcement. It is a condition of Article 21 that could be enforced. Q. If you are aware of an issue with respect to work practices or maintenance and operations of a facility. 	382

		383			203
1	would you take enforcement action with respect to that?		1	A. Okay.	
2	A. We have in the past and we definitely could. On		2	Q could you read "B"?	
3	the ones that are more there's a certain subjectivity		3	A. Yeah, "68: As required by 63.6(e)(1)(i,) the	
4	to an operation maintenance violation. With that level		4	permittee shall operate and maintain each coke battery,	
5	of subjectivity, I would probably refer to Jayme Graham,		5	including air pollution control and monitoring	
6	the department manager, to make sure it's going to go in		6	equipment, in a manner consistent with good air	
7	that direction before we issue an enforcement order		7	pollution control practices for minimizing emissions at	
8	or violation.		8	least to the levels required by 40 CFR, Part 63, Subpart	
9	Q. What		9	5C."	
10	A. But yes, it's enforceable.		10	Q. And is there a citation to Article 21 with that?	
11	Q. What would lead you, in terms of conditions or		11	A. Two citations, it appears.	
12	the environment at a facility, what would lead you to go		12	Q. Which ones would those be?	
13	to Javme Graham with an issue regarding work practices		13	A. 2103.12.k and 2103.12.h.6.	
14	or operations?		14	O. Thank you. I'm going to give you what is ACHD	
15	A. Work practices are a little bit more, we will		15	18. Do you recognize this e-mail?	
16	call it. or av. It's not as defined on what a cood work		16	A. I need to read it. It brings back manyries	
17	mantino is		17	anab	
18	So if we are anothing that is an up - a had		18	• Could you tall me what this a-mail is about?	
10			10	A It was a small that I sant to Colors Datis and	
20	work practice of a new environmental work practice, we		20	A. It was an evial that I set to conservation	
20	would have by - I would rather get the herager's		20	This is free Sentenber 14th 2016	
21	approval to go that direction before issuing an order.		21	De une verscher ihr verscheid?	
22	For the typical quarterly - fortunately, typical		22	Q. Do you remember why you sent this?	
23	quarterly violations, those ones, it's clear-out. It's		23	A. I believe I'm trying to recall here. I	
24	a violation of 210521A. We know the charging condition		24	believe this was for if we had odor complaints in the	
25	- as an example, it embeds that charging limit.		25	community, then we were going to send them on to U.S.	
1	That's an easier one.	384	1	Steel so that they could respond accordingly and see if	386
2	Operation and maintenance, some of these other		2	they could find a cause of that odor.	
3	ones are a little bit more I want to make sure the				
4			3	Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection?	
	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for		3 4	Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection?A. I don't recall.	
5	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance.		3 4 5	Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection?A. I don't recall.Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of	
5 6	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some		3 4 5 6	Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection?A. I don't recall.Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have	
5 6 7	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how		3 4 5 6 7	Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection?A. I don't recall.Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge?	
5 6 7 8	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate.		3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 	
5 6 7 8 9	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class.		3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Ch, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the 	
5 6 7 8 9	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class		3 4 5 7 8 9	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then 	
5 6 7 8 9 10	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate?		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Ch, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes.		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit,		3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; "cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says,		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Ch, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; "cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Ch, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that odor; and if we had the citizens confirming that odor 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that odor existed, we could have done an odor violation for that. 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you read letter A? 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could have done an odor violation for that, vesh. It is a little bit of a harder threshold to reach 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you read letter A? A. "Ooke oven batteries 1, 2 and 3 shall be procenter." 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; "cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that odor; and if we had the citizens confirming that odor existed, we could have done an odor violation for that, yeah. It is a little bit of a harder threshold to reach the odor violation, but 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you read letter A? A. "Coke oven batteries 1, 2 and 3 shall be properly maintained and operated at all times approxime to cond 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that odor existed, we could have done an odor violation for that, yeeh. It is a little bit of a harder threshold to reach the odor violation, but Q. Why is that? 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Correct. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you read letter A? A. "Ooke oven batteries 1, 2 and 3 shall be properly maintained and operated at all times according to good expinenting and air pollution control vertices " 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the bottom, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could determine the origination point of that odor existed, we could have done an odor violation for that, yeah. It is a little bit of a harder threshold to reach the odor violation, but Q. Why is that? 	
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Department is in agreement before we issue anything for operation and maintenance. Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you had some training with respect to coke ovens and particularly how they operate. A. Yeah, at the Canada class. Q. The Canada class. And that was a week-long class which entailed basically an instruction as to how a properly functioning coke facility should operate? A. That was definitely a part of it, yes. Q. Okay. If you turn to page 59 of that permit, that's a section in looking at Number 6, it says, "Work practice standards"? A. Onrect. Q. This relates to coke ovens batteries 1, 2 and 3; would you agree? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Could you read letter A? A. "Coke oven batteries 1, 2 and 3 shall be properly maintained and operated at all times according to good engineering and air pollution control practices." 		3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Q. Was this ever followed up by an inspection? A. I don't recall. Q. Given that it was one complaint that was of concern here, is this something that we could have enforced against, to your knowledge? A. Oh, I don't think this is only one complaint; 'cause the second paragraph, it says, "Following in the body is two of the complaints received today." And then the botton, "received at least 10 other similar complaints today where stated odors were observed either overnight or this morning." Q. Is there any way that we could have done an odor investigation on site based on the fact that it's alleged that they were overnight or morning? A. We could have done observations offsite and seen if we could have done an odor violation for that, yeah. It is a little bit of a harder threshold to reach the odor violation, but Q. Why is that? A. Just because we have to do a full method with it. 	

1 2	We can't take the citizens' words earing it emails had			
2	The carry transfer and carry and the second		those categories. Could you explain why there is a	
-	and write an order based off that. It has to be	2	number system in there?	
3	Department-observed. So we have to actually observe it	3	A. Yeah, those there is also the calculation	
4	and confirm it with citizens that it exists, that it is	4	sheet, which would be the first portion of this guidance	
5	the same odor they are smelling.	5	document. This is a second tab to it. And in that	
6	${\sf Q}.~$ Do we get a lot of odor complaints overnight?	e	sheet, there are separate categories going down.	
7	A. We get a lot of odor complaints. A lot of them	7	The first group incorporated maybe six or seven	
8	happen overnight, yeah, early mornings.	8	of these that was zero, one, or two. And then all of	
9	${\sf Q}.~$ Do we have any in the region of Clairton Coke	9	these numbers were factored into the maximum potential.	
10	Works?	10	penalty, and it was basically graded downward from	
11	A. Sorry, what was that?	11	there.	
12	${\sf Q}.$ Do we get a lot of complaints originating in the	12	So if you were at the maximum rate for	
13	area surrounding Clairton Coke Works?	13	everything, that would come up with the meximum penalty;	
14	A. I don't look at the complaints anymore because	14	and then anything lower than that decreased it	
15	there are too many of them, but I know we get complaints	15	numerically.	
16	throughout the whole county.	16	Q. And this is all you had prior to 2018 in terms of	
17	There are definitely complaints which come in	17	determining a penalty to be assessed?	
18	from Clairton. I don't know how many.	18	A. For coke ovens, yes. We had a separate one for	
19	Q. Okay. But this, at least, puts Clairton on	19	non-coke ovens.	
20	notice that we will be providing them with that	20	Q. Turn to the next exhibit, 12.	
21	information as we receive it?	21	A. Okay.	
22	A. Definitely at this time, yes.	22	Q. What are we looking at here?	
23	Q. Okav. Is that consistent to what we do now?	23	A. This is the 2018 ACHD penalty policy. It looks	
24	A. I don't know if we are still sending that out or	24	like it has some pages after the policy too, but	
25	not. I would have to talk to current staff.	25	O. Where does that begin?	
1		388	A	390
1	MR. WILLIS: Inat's all I have for that one.		A. 12929.	
2	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the		Q. Okay. Now, this penalty policy is 17 pages in	
3	ACTUSSION OF ACHD 18?	3	length; is that correct?	
4	MR. LALSCH: NO ODJECTION.	4	A. correct.	
5	HEAKING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 18 is admitted.	5	Q. And the prior penalty policy was two pages in	
7	MR. WILLIS: I think you guys have this, but I	0	length, correct?	
0	don't know where. This is the old guidelines.		A. rear, yes.	
0	MR. LAUSCH: II.	0	Q. why the huge difference between the volume of	
9	BY MR. WILLIS:	9	these policies? What is going on that is so different	
10	Q. Please turn to Exhibit 11 and describe what we	10	iran the new policy to the old?	
10	are looking at with respect to Exhibit II.		A. It incorporates a lot more. It was written with	
12	A. This - yeah, this is the calculation guidance	12	legal assistance. It incorporated supplemental and	
13	specifically for coke overs prior to the 2018 penalty	13	environmental projects. It incorporated more or a	
14	policy.	14	description as to now violations should be counted, the	
15	Q. So this is the old guidance that we have?	15	number or violations, 1'm just going through it	
16	A. Yes. It's not the old, yes, but it is a prior	10	the economic benefit portion of it. It goes into a lot	
10	one to 2018.		more detail than the prior one did.	
18	Q. You would agree there is really not much to it?	18	Q. So it is fair to say that this is a far more	
19	A. No. The front and back is one sheet and then	19	comprehensive policy than the previous policy that was	
20	there was a separate tab I put in there in case anyone	20	in place?	
21 1	wanted to use it, the calculations.	21	A. Yeah, yeah. This one also includes the proceedure	
	${\bf Q}.$ Could you explain the numbering system with	22	which I know I use, and I'm sure a lot of the engineers	
22	respect to this one? It looks as though for each of	23	also use, whenever they are creating the penalty	
22 23			alles had a second statement of the	
22 23 24	these categories, health effects, impacts on public,	24	policies, creating the penalties; going through step by	

		391		555
1	and then putting that into the spreadsheet.		l observed and issued as penalties in the order on appeal?	
2	${f Q}.$ So instead of having merely a 012, there is		2 A. Yes, those are the inspections.	
3	actually a full description that would appear. Let's		3 Q. Okay. Now, do you typically send out — and I	
4	take, for example, severity of violation. The severity		4 think you may have mentioned this before do you	
5	of violation under the old policy is basically 012 with		5 typically send out this information with a violation or	
6	some description to it. If you look at the new policy		6 Notice of Violation?	
7	under Exhibit 12, it is an entire table.		7 A. Yeah, the standard procedure would be to send out	
8	A. Connect.		8 the inspections with the order.	
9	${\sf Q},\;\; {\sf Does}\; {\sf that}\; {\sf make}\; {\sf it}\; {\sf more}\; {\sf comprehensive}\; {\sf or}\; {\sf less}\;$		9 Q. And is that to allow the source to understand the	
10	comprehensive than the old policy?	1	0 nature of the violations?	
11	A. It incorporates more information into it, so it's	1	A. It is a little bit different for ooke ovens	
12	nore comprehensive.	1	2 because of the quantity of violations each quarter. But	
13	Q. And it contemplates different types of sources	1	3 we want to make sure we are on the same - so we issue	
14	with respect to the severity, it's not merely just coke	1	all of the violations with - well, the inspection data	
15	ovens that are involved with this?	1	for the violations with the order itself, and it would	
16	A. Correct, yeah. This is used for the Air Owality	1	do it in table form.	
17	Program.	1	7 If it is a visible emission inspection at a stack	
18	0. In fact, the third column on the or the third	1	for a different type of plant, we may include the full	
19	row in this table refers to open burning violations: is		inspection sheet with it. So hereuse of the number we	
20	that correct?	2	(an't inverse all of these inspection sheets We	
21	A Correct.	2	symptize them in the tables	
22	O Is there anything in here specifically geared	2	O I see Ind the recipients of this e-mail are:	
22	ta and aska appag	2	Vike Druzieke Tepelle Scheetz Bill Clark and NO	
23	A To this consists of sighting toble?	2	Departs	
25	A. In this severity of violation table	2		
25	Q. In the severity of violation table.	23	A. Mike Dzuminko 1 don't know the exact titles,	
-				
		202		204
1	A the star at the first and refers to a sate	392	but Mile Develops in the band of Mar 1511 av	394
1	A. The star note on the first row refers to a note		DUC MIKE DZUFINKO IS CHE NEBO OF MON VALLEY	
2	For it and a Win this factor for deterministics of		The invested for U.C. Sheel and then Tapella Orbesta in	
2	for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of	2	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is	
2	for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries."	2	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is	
234	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table?</pre>	3	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD.	
2 3 4 5	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row.</pre>	2	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonalle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or	
2 3 4 5 6	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonalle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised	
2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens.</pre>	2 3 4 5 7 7 8	Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 7 7 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonalle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail.</pre>	2 3 4 5 7 8 7 8 9 10 11	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket menager uses 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both.</pre>	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14,</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS:</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Arything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enformement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. T'n not certain. I just know that the e-mails 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get acamed onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. I'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually mekes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. T'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enformement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. Two certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row? Q. The first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on Jine 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you describe the attachments?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket menager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. T'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. M. WILLIS: Again, we have the issue with the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you describe the attachments? A. Yee, it is the first quarter of 2018, the fourth</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Arything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. T'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. M. WIILIS: Again, we have the issue with the two-sided printing. We are only concerned with ACHD's 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row. Q. The first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you describe the attachments? A. Yee, it is the first quarter of 2019, the fourth quarter of 2017, and the third quarter of 2017</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enformement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually mekes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. I'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. M. WIILIS: Again, we have the issue with the two-sided printing. We are only concerned with ACHD's 7210. Again, at the end, we will get together as a 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row? A. Yeeh. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you describe the attachments? A. Yee, it is the first quarter of 2018, the fourth quarter of 2017, and the third quarter of 2017 inspection data.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get scanned onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. Then not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. M. WIILLIS: Again, we have the issue with the two-sided printing. We are only concerned with ACHD's 7210. Again, at the end, we will get together as a collective and try to sort that out. 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>for it saying, "Use this factor for determination of high-opacity door violations on coke batteries." Q. Okay. Where is that referenced in the table? A. It's the first row? A. Yeah. And o is the only part that has anything specific to coke ovens. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: You may have this data. If you have the data, then I would just go with the e-mail. MR. DAUSCH: We have both. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. WILLIS: You have both, okay. MR. DAUSCH: 14. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Could you look at Number 14 in the booklet? Could you identify that e-mail? A. This is an e-mail that I sent to Mike Dzurinko and Jonelle Scheetz on June 29th, 2018. Q. It shows there are several attachments. Can you describe the attachments? A. Yee, it is the first quarter of 2017, and the third quarter of 2017, inspection data. Q. And that relates to the violations which were</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Environmental for U.S. Steel and then Jonelle Scheetz is the U.S. Clairton environmental person and Bill Clark is the enforcement engineer for ACHD. Q. So with each of these enforcement orders or Notices of Violation, somebody at U.S. Steel is apprised as to the nature of the violations, the breakdown of what they are? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And what is AQ Reports? A. That is the e-mail that the docket manager uses whenever companies submit reports. Anything we want to get acamed onto the system, we send to AQ Report; and then that eventually makes its way onto the network. Q. Is that used for any specific purpose after it's been sent to that folder, for lack of a better term? A. I'm not certain. I just know that the e-mails get scanned onto the network from that e-mail address. So the companies will submit reports to that address too. M. WIILIS: Again, we have the issue with the two-sided printing. We are only concerned with ACHD's 7210. Again, at the end, we will get together as a collective and try to sort that out. 	

	395	5		397
1	just the first page?	1	A. Yes.	
2	MR. WILLIS: Just the first page, 7210. What are	2	MR. WILLIS: Okay, that's all I have for that	
3	we at, 19?	3	one,	
4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: We are at 19, yeah.	4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to the	
5	BY MR. WILLIS:	5	admission of ACHD 19?	
6	Q. Do you recognize this?	6	MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	
7	A. This is the - this is part of Keramida's monthly	7	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 19 is admitted.	
8	neport that they submit to us and this is for December	8	MR. WILLIS: It is 6690, and I think they are	
9	2017.	9	sequential to 7210. I'm sorry, not 7210, but 7209.	
10	Q. What does it represent?	10	MR. DAUSCH: Check 32.	
11	A. It represents the inspections that occur on each	11	MR. WILLIS: I think it is a different set. We	
12	shift because we — in the agreement, we had 40 percent	12	have a different set, I think, so	
13	as a no-more-than goal to try to ensure the inspections	13	MR. PARKER: This will be ACHD 20.	
14	are done on a daily basis throughout the whole day.	14	BY MR. WILLIS:	
15	${\sf Q}.$ And this is something that we asked Keramida to	15	${\sf Q}.~$ So just to make sure we're looking at the same	
16	do for us?	16	documents here, do you have 6690 ACHD6690 through	
17	A. Yeah, yes.	17	ACHD7209?	
18	${\sf Q}.$ And what does it represent? I mean, what is your	18	A. My first page is 6690, that's correct. My last	
19	takeaway from this?	19	page is 7208. I'm probably just missing December 31st.	
20	A. Wall, as an example, just the the first row	20	Q. You don't have a backside to that sheet?	
21	for Battery Number 1, so what that means is for the	21	A. Wait. Yeah, I do. Sorry.	
22	month of December on Battery 1, 25.81 percent of their	22	Q. Okay. The last sheet was	
23	inspections were done in the afternoon, 35.48 in	23	A. I wasn't expecting that to be the last sheet,	
24	daylight, and 38.71 at midnight.	24	yea.	
25	The idea behind it is to ensure that the	25	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This is ACHD 20?	
1	inspections are done throughout the whole course of the	1	MR. WILLIS: Yes.	
2	day, and then that example follows for all 10 of the	2	BY MR. WILLIS:	
3	Delteries.	3	Q. If you could take a look through all of these	
4	Q. And that's just with Keramida inspections?	4	pages really quickly? Just breeze through so you can	
5	A. This is just Keramida, yes.	5	familiarize yourself with them so you know what we are	
6	Q. ACHD does not do midnight inspections?	6	talking about.	
/	A. They do not.		HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Keramida is	
8	Q. Okay. But we do do daylight and afternoon	8	K-E-R-A-M-I-D-A?	
9	inspections?	9	MR. WILLIS: Yes.	
10	A. Yes. The way these shifts - because I balieve		MR. DELUCA: After a quick scroll, it looks like	
11	- the shirts go, I think, from michight to eight a.m.	11	it is six months of Keramida's reports, from August to	
12	and then elight to rour. So we would be over both or	12	December of 2017.	
14	O had with warrant to there improve in a we do	11	BI MR. WILLIS:	
19	Q. And with respect to those inspections, do we do	15	A will set six metho but here the first are I	
16	it sequencially, bactery by bactery:	110	A. Well, Not all indicate, but bury — the lifet one I	
TO	A Which interactions Konstitute in martime?	116	and in Talas of 2017	
17	A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections?	16	See is July of 2017.	
17 19	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A Not as far as I know 	16 17	Q. You're familiar with these documents?	
17 18	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they renformed? 	16 17 18	 a july of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you == 	
17 18 19 20	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. OFD inspections it just has the methly. 	16 17 18 19 20	<pre>see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recording these records.</pre>	
17 18 19 20 21	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. ACHD inspections, it just has the monthly 	16 17 18 19 20 21	 see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recognize these reports. Q. Can you describe what they are? 	
17 18 19 20 21	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. ACHD inspections, it just has the monthly requirement to do each battery, each inspection type and each battery at least over at month. 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recognize these reports. Q. Can you describe what they are? A. This is the monthly surrary should that Knowlds 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. ACHD inspections, it just has the monthly requirement to do each battery, each inspection type and each battery at least once at month. Q. Okay. So you leave it to the inspectors to a set of the inspectors to be a set of the inspectors. 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recognize these reports. Q. Can you describe what they are? A. This is the monthly summary sheets that Keramida 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. ACHD inspections, it just has the monthly requirement to do each battery, each inspection type and each battery at least once at month. Q. Okay. So you leave it to the inspectors to determine which places they go in any given day so long. 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recognize these reports. Q. Can you describe what they are? A. This is the monthly summary sheets that Keramida gives to us. Well, monthly summary report that they cave to us that covers their inspections for the month. 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. Which inspections, Keramida's inspections? Q. ACHD inspections. A. Not as far as I know. Q. Okay. How are they performed? A. ACHD inspections, it just has the monthly requirement to do each battery, each inspection type and each battery at least once at month. Q. Okay. So you leave it to the inspectors to determine which places they go in any given day so long as they meet that requirement? 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 see is July of 2017. Q. You're familiar with these documents? A. Yeah. Q. Can you A. I recognize these reports. Q. Can you describe what they are? A. This is the monthly summary absets that Keramida gives to us. Wall, monthly summary report that they gave to us that covers their inspections for the month, for 303. 	

		399		401
1	Q. I think you mentioned earlier that we receive	1	on coke side than the push side, but I don't know that	
2	daily reports as well?	2	for certain.	
3	A. We receive daily e-mails with the raw data for	3	${\sf Q}.~$ But would you agree, based on what you see for	
4	each of the battery inspections, yes; "we" being U.S.	4	Battery C, that there are more coke-side leaks than	
5	Steel and ACHD.	5	there are on Battery B?	
6	${\sf Q}.$ But at the end of any given month, there is an	6	A. Battery C was 25 and Battery B was, I think, 160.	
7	actual quality assured copy of the same data?	7	So yeah, 160, yeah, there was definitely more in Battery	
8	A. Yeah, that's what this is. This is the monthly	8	в.	
9	report.	9	Q. Flip to 6820.	
10	${f Q}.$ Okay. If you look to ACHD6735, what are we	10	A, Okay.	
11	looking at here?	11	Q. How many leaks on the push side?	
12	A. This is the Battery B high-frequency, door-	12	A. This is Battery B. August is 20 on the push	
13	leaking summary.	13	side.	
14	Q. Again, this is provided by Keramida, who will do	14	Q. And how many for the coke side?	
15	inspections on the coke side of Battery B?	15	A. Two hundred eleven.	
16	A. Connect.	16	Q. Factor of 10, would you say?	
17	${f Q}.$ Okay. So these are their observations from the	17	A. Yeah, it was more than 10 times as many on the	
18	coke side of Battery B?	18	coke side.	
19	A. The monthly summary of what they've observed,	19	Q. Okay. And just randomly picking another battery,	
20	yes.	20	take a look at 6866.	
21	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Am I correct in thinking that on the left	21	A. Okay.	
22	side because it says "push side" here, that that side	22	Q. We're looking at Battery 1, right?	
23	of the table relates solely to observations on the push	23	A. Yes.	
24	side?	24	Q. Battery 1 is one of the oldest batteries at the	
25	A. That's connect.	25	facility; is that correct?	
				400
1	$\mathbf{Q}.$ And on the right side of that table, it relates	400	A. Yes.	402
1 2	${\bf Q}.$ And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations?	400 1 2	A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side?	402
1 2 3	Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct.	400 1 2 3	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. 	402
1 2 3 4	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were 	400 1 2 3 4	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? 	402
1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? 	400 1 2 3 4 5	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Ckay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay. 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. One hundred sixty-nine. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Ckay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. One hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. One hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Ore hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. M. Okay. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Four. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. One hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. MR. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? MR. WILLIS: 6993. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Ckay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Four. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Cos hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. M. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? MR. WILLIS: 6993. MR. DAUSCH: Thanks. 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Ckay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeah, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Four. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Four. A. Twenty-five. 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay. 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Ora hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. M. Okay. M. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? MR. WILLIS: 6993. MR. DAUSCH: Thanks. BY MR. WILLIS: 	402
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Four. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Twenty-five. Q. Would you expect to find more leaks on the coke 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 12	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Ckay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. 6809? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay. 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. One hundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. M. Ckay. M. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? M. WILLIS: 6993. M. WILLIS: Q. So for the push side, how many leaks? 	402
1 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 on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeah, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Battery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Four. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Four. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Twenty-five. Q. Would you expect to find more leaks on the coke side than the push side? 	400 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6909? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Coshundred sixty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. MR. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? MR. WILLIS: 6993. MR. DAUSCH: Thanks. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. So for the push side, how many leaks? A. Seventeen. 	402
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	 Q. And on the right side of that table, it relates to coke-side observations? A. Correct. Q. Okay. How many leaks, based on this sheet, were observed on the push side? A. Sixteen. Q. And on the coke side? A. One hundred sixty. Q. Did we enforce with respect to that 160 leaks? A. No, we did not. Q. Flip to 6740, please. A. Okay. Q. Is that the same type of inspection type? A. Yeeh, it's the high-frequency door leaking for Eattery C. Q. For Battery C. Battery C doesn't have a shed? A. They do not. Q. How many leaks on the push side? A. Therty-five. Q. Would you expect to find more leaks on the coke side than the push side? A. That's what I've been told secondmend that it is interment to be between the times. 	400 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	 A. Yes. Q. Okay. How many leaks on the push side? A. Three. Q. How many leaks on the coke side? A. Forty-nine. Q. Okay. Let's look at 6909. A. Okay. Q. This is for September 2017. How many leaks on the push side? A. 6809? Q. Oh, sorry, 6906, I apologize. A. Okay, 23 on the push side. Q. And for the coke side? A. Okay. Let's look to 6993. This is for October 2017. M. Ckay. M. DAUSCH: Can you say that again? MR. WILLIS: 6993. MR. DAUSCH: Thanks. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. So for the push side, how many leaks? A. Seventeen. Q. And for the coke side? 	402

Τ

		403			405
1	Q. Okay. And that was for October 2017?		1	MR. WILLIS: I have a whole other stack to go	
2	A. Yeah, October 2017, Battery B.		2	through. Can we take a break at this point, because I	
3	Q. Okay. If you'll look to 7084, also door leaks		3	kind of need to get my head straight?	
4	for Battery B?		4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: We can take lunch, and	
5	A. Yes, this is for November of 2017.		5	then	
6	Q. How many on the push side?		6	MR. WILLIS: If they're okay with that.	
7	A. six.		7	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that all right with	
8	Q. How many on the coke side?		8	U.S. Steel?	
9	A. One hundred sixty-seven.		9	MR. DAUSCH: That's fine.	
10	Q. Let's move to 7171.		10	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: We'll resume at about	
11	A. Okay.		11	1:05.	
12	Q. How many on the push side?		12	(The hearing recessed at 12:08 p.m. and	
13	A. Nine.		13	reconvened at 1:05 p.m.)	
14	Q. How many on the coke side?		14	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Let's go back on the	
15	A. One hundred eighty-nine.		15	record then.	
16	$Q. \ \mbox{And in looking at this table, on the left-hand}$		16	BY MR. WILLIS:	
17	side, there is something there is a column called		17	Q. I'm going to give you what is going to be ACHD	
18	"depiction." Can you describe what that is all about?		18	21. This is also a summary inspection, data summary	
19	A. That graphically shows it will be a longer bar		19	from Keramida.	
20	for more violations. So it depicts the number as a		20	A. It's fram October of 2017.	
21	longer length bar versus a shorter length bar. If there		21	Q. Okay, Could you look to ACHD3643?	
22	are no leaks, then the depiction is just going to be		22	A. Okay.	
23	blank.		23	Q. How many leaks on the push side?	
24	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And with respect to the depiction on 7171,		24	A. This is a high-frequency door, 17 on push side.	
25	and looking on the push side, would you say it's kind of		25	Q. And on the coke side?	
			-		
		404	-		406
1	sparse?	404	1	A. Two hundred nine.	406
1 2	sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole	404	1 2	A. Two hundred nine.Q. And that's for October 2017?	406
1 2 3	sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens.	404	1 2 3	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. 	406
1 2 3 4	sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily	404	1 2 3 4	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? 	406
1 2 3 4 5	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened?</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't count them all but about seven.</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't count them all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce enciet that 100 leaks.</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't court them all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. Yes did ent</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of these leaks. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't count them all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't court them all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yesh area</pre>	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WINEK: Yes. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't count then all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WINEK: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be — or could be coke oven gas? 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WILLIS: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak more than likely, along with other. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are emire into 2018 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be — or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Eattery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WILLIS: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. M. WILLIS: I was going to move for the admission. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Tab 322 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. I can't count them all but about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be — or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. MR. WILLIS: I was going to move for the admission. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Tab 32? MB. WILLIS: Yes. sir. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. M. WILLIS: I was going to move for the admission. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Oh, yes. Any objection to the admission of A20? 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WINEK: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Tab 32? MR. WILLIS: Yes, sir. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. 	406
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 sparse? A. Yes, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. M. WILLIS: I was going to move for the admission. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Oh, yes. Any objection to the admission of A20? M. DAUSCH: No objection. 	404	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Two hundred mine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Tab 32? MR. WILLIS: Yes, sir. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. BY MR. WILLIS: 	406
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	 sparse? A. Yee, there's only seven entries for the whole month with all the ovens. Q. And on the coke side, it's pretty heavily blackened? A. It's almost the reverse. This is probably about seven. Q. Okay, and those are 189 leaks. Did we enforce against that 189 leaks? A. We did not. Q. Is it fair to say that each of those leaks represents an opportunity for an emission into the air? A. Yeah, yes. Q. And as you mentioned earlier, those emissions would be or could be coke oven gas? A. They should be raw coke oven gas coming out of the door leak, more than likely, along with other compounds. Q. Okay. All right. M. WILLIS: I was going to move for the admission. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Oh, yes. Any objection to the admission of A20? M. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: A20 is admitted 	404	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	 A. Two hundred nine. Q. And that's for October 2017? A. Correct. Q. Just for Battery B? A. Battery B, high-frequency door leaking summary. MR. DAUSCH: Jason, we've already gone over these. We already did these ones with the last exhibit. MR. WILLIS: We already did November? MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, we did third and fourth quarter of November of 2017. MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WILLIS: Sorry about that. What's the last one that we have, December? MR. WINEK: Yes. MR. DAUSCH: You did up to December of '17, so you are in '18. MR. WILLIS: Okay. Let's strike that. We are going into 2018. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you turn to Tab 32 in the binder, you will see what is also a Keramida report. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Tab 32? MR. WILLIS: Yes, sir. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. If you can find the Battery B emissions for the 	406

		407			409
1	coke-side dcors, the dcor-leaking summary. I believe		1	Q. If you would, sir, look to it's ACHD3995.	
2	it's on		2	A. Okay.	
3	A. 3822?		3	Q. How many leaks on the push side?	
4	Q. 3821. 22 is the offtakes and 21		4	A. Push side has three, and the coke side has 208.	
5	A. Connect, yeah, 21.		5	${\sf Q},\;$ And again, those 208 leaks were from under the	
6	Q. Okay. Again, this is from December of 2017. How		6	shed on Battery B?	
7	many on the how many leaks on the push side?		7	A. Coke side under the shed, yes.	
8	(Exhibit 21 was marked at this time.)		8	Q. Okay.	
9	A. Push side has nine and coke side has 189.		9	MR. WILLIS: Any objection?	
10	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. If you could, look to page 3907.		10	MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	
11	A. Okay.		11	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A22 is	
12	Q. How many leaks on the push side?		12	admitted.	
13	A. Nine.		13	BY MR. WILLIS:	
14	Q. And on coke side?		14	Q. Are you familiar with this document, sir, A23?	
15	A. One hundred sixty-six.		15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. Again, this is for January of 2018?		16	Q. It's dated April 10, 2018, also from Keramida.	
17	A. January for Battery B, January of 2018, yes.		17	If you would turn to page 4081?	
18	Q. And those are for the door leaks?		18	A. Okay.	
19	A. High-frequency door-leaking summary, yeah.		19	Q. Okay, this one is interesting. How many leaks on	
20	$Q_{\rm \cdot}$ And then for those 200 or sorry, 166 leaks,		20	the push side?	
21	there were no violations described to as leaks?		21	A. Eighty-one or 80?	
22	A. No.		22	Q. Eighty-one.	
23	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Could we have counted those leaks per		23	A. Okay, the officience.	
24	Article 21?		24	Q. Oh, these are officakes, 1'm sorry. That's why	
25	A. Per Article 21, yes.		25	they were interesting. Sorry.	
		408			410
1	\mathbf{Q} . And if we were to have counted those leaks under	408	1	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push	410
1 2	Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher?	408	1 2	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side?	410
1 2 3	Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks underArticle 21, would the penalty have been higher?A. Assuming there would have been violations of that	408	1 2 3	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door	410
1 2 3 4	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would 	408	1 2 3 4	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and	410
1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. 	408	1 2 3 4 5	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one?	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 — or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document?	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging."	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I cen't confirm this by this abset. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." BY MR. WILLIS:	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this abeet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. So this will be Exhibit 22. I'm handing you 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." EY MR. WILLIS:	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Gause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this abset. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. so this will be Exhibit 22. I'm handing you another document also from Keramida, and this one is 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Do you recognize this document, sir? A. Yes.	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Cause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this sheet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Q. So this will be Exhibit 22. I'm handing you another document also from Keramida, and this one is dated March 9, 2018. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Do you recognize this document, sir? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe it for Mr. Slater?	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Gause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this abeet. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: M. So this will be Exhibit 22. I'm handing you another document also from Keramida, and this one is cated March 9, 2018. MERING OFFICER SLATER: I'll mark that as A22. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Do you recognize this document, sir? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe it for Mr. Slater?	410
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And if we were to have counted those leaks under Article 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been"? A. 'Gause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this abest. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? COURT REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: MR. WILLIS: Any chiet is and this one is cated March 9, 2018. MR. WILLIS: I'm handing you another document also from Keramida, and this one is cated March 9, 2018. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll mark that as A22. EY MR. WILLIS: 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Do you recognize this document, sir? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe it for Mr. Slater? A. This is the ACHD inspection data from 2017 that was entered by the coke oven inspectors for charging.	410
1 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 if we were to have counted those leaks under atticle 21, would the penalty have been higher? A. Assuming there would have been violations of that standard, which it appears it would have been, it would have been a higher violation, yes. Q. Why do you say "appears it would have been." A. 'Gause just looking at the number of violations, it would be 160 - or 175 for the month. Just off of an averaging, it's somewhere in the range of three a day. I'm just assuming that it would be at some point, but I can't confirm this by this abset. Q. Okay. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that? MR. DAUSCH: No. What number are we on? court REPORTER: 21. MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: So A21 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: As this will be Exhibit 22. I'm handing you another document also from Keramida, and this one is is inter document also from Keramida, and this one is is its MR. WILLIS: As the MILLIS: MR. WILLIS: MR. WILLIS: MARING OFFICER SLATER: I'll mark that as A22. MR. WILLIS: Q. 22. 	408	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Go back to 4080. How many leaks on the push side? A. Yeah, this is Battery B, high-frequency door leaking again, was March of 2018. Push side is five and the coke side is 185. Q. Okay, thank you. MR. WILLIS: Any objection to that one? MR. DAUSCH: No objection. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right, A23 is admitted. MR. WILLIS: Again, Mr. Slater, this is one of those that has the difficulty with the two sides. We are really only concerned with 4717 through 4786. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Duly noted. What is this document? MR. WILLIS: The first page has at the top "2017 charging." EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Do you recognize this document, sir? A. Yes. Q. Could you describe it for Mr. Slater? A. This is the ACHD inspection data from 2017 that is see entered by the coke oven inspectors for charging. The left table that goes over multiple pages is	410

	411			413
1	the plant-wide charging and then each individual battery	1	topside (lids.)" Could you explain what that is	
2	following.	2	reflecting?	
3	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. So this, at least based on the	3	A. Yeah, this is the - 'cause the topsides do both	
4	representation of the first page, looks as though you've	4	lids and officakes. So in the — what we do, data is	
5	incorporated both the inspection, the results of the	5	only entered on the officiales tab. And then we will copy	
6	inspection, and then did some compliance calculations to	6	and paste it over to the lids tab for the actual	
7	the right in the right-hand tables?	7	compliance data. So that's why it's "topside (lids.)"	
8	A. Yesh, it does a monthly summary of the compliant	8	${\sf Q}.$ Could you explain what you mean by offtakes and	
9	inspections over the ACHD total inspections and then the	9	lids?	
10	annual summary up to that point.	10	A. Offtakes and lids are two of the inspection types	
11	Q. But it's just ACHD inspections?	11	done by ACHD inspectors and Method 303, actually on top	
12	A. Correct.	12	of the battery. So it states you are comparing it to	
13	${f Q}.$ Okay. If you move to page 4724, you have to	13	a percent leaking. So the total number of lids is 100.	
14	excuse me, but the print is very fine on this page	14	You count the number of lids which are leaking and that	
15	what are we looking at here?	15	is what is recorded here, and then the percent lid	
16	A. This is the same Excel spreadsheet just for the	16	leaking is calculated by the spreadsheet.	
17	doors tab. So it is the doors data entry and then the	17	Q. And what's a lid?	
18	doors tables.	18	A. A lid is a — it's a charging port. It's where	
19	${\sf Q}.$ And it looks as though you did some compliance	19	coal is introduced into the oven.	
20	calculations on the right-hand side; is that correct?	20	Q. And what is an offtake?	
21	A. Correct, yes.	21	A. And offtake is on the outside of the batteries.	
22	Q. And this is solely for 2017?	22	Each oven has an offtake on both sides, except for	
23	A. Yeah, 2017, ACHD for doors.	23	Battery C with one offtake, and then that is a point to,	
24	Q. Okay. If you look to 4729, can you describe what	24	I guess, divert gas when they are soaking. And I don't	
25	this is about?	25	know what else it is used for specifically, but it is on	
1	412 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedances or	1	the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks	414
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedences or readings from ACHD from 2017. Q. Okay. And it's specific for Battery B or is it for all batteries? A. This is for all batteries. Q. Okay. It just notes 30 percent for Battery C? A. Yeeh. The 40 percent standard is in Article 21, and Battery C has a 30 percent in their TP, their permit. Q. Okay. Do you know why Battery C has a 30 percent as opposed to 40 percent? A. I was not involved in the permit development. Q. Okay. Can you explain and I think I know the answer but in the far left column or sorry, far right column of that chart, there are certain portions of it that just say, "hashtag value, explanation point." Could you explain what's going on up there? A. Yeeh, if you look in the upper right, it explains 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks whenever they are doing topside inspections. Q. Could you explain sosking a little bit for us since you've mentioned sosking? A. Soaking is the procedure that occurs before pushing of the oven towards the end of the coking cycle. Coke is in there 18 hours or so and they pop up the lids to drop it off the collector main; stop the flow of gas; open up the officakes for the soaking emissions to occur, if there are emissions. There doesn't have to be emissions. They open that up to let any of the excess gas to come up before they push the ovens. Q. Okay. Why would you do that? A. I believe it's for - I think it's for explosive - to stop any explosive things from happening, but I'm not positive on the why. Q. Okay. All right. On 20 - sorry, on 4739, it also says "topside" but here it says "offtakes." A. Yes. Q. So you broke that out from topside lids to 	414
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedences or readings from ACHD from 2017. Q. Okay. And it's specific for Battery B or is it for all batteries? A. This is for all batteries. Q. Okay. It just notes 30 percent for Battery C? A. Yeah. The 40 percent standard is in Article 21, and Battery C has a 30 percent in their IP, their permit. Q. Okay. Do you know why Battery C has a 30 percent as opposed to 40 percent? A. I was not involved in the permit development. Q. That's a permit condition? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. Can you explain and I think I know the answer but in the far left column or sorry, far right column of that chart, there are certain portions of it that just say, "hashtag value, explanation point." Could you explain what's going on up there? A. Yeah, if you look in the upper right, it explains it a little bit. So that's the read minus charge time. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks whenever they are doing topside inspections. Q. Could you explain soaking a little bit for us since you've mentioned soaking? A. Soaking is the procedure that occurs before pushing of the oven towards the end of the coking cycle. toke is in there 18 hours or so and they pop up the lids to drop it off the collector main; stop the flow of gas; open up the officies for the soaking emissions to occur, if there are emissions. There doesn't have to be emissions. They open that up to let any of the excess gas to come up before they push the ovens. Q. Okay. Why would you do that? A. I believe it's for - I think it's for explosive - to stop any explosive things from happening, but I'm not positive on the why. Q. Okay. All right. On 20 - sorry, on 4739, it also says "topside" but here it says "offtakes." A. Yes. Q. So you broke that out from topside lids to topside offtakes? 	414
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22 2	 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedences or readings from ACHD from 2017. Q. Okay. And it's specific for Battery B or is it for all batteries? A. This is for all batteries. Q. Okay. It just notes 30 percent for Battery C? A. Yeeh. The 40 percent standard is in Article 21, and Battery C has a 30 percent in their IP, their parmit. Q. Okay. Do you know why Battery C has a 30 percent as opposed to 40 percent? A. I was not involved in the permit development. Q. Okay. Can you explain and I think I know the answer but in the far left column or sorry, far right column of that chart, there are certain portions of it that just say, "hashtag value, explanation point." Could you explain what's going on up there? A. Yeeh, if you look in the upper right, it explains it a little bit. So that's the read minus charge time. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks whenever they are doing topside inspections. Q. Could you explain sosking a little bit for us since you've mentioned sosking? A. Soaking is the procedure that occurs before pushing of the oven towards the end of the coking cycle. Cole is in there 18 hours or so and they pop up the lids to drop it off the collector main; stop the flow of gas; open up the officies for the soaking emissions to occur, if there are emissions. There doesn't have to be emissions. They open that up to let any of the excess gas to come up before they push the ovens. Q. Okay. Why would you do that? A. I believe it's for - I think it's for explosive - to stop any explosive things from happening, but I'm not positive on the why. Q. Okay. All right. On 20 - sorry, on 4739, it also says "topside" but here it says "offtakes." A. Yes. Q. So you broke that out from topside lids to topside offtakes? 	414
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedences or readings from ACHD from 2017. Q. Okay. And it's specific for Battery B or is it for all batteries? A. This is for all batteries. Q. Okay. It just notes 30 percent for Battery C? A. Yeah. The 40 percent standard is in Article 21, and Battery C has a 30 percent in their IP, their permit. Q. Okay. Do you know why Battery C has a 30 percent as opposed to 40 percent? A. I was not involved in the permit development. Q. Okay. Can you explain and I think I know the answer but in the far left column or sorry, far right column of that chart, there are certain portions of it that just say, "hashtag value, explanation point." Could you explain what's going on up there? A. Yeah, if you look in the upper right, it explains it a little bit. So that's the read minus charge time. So if it just has hashtage the whole way across and the read was before the charge, it has hashtag 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks whenever they are doing topside inspections. Q. Could you explain soaking a little bit for us since you've mentioned soaking? A. Soaking is the procedure that occurs before pushing of the oven towards the end of the coking cycle. Ooke is in there 18 hours or so and they pop up the lids to drop it off the collector main; stop the flow of gas; open up the offtakes for the soaking emissions to occur, if there are emissions. There doesn't have to be emissions. They open that up to let any of the excess gas to come up before they push the ovens. Q. Okay. Why would you do that? A. I believe it's for - I think it's for explosive - to stop any explosive things from happening, but I'm not positive on the why. Q. Okay. All right. On 20 - sorry, on 4739, it also says "topside" but here it says "offtakes." A. Yes. Q. So you broke that out from topside lids to topside offtakes? 	414
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	 A. This is the high-opacity door exceedences or readings from ACHD from 2017. Q. Okay. And it's specific for Battery B or is it for all batteries? A. This is for all batteries. Q. Okay. It just notes 30 percent for Battery C? A. Yeah. The 40 percent standard is in Article 21, and Battery C has a 30 percent in their IP, their permit. Q. Okay. Do you know why Battery C has a 30 percent as opposed to 40 percent? A. I was not involved in the permit development. Q. That's a permit condition? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. Can you explain and I think I know the answer but in the far left column or sorry, far right column of that chart, there are certain portions of it that just say, "hashtag value, explanation point." Could you explain what's going on up there? A. Yeah, if you look in the upper right, it explains it a little bit. So that's the read minus charge time. So if it just has hashtags the whole way across and the read was before the charge, it has hashtag 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 the outside of each oven and they inspect that for leaks whenever they are doing topside inspections. Q. Could you explain soaking a little bit for us since you've mentioned soaking? A. Soaking is the procedure that occurs before pushing of the oven towards the end of the coking cycle. Only it off the collector main; stop the flow of gas; open up the offtakes for the soaking emissions to occur, if there are emissions. There doesn't have to be emissions. They open that up to let any of the excess gas to come up before they push the ovens. Q. Okay. Why would you do that? A. I believe it's for - I think it's for explosive - to stop any explosive things from happening, but I'm not positive on the why. Q. Okay. All right. On 20 sorry, on 4739, it also says "topside" but here it says "offtakes." A. Yes. Q. So you broke that out from topside lids to topside offtakes? A. Yeah. If you look at the actual tables for those two, you have a column for forfitake leaks and a column for leaking lids. So it's the same - the information for the leaking lids. 	414

1		415			417
1	the offtakes, and then it is transferred over to the		1	consistent, that there aren't anomalies?	
2	lids. So the same data entry is going to be on both of		2	A. Yesh, I checked to make sure there is nothing	
3	the sheets. Just 'cause of the complexity, we have two		3	that's — I didn't go through every single inspection	
4	separate sheets because there are two separate sets of		4	for the year, but I checked the spreadsheet itself to	
5	standards.		5	make sure that everything in here appears like it's	
6	Q. Okay. If you look at 4743, this one says,		6	accurate.	
7	"Clairton pushing." Some of these don't have just		7	A good example would be, if there's an opacity	
8	pushing, but they have something called travel. Could		8	written down of eight percent, we read opacity in five	
9	you explain what travel is?		9	percent increments, so that's a typo. So I would have	
10	A. Travel is the part of the pushing where the hot		10	to check back to the actual inspection sheet to see what	
11	car goes to the quench tower. The pushing operation		11	that error was, as an example.	
12	goes - depending upon Article 21 definitions, it		12	Q. And you've been doing this for how long?	
13	changes depending how much battery it's on.		13	A. I know I did it for 2017 and 2016, maybe the last	
14	Basically, the pushing happens when the coke goes		14	three years.	
15	out and it goes into the quench tower. The travel is		15	Q. The last three years?	
16	the second half of that operation. After all the coke		16	A. Or something, yeah.	
17	is put into the hot car, the hot car travels down to the		17	Q. Has anything jumped out at you with respect to	
18	quench tower. That's the act of travel.		18	any of these inspections? As they are entered in, did	
19	O. Okav. And these are all the observations with		19	vou ever	
20	respect to that in 2017?		20	A. Any individual inspections?	
21	A. For rushing and travel by ACHD, yes,		21	0. Well, let's say with respect to your view of	
22	$O_{\rm r}$ Okay. Look to 4759.		22	2017, did something jump out at you as anomalous?	
23	A. Clear		23	A. Whenever I put all the data into the annual	
24	Ω What do we have here?		24	shoets and say there were more violations	
25	A This is the enabling inspection by 2000 for 2017		25	O Okay Well with respect to the data that was	
		416			418
1	Q. Same thing, broken out by battery?		1	entered by the coke oven inspectors, was there something	
2	A. Broken out by battery on the right tables and the		2	that jumped out at you as particularly unusual? Maybe,	
3	plant total, yes.		3	I don't know, a timing?	
4	Q. And on the left?		4	Because it looks as though there is a start time	
5	A. The left is the data entry portion of it with the		5	and an end time for all the recordings. There is a	
6	times, where it's located, its condition, and the		6	duration of the readings and the battery location.	
7	opacity.		7	Does any of that did any of the data that you	
8	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Having reviewed all of these documents,		8	review strike you as unusual with respect to the time of	
9	you put together this table, correct?		9	the observation?	
10	A. I created the background spreadsheets and then		10	A. Not that I recall. Like, there may have been $-$	
11	the coke oven inspectors put the data entry into it.		11	the same thing, there may have been a typo with the	
12	${\sf Q},\;$ And you've reviewed the data that's been entered?		12	dampered time that it said like 1939 or something like	
13	A. I neviewed what? Sorry.		13	that, something that would, obviously, be in the evening	
14	${\bf Q}.~$ Do you review the data that's been entered onto		14	where you couldn't read opacity.	
15	the sheet?		15	Q. Oh.	
16	A. That's more the engineer that reviews the actual		16	A. But nothing that stands out that I can recall.	
17	inspection sheets. I'll check the actual spreadsheet	1	17	MR. WILLIS: Okay, that's all I have for that.	
18	itself and see if there are any obvious errors or typos		18	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Any objection to A24?	
19	or anything like that at the end of the year. I will go		19	MR. DAUSCH: No objection.	
20	through and check those.		20	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: ACHD 24 is admitted.	
21	But more of that review is done by the well,		21	MR. WILLIS: I don't believe I have any more	
22	the inspector that is doing the entry and then the		22	exhibits, and I don't have any further questions.	
23	engineer whenever the quarterly enforcement comes up.		23	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Dausch, I assume you	
24	Q. But you have had some contact with this		24	have some questions for Mr. DeLuca?	
25	particular data set in terms of making sure that it's		25	MR. DAUSCH: Yes, I have some questions.	
		419	4	121	
---	--	--	--	-----	
1	CROSS-EXAMINATION		1 Q. Would you expect the same to happen when you are		
2	BY MR. DAUSCH:		2 looking at door leaks on a coke oven?		
3	Q. Mr. DeLuca, we just spent a lot of time going		3 A. It would be harder to see. I'm just saying if		
4	through monthly summary reports from Keramida and		4 there is a large leak, you would still be able to see it		
5	looking at the B battery door leaks, right?		5 at both locations.		
6	A. Connect.		6 Q. And there have been studies done on this, right?		
7	${\sf Q}.$ And you went through every month that's at issue		7 A. Idon't know.		
8	in this enforcement order?		8 Q. EPA did a study to come up with the yard		
9	A. Correct.		9 equivalent?		
10	${\sf Q}.$ We started in the third quarter of 2017, went	1	0 A. It — I know that the yard equivalency is in 303.		
11	through the first quarter of 2018?	1	1 I don't know how they came up with that.		
12	A. I don't know if we did all nine months today.	1	2 Q. You're not saying it was a random number?		
13	Q. We generally covered the penalty period?	1	3 A. I'm assuming it was not, but I don't know.		
14	A. Yeah, connect.	1	4 Q. Okay. Are you assuming that every door leak you		
15	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And in the months that you looked at that	1	5 could see from the bench you could also see from the		
16	are on the record, you compared the coke-side door leaks	1	6 yard?		
17	to the push-side door leaks on the B battery, correct?	1	7 A. Idon't believe so.		
18	A. Connect.	1	 Q. Okay. And so if you're looking at door leaks 		
19	Q. Those are inspections that were done by Keramida?	1	9 from the coke side of B battery and comparing them to		
20	A. Correct.	2	0 leaks on the push side, you can't say they are		
21	Q. The coke-side door leaks were read from a	2	1 necessarily equivalent?		
22	different position than the push-side door leaks; is	2	2 A. No. You would assume that from five feet each		
23	that fair?	2	3 way, you would be able to see more than 25 feet or so		
24	A. Connect.	2	4 амау.		
25	Q. So the push-side door leaks would have been read	2	5 Q. Right, and that's why the yard equivalent		
		420	4	122	
1	from the yard?	420	4 calculation exists?	122	
1 2	from the yard? A. Correct.	420	1 calculation exists? 2 A. As I know, yes.	122	
1 2 3	from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since 	122	
1 2 3 4	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench?</pre>	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, 	122	
1 2 3 4 5	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes.</pre>	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the</pre>	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard?</pre>	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes.</pre>	420	1 calculation exists? 2 A. As I know, yes. 3 Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since 4 before the penalty period in this enforcement order, 5 correct? 6 A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty 7 period, more than likely. 8 Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery?	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard</pre>	420	4 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is</pre>	420	4 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall.	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is 	420	 4 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? 	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is 	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if 	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if you are - 	420	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sure what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I den't know here to do it. I'd assume so. 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. A highly technical process? 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. A highly technical process? 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sure what you are - if you are Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to con it from the used then the door of the say it from the used then the door of the say it form the used	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not - Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. A highly technical process? A. There is a technical aspect to it. I don't know 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to see it from the yard than the door or than the bench 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. A highly technical process? A. There is a technical aspect to it. I don't know how to operate a coke plant. Q. You're not a coke plant expert; is that fair? 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sure what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to see it from the yard than the door or than the bench. Q. Mr. Deluca, if I held up a sheet that has a bunch 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. A highly technical process? A. There is a technical aspect to it. I don't know how to operate a coke plant. Q. You're not a coke plant expert; is that fair? A. I've been told there's a legal definition of 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sure what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to see it from the yard than the door or than the bench. Q. Mr. DeLuca, if I held up a sheet that has a bunch of numbers, from here is it harder to see if I'm right 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not — Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. There is a technical aspect to it. I don't know how to operate a coke plant. Q. You're not a coke plant expert; is that fair? A. I've been told there's a legal definition of 	122	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sume what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to see it from the yard than the door or than the bench. Q. Mr. DeLuca, if I held up a sheet that has a bunch of numbers, from here is it harder to see if I'm right here or if I'm right up next to you? 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've newer been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not - Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. There is a technical aspect to it. I don't know how to operate a coke plant. Q. You're not a coke plant expert; is that fair? A. I've been told there's a legal definition of "expert." I don't know if I'm that or not. I know that 	122	
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	 from the yard? A. Correct. Q. And the coke-side door leaks would have been read from the bench? A. Yes. Q. The bench is much closer to the doors than the yard? A. Yes. Q. And you can't compare readings from the yard compared to readings from the bench and say, "One is more than the other" just by looking at the numbers; is that fair? A. I can look at the two numbers and say that one is greater than the other. I'm not sure what you are - if you are - Q. It is not an apples-to-apples comparison, is it? A. Method 303 has a coke-load equivalency that implies it's not. I can't definitively say, but I know you are closer. And if it is a small leak, you are less likely to see it from the yard than the door or than the bench. Q. Mr. Deluca, if I held up a sheet that has a bunch of numbers, from here is it harder to see if I'm right here or if I'm right up next to you? A. It's harder to see from across the room. 	420 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 calculation exists? A. As I know, yes. Q. You haven't been to the Clairton plant since before the penalty period in this enforcement order, correct? A. Definitely since before the order; the penalty period, more than likely. Q. When is the last time you were at the B battery? A. I've never been on B battery, as far as I can recall. Q. Okay. So you've never actually seen the B battery shed in person? A. Not from the battery itself; driving by but not - Q. Okay. You would agree that operating the coke plant is a highly complex process? A. I don't know how to do it. I'd assume so. Q. You're not a coke plant. Q. You're not a coke plant expert; is that fair? A. I've been told there's a legal definition of "expert." I don't know if I'm that or not. I know that I cen't run a coke plant. Q. Okay. Do you consider yourself to be an expert 	122	

Т

		423	425
1	in coke plant operations?	1	enclose a bigger area of the shed inside before the
2	A. What I've been told before is the expert is	2	quench tower.
3	somebody who knows more than 50 percent of people. So	3	Q. And what was that made of?
4	I'm assuming I know more than 50 percent of people.	4	A. I don't know.
5	${\sf Q}.~$ So you're saying you consider yourself a coke	5	${\bf Q}.$ Okay. Do you know where they got that material?
6	plant expert?	6	A. I do not.
7	A. By that definition, I would not consider myself	7	${\sf Q}.$ You talked about a scrubber going on the bag
8	to be one by that definition.	8	house at the B battery coke-side shed?
9	Q. And have you ever advertised yourself as a coke	9	A. Well, I think I was asked if there was a way to
10	plant expert?	10	control gaseous emissions from there, and it would be a
11	A. No.	11	scrubber.
12	Q. The extent of your coke plant training is a	12	$Q_{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$. Okay. Is there any scrubber that you are aware
13	one-week course in Canada?	13	of that's manufactured that goes on a bag house on a
14	A. That's the focus of it. There is daily work, but	14	shed from a coke battery?
15	yes.	15	A. Not that I'm aware of.
16	${\sf Q}.$ And you don't have any actual work experience in	16	Q. U.S. Steel is subject to a higher level of
17	coke plants; is that fair?	17	inspections than any other coke plant in the country; is
18	A. Correct.	18	that fair?
19	Q. You mentioned that the B battery coke-side shed	19	A. Method 303 requirements are the same in all coke
20	has spots that are not closed in?	20	plants, but we have the two full-time coke oven
21	A. Correct.	21	inspectors, which other regions do not, so that leads to
22	${\sf Q}. \ $ And you believe that there's a way to close those	22	more inspections.
23	in like a garage door?	23	Q. So back to my question. U.S. Steel is subject to
24	A. Maybe not for a hundred percent enclosure but to	24	a higher number of inspections than any coke plant in
25	enclose it more so than it is right now. If you have an	25	the country, correct?
1			
		424	426
1	open shed that's, I don't know, 25 feet across by 20-	1	A. Yes.
2	foot high and that entire area is open, there are things	2	$Q.\;$ And there are thousands of fugitive emissions
3	that you can put in there	3	points in a battery?
4	Like the example I used was those clear plastic	4	A. Connect.
5	strips you'll see on doors just to keep temperature	5	${\sf Q}.$ And fugitive emissions points are not measured
6	differentials from inside the building versus outside	6	through scientific equipment?
7	the building, and something like that would also	7	A. Not generally, no.
8	increase the capture.	8	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. They don't go through a stack, so they're
9	Q. Who creates or who manufacturers those clear	9	harder to accurately measure?
10	strips for coke ovens?	10	A. Correct.
11	A. I have no idea.	11	${\sf Q}.$ It's rare to have both full-time Keramida Method
12	Q. Do you know if they even exist?	12	303 inspectors and county inspectors at a coke plant; is
13	A. I do not. That was just an example of something	13	that fair?
14	that could be used.	14	A. Yes. Not the 303 portion, because that's
15	Q. Okay. Do you know of any technology that is	15	standard, but the ACHD portion is definitely rare.
16	currently in existence that does what you are	16	Q. Right. It's rare to have both of those together
17	describing, that completely closes up any gaps in a coke	17	at the same coke plant?
18	oven shed?	18	A. Yes, you can take it to both sides.
19	A. Well, my description wouldn't completely enclose	19	${\mathbb Q}.$ Every year, U.S. Steel has to put together an
20	it, it just would increase the capture of it. I know	20	annual emissions inventory, correct?
21	that the prior coke plant, it could design some sort of	21	A. Yes.
22	saddle to increase the capture from their shedded side.	22	${\sf Q}. \ $ And that annual emissions inventory has to
23		0.0	
	Q. So do you know any product that is on the market	23	estimate the total emissions from all different sources
24	Q. So do you know any product that is on the market now that's what you are describing?	23	estimate the total emissions from all different sources at the Clairton plant?

		427			429
1	${\sf Q}.~$ And the annual emissions inventory would		1 C	. For offtakes, there would be a federal NESHAP	
2	currently be the most reliable information we have if we		2 stand	lard?	
3	wanted to compare total emissions from the battery		3 A	. Yes.	
4	fugitive emissions points to the site-wide emissions; is		4 C	. There would be an Article 21 standard?	
5	that fair?		5 A	. Yes,	
6	A. There's always the caveat I'm using the		6 C	. There are violations related to offtakes in the	
7	estimated actuals for reality in fugitive emissions, and		7 enfor	cement order?	
8	a lot of the battery fugitives — there's variation in		в А	. Yes.	
9	it. There are assumptions made.		9 Q	. Charging would have a federal NESHAP standard?	
10	The source will submit emission inventories to	1	o A	. Uh-huh (affirmative,) yes.	
11	ACHD and ACHD will review it and determine some	1	1 C	. It would have an Article 21 standard?	
12	conditions to challenge and some conditions to let go.	1	2 A	. Yes.	
13	So there is a question mark to that. Is it the	1	3 Q	. There are charging violations alleged in the	
14	best that we have? Probably.	1	4 enfor	cement order?	
15	\mathbf{O} So it would currently be the most reliable data	1	5 A	. Yes.	
16	that we have for that commarison?	1	6 C	. High offtake or high-opacity doors would have	
17	A Thics employ has drap some more detailed	1	7 an Ar	ticle 21 standard?	
10	A. Unless bulletury iss the suit and the state	1	R A	Yes, they do.	
10	O Is it the met maliable date that would a supre	1		There wouldn't be a NESHAP standard?	
19	Q. Is it the most reliable data that you're aware	2		No	
20	of?			Costing would have an Article 21 standard?	
21	A, That I'm aware of? Yeah.			. Sudking would have an Alticle 21 Standard.	
22	Q. And before the enforcement order was prepared,	2		, IGS.	
23	you didn't look at any of that data; is that fair?	2		. Inere wouldn't be a Meshar standard:	
24	A. Correct.	2	4 A	. Yes.	
25	Q. Most of the battery emissions points have both	2		. Article 21 regulations that apply to all of those	
1	state and federal limits, correct?	428	l emiss	tions points that we just discussed, they went	430
2				a regulatory approval process before they became	
	A. By state, do you mean Article 21?		2 throu	gir a regardeory approval provide provide and a second second	
3	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the 		2 throu 3 regul	ations, correct?	
3 4	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would	
3 4 5	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to.	
3 4 5 6	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. . And do you know what that process is?	
3 4 5 6 7	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. . And do you know what that process is? . Cursory, I know it goes through stages of	
3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 8 appro	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. . And do you know what that process is? . Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val.	
3 4 5 7 8 9	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we 		2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 appro 9 Q	ations, correct? . Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. 2. And do you know what that process is? . Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. 2. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 	1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 3 appro 9 C 0 analy	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? 	1	2 through a second seco	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of a rules or regulations? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. 	1 1 1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 aggro 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based vis done in any of those in the process for any of e rules or regulations? The coke oven section? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be a federal NESHAP standard? 	1 1 1 1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 3 appro 9 C 9 C 1 those 2 A 3 C	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Oursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of a rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. 	
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. 	1 1 1 1 1	2 throught 3 regula 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 8 approx 9 C 10 analy 1 those 2 A 3 C 4 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in 	1 1 1 1 1 1	2 throught 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 approx 9 Q 10 anal.y 11 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based visis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 throught 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 3 aggree 9 C 10 analy 11 those 2 A 3 C 4 A 5 C 6 Limit	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Oursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 appro 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 approx 9 Q 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 1 imit 7 A 6 1 imit 7 A 3 Q 6 1 imit 7 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 appro 9 Q 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 6 limit 7 A 6 limit 7 A 9 Q 9 has c	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and hifferent hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	2 throught 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 3 aggree 9 C 1 those 2 A 3 C 4 A 5 C 1 those 2 A 3 C 4 A 5 C 4 A 5 C 4 A 5 C 6 limit 7 A 3 C 6 limit 7 A 9 has c 0 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Oursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and different hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 C 7 A 8 appro 9 C 1 those 2 A 3 C 4 A 5 Q 1 those 2 A 3 C 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 6 limit 7 A 6 limit 7 A 6 limit 7 A 9 has c 0 A 1 hazar	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and different hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have dous air pollutants. 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 approx 9 Q 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 8 Q 9 has c 0 A 1 hazar 2 Q	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rsis done in any of those in the process for any of erules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and different hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have dous air pollutants. Okay. Do you know the NESHAP regulations are 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And in the enforcement order, there are alleged 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 appro 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 3 Q 4 A 6 Q 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 4 A 5 Q 6 Q 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A 5 have 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A 4 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Oursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and different hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have dous air pollutants. Okay. Do you know the NESHAP regulations are stry-specific regulations? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And for doors, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there are alleged violations related to lids? 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 3 aggree 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 6 limit 7 A 3 Q 4 A 1 hazar 2 Q 3 indus 4 A	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Oursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The ooke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and different hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have dous air pollutants. Okay. Do you know the NESHAP regulations are stry-specific regulations? 	
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. By state, do you mean Article 21? Q. Yeah, I'm sorry, Article 21. Let me ask the question again. Most of the battery fugitive emissions points have both Article 21 and federal limits, correct? A. The battery fugitive emissions points which are inspected, yes. Q. Okay. And let's do, for example, doors. If we are looking at door leaks, there would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there would be a federal NESHAP standard? A. Yes. Q. Okay. For lids, there are violations alleged in the enforcement order? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. There would be an Article 21 standard? A. Yes. Q. And in the enforcement order, there are alleged violations related to lids? A. Yes. 	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	2 throu 3 regul 4 A 5 have 6 Q 7 A 8 appro 9 Q 0 analy 1 those 2 A 3 Q 4 A 5 Q 6 limit 7 A 3 Q 9 has c 0 A 1 hazar 2 Q 3 inclus 4 A 5 Q 6 1 1 those 2 A 3 Q 9 has c 0 A 1 hazar 2 Q 3 inclus 4 A 5 possit	 ations, correct? Yes, they are in the regulations. They would had to. And do you know what that process is? Cursory, I know it goes through stages of val. Okay. Do you know if there was a health-based rules or regulations? The coke oven section? Yes. No, I'm not aware. The NESHAP limits are the federal emission is, correct? Yes. And every industry uses different technology and hifferent hazardous air pollutants; is that fair? There probably are industries that don't have dous air pollutants. Okay. Do you know the NESHAP regulations are stry-specific regulations? 	

		431			433
1	Q. You're not sure either way?		1	inspectors have discretion as to where they inspect on	
2	A. No, I'm not.		2	any given day?	
3	${\sf Q}.~$ Do you know if the federal NESHAP regulations		3	A. Correct.	
4	involve some analysis of technological feasibility		4	${\sf Q}.~$ So we can expect that there would be an uneven	
5	before they were enacted?		5	number of inspections from the county inspectors because	
6	A. I dan't know how they were enacted.		6	they can pick and choose where they go each day?	
7	Q.~ U.S. Steel was 100 percent compliant with the		7	A. Yeah, I wouldn't consider it to be dead even	
8	federal NESHAP limits; is that correct?	1.0	8	given all the batteries.	
9	A. Over what timeframe?		9	${\sf Q}.~$ And there's no guidance or written document that	
10	${\sf Q}. \ $ The penalty period that's at issue in this case.		10	puts any restrictions on what or where the county	
11	A. Yes.		11	inspectors should be inspecting on any given day?	
12	Q. The Keramida inspectors follow Method 303,		12	A. No.	
13	correct?		13	${\sf Q}.$ The continuity inspectors, they do handwritten	
14	A. Yes.		14	inspection sheets for their inspections?	
15	${\bf Q}.~$ And they do inspections for NESHAP limits?	1.0	15	A. Correct.	
16	A. And Article 21 limits; but yes, they do the		16	${\sf Q}.~$ And so every day, they are generating hard copies	
17	NESHAP.		17	of their inspections?	
18	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And the Keramida inspectors inspect every		18	A. Yes.	
19	battery every day?		19	${\sf Q}.$ And they keep these hard copy pieces of paper	
20	A. Yes.		20	with their inspection results and, on some basis, come	
21	$Q. \ \mbox{So there should be an equal number of inspections}$		21	down to this office and enter them into a computer?	
22	for the different batteries from the Keramida		22	A. Correct.	
23	inspectors?		23	$Q.\;$ And in that process, they look at the handwritten	
24	A. Yes.	1	24	inspection sheets and enter it into an Excel file that	
25	${\sf Q}.~$ And that's based on the federal requirements in	-	25	you've created?	
1	Method 303?	432	1	A. Yes.	434
1 2	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day,	432	1 2	A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303?	434
1 2 3	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so	432	1 2 3	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. 	434
1 2 3 4	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet	432	1 2 3 4	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. 	434
1 2 3 4 5	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections?	432	1 2 3 4 5	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah.	432	1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We 	434
1 2 4 5 6 7 8	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the 	434
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there snoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for snoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? 	432	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 'certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2 11 2	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors don't inspect seven days a week? 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 'cause of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? A. No. Q. Do you know if any of the Allegheny County Health 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors don't inspect seven days a week? A. They do not. 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there snoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for snoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? A. No. Q. bo you know if any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors are? 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors don't inspect seven days a week? A. They do not. Q. They inspect five days a week? 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 12 2 3	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 certified for enforcement, so Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? A. No. Q. bo you know if any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors are? A. I don't know if there's any certification for 	434
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Method 303? A. Yeah, they have to do every battery every day, so Q. Okay. And the Keramida inspectors use a tablet similar to an iPad to do their inspections? A. Yeah. Q. And that data is available to you on a is it a daily basis? A. We get the raw data e-mailed daily after the shift, after each battery shift. The monthly summary is more where we actually look at it. That comes every month. Q. And you have an electronic system that allows you to have Keramida's daily inspection data? A. I have access to the Careport (phonetic) System, yes. Q. And that allows you to have daily access to their inspection results? A. Correct. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors don't inspect five days a week? A. Not on vacations and holidays, yeah, normal work. 	432 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 1 22 3 4	 A. Yes. Q. The county inspectors don't follow Method 303? A. Not for their inspections, no. Q. You mentioned Method 22 in your direct testimony. Can you explain what that is? A. My recollection of it is that it's just "Is there smoke or not?" It is not one we frequently use. We typically do Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. But Method 22 is another EPA method for smoke observance. Q. And does the Department use Method 22? A. Not that I'm aware. We are all Method 9 'cause it's more formalized to the standards. Q. So you're not aware of any situation where the Department uses Method 22? A. Fugitive emissions or roadway emissions, there are potentialities where we could use Method 22, but Method 9 is by far more common. Q. Okay. Are you certified in Method 22? A. No. Q. bo you know if any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors are? A. I don't know if there's any certification for Method 22. 	434

	43	5		437
1	were used as part of the enforcement order used Method	1	it's supposed to be done. If there is, I guess,	
2	22?	2	discrepancies, we would use the - sorry. I guess, can	
3	A. They did not.	3	you ask the question again?	
4	${\sf Q}.$ The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors	4	${\sf Q}.$ Yeah. Was it the county's position that	
5	follow the methods in the source test manual?	5	inspectors do not have to use the source test manual for	
6	A. That's the manual, yeah.	6	inspection data that can be used to enforce the Article	
7	${\sf Q}.~$ And the source test manual's method for	7	21 standards?	
8	inspecting coke batteries is different from Method 303?	8	A. Ch, connect.	
9	A. Yes.	9	${\sf Q}.~$ And so the county's position is it does not have	
10	${\bf Q}.~$ And you use both the Keramida Method 303	10	to follow the source test manual to enforce Article 21	
11	inspections and the County Health Department inspections	11	standards?	
12	for compliance with Article 21?	12	A. Connect.	
13	A. Correct.	13	${\sf Q}.~$ And who gets to make that decision as to whether	
14	Q. And why is it that you do that?	14	or not to follow the source test manual?	
15	A. Because it's inspection data that we have that we	15	A. I'm assuming it could be multiple of us. I meen,	
16	are able to use to compare to the Article 21 standards	16	if an inspection is done that shows leaks that would be	
17	for enforcement purposes or for inspection purposes,	17	a violation, the regulation says that that is an	
18	compliance purposes. Occasionally, like, for example,	18	exceedance of that condition. So we would use that	
19	the Battery B shed side doors, for consistent	19	regulation.	
20	enforcement, we enforce their inspections the same way	20	Q. And as chief of the enforcement section, have you	
21	as ours have been.	21	made the decision to use inspection data that doesn't	
22	So we will take that data and then transfer it to	22	follow the source test manual for enforcement of Article	
23	the way that our inspections are done and the way that	23	21 standards?	
24	we are enforcing our inspections, if that's clear.	24	A. I've continued to, yeah. It was done before I	
25	Q. It's not. Can you explain how you transfer the	25	got in the position also.	
1	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article		Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of	438
1 2 3	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement?	6 1 2 3	Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this arreal?	438
1 2 3	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they hit a matter of leaks for crupic up would crut	6 1 2 3	Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal?	438
1 2 3 4	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count these number of leaks and common these number of leaks	5 1 2 3 4	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the subject of the	438
1 2 3 4 5 6	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards	5 1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 3032 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. O. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everytax 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections?</pre>	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they 	438
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No. they are not.</pre>	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a 	438
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the</pre>	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on</pre>	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a deily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>436 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods?</pre>	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article clenforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a deily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday impections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? A. Theyhare. 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it doesn't have to follow the source test manual to find 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? Q. Are there requirements for regulated sources that 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it doesn't have to follow the source test manual to find violations of the Article 21 regulations? 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to our standards. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it doesn't have to follow the source test manual to find violations of the Article 21 regulations. If you – 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? A. The weat for stack testing and other portions 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to come tartients. Q. And the Keramida inspectors aren't using the source test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The manual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it doesn't have to follow the source test manual to find violations of the Article 21 regulations. If you — if somebody sees 12 leaks of a standard, they would 	5 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Okay. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow Method 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. They are not. Q. And does U.S. Steel have to follow the source test manual? Q. Are there requirements for regulated sources that are contained in the source test manual? A. You mean for stack testing and other portions other than coke ovens? 	438
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they list a number of leaks, for example, we would count those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare test manual method for their inspections? A. No, they are not. Q. And is it the Department's position that the Department can enforce Article 21 standards based on inspections that don't use the source test manual methods? A. Yes. Q. And why is that? A. 'Cause it's evidence of a violation. The menual is just a guidance; the regulation is what has to be followed. Q. And so is it the Department's position that it doesn't have to follow the source test manual to find violations of the Article 21 regulations? A. If it's — it goes by the regulation. If you — if somebody sees 12 leaks of a standard, they would compare that to the regulation. 	5 1 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. And you've made that decision as part of the enforcement that occurred in the enforcement order that is the subject of this appeal? A. Correct. Q. Do you know if the Keramida inspectors have the ability to not follow Method 303? A. There might be a deviation from the everyday condition. Well, there's some sort of deviation if they are unable to get inspections on a daily basis due to a battery outage, shutdown, something like that. There are conditions to not meet the requirements of everyday inspections. But following the method, they do follow withou 303 for their inspections. Q. And are they allowed to not follow that method if they choose to? A. In what sense? Q. Are there requirements for regulated sources that are contained in the source test manual? Q. You mean for stack testing and other portions other than ooke ovens? Q. Correct. 	438
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	 data from the Keramida inspectors who use it for Article 21 enforcement? A. We take the data from their inspections. If they is a number of leaks, for example, we would court those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to the compare those number of leaks and compare those number of leaks to the compare those number of leaks and compare the source test manual number of leaks and compare those number of leaks and compare tho	5 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	<text><text><text><text><text><text><text><list-item><list-item><table-container></table-container></list-item></list-item></text></text></text></text></text></text></text>	438

		439		441
1	refers to EPA guidance a lot of the time. So if there		1 303, they use 30-day average calculations?	
2	is EPA guidance that overrides the manual, they would		2 A. For compliance with the NESHAP, yes.	
3	use the more current EPA guide.		3 ${\sf Q}.$ Okay. None of the alleged violations in the	
4	${\bf Q}_{\star}$. And in one of those situations where there is		4 enforcement order use 30-day averages?	
5	sections in the manual that apply to U.S. Steel, can it		5 A. Correct.	
6	pick and choose which ones it follows?		6 Q. Every Method 303 inspection during the penalty	
7	A. That makes it sound very arbitrary. But if there		7 period was compliant?	
8	is something that is better than the source testing		8 A. With the Method 303?	
9	manual, they would follow the more recent version; not		9 Q. With the NESHAP.	
10	the source testing manual but the more recent guidance		10 A. Yeah, with the NESHAP.	
11	or EPA requirements.		11 Q. Every Method 303 inspection that used the 30-day	
12	Q. Okay, I'm not sure I understand. Does U.S. Steel		12 average during the penalty period was compliant?	
13	have to follow the source test manual?		13 A. Yes.	
14	A. Not if there's something better out there.		14 O . When an inspector reads opacity, there's some	
15	0. So it can pick and choose when it follows the		15 subjectivity that's involved; is that fair?	
16	source test manual?		16 A Connect, weak the method that describes how but	
17	A. No. you are oping back to where it's pick and		17 yes	
18	choose again That evends arbitrary. If you have a		18 O Thorals some room for error when humans are	
10	credition in the course testing provide that has a data		10 Q. There's sole found for erfor when humans are	
20	of 2009 that this use sented and then later as is 2016		20 A comment	
20	of 2006 that this was created and then later on in 2016		20 A. Correct.	
21	the LPA has a more recent occurrent that hasn't been put		22 Q. Did you adjust the violations of penalty in any	
22	into the manual, they would have to follow the more		22 way based on the accuracy of having humans read opacity?	
23	recent document.		23 A. No.	
24	Q. And does U.S. Steel get to make that decision on		24 Q. After you review inspection data that you get	
25	its own?	2	25 from either county inspectors or from Keramida	
1 2	A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties	440	1 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's 2 appropriate to deviate from the source test manual?	442
1 2 3	A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence.	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of 	442
1 2 3 4	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test 	442
1 2 3 4 5	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, or if you yourself are reviewing inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, or if you yourself are reviewing inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the source test manual? 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that never version. But 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are areas of that never version, they would have 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the menual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, or if you yourself are reviewing inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that if they are aware of that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? O. That realing that you doorsiled 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or mot to deviate from the source test manual? 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are avare of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test menual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the menual. If the regulation and the menual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the menual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's - before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or not to deviate from the source test manual? 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. A. I'm sure it's not. 	440	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, or if you yourself are reviewing inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's - before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or not to deviate from the source test manual? A. Only - well, if the regulation is different than 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are sware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. A. I'm sure it's not. Q. If the source test manual references a monobal for the balance of the bala	440 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, or if you yourself are reviewing inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or not to deviate from the source test manual? A. Only — well, if the regulation is different than the manual, like I said, you have to follow the 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are aware of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. A. I'm sure it's not. Q. If the source test manual references a regulation, both the Department and U.S. Steel have to follow the newer less manual references a 	440 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Wall, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's — before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or the source test manual? A. Only — well, if the regulation is different than the menual, like I said, you have to follow the regulation, so yeah. 	442
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are avare of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeah. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the Department nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that case, they would deviate from that newer version. But if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. A. I'm sure it's not. Q. If the source test manual references a regulation, both the Department and U.S. Steel have to follow that regulation? 	440 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeeh, I mean, that's - before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeeh. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or not test manual? A. Only - well, if the regulation is different than the manual, like I said, you have to follow the regulation, so yeeh. Q. Can you look at Exhibit 22, please? 	442
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	 A. I don't believe. No, they wouldn't. The most recent would have to be used as long as all the parties are avare of its existence. Q. And so any time the source test manual references an actual regulation, the actual regulation has to be followed? A. Yeeh. Q. Okay. And in those situations, neither the bepartment nor U.S. Steel can deviate from the regulation? A. As long as everybody is aware of it. If the situation exists where neither party knows it's been revised, then they wouldn't know it's there. In that if they are aware of that newer version, they would have to follow the newer version. Q. And where is that written down? Q. That policy that you described. A. I'm sure it's not. Q. If the source test manual references a regulation, both the Department and U.S. Steel have to follow that regulation? 	440 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 inspectors, is that when you decide whether or not it's appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Well, if the engineer does the initial review of the inspections but deviates from the source test manual, we have to follow the regulation. It overrides the manual. If the regulation and the manual disagree, you have to agree with the regulation about the manual. Q. And so when you look at results from either one of your engineers after they reviewed inspection data, is that when you would decide whether or not it was appropriate to deviate from the source test manual? A. Or it would be in the spreadsheet itself. But yeah, I mean, that's - before we would enforce anything, we would check that, yeah. Q. Okay. So after the inspections are done but before an enforcement action is taken is when you would decide whether or not to test manual? A. Only - well, if the regulation is different than the manual, like I said, you have to follow the regulation, so yeah. Q. Can you look at Exhibit 22, please? A. Still in Volume 1? 	442

		443			445
1	A. 22 you said?		1	Q. Okay. Let's look at Exhibit 33, and hold your	
2	Q. Yes. Are you familiar with this document?		2	spot on the source test manual 'cause we'll come back to	
3	A. Yes.		3	it.	
4	Q. This is the source test manual?		4	A. Which exhibit again?	
5	A. Correct.		5	Q. 33, please. Do you see in the top left corner of	
6	\mathbf{Q} . This is the most recent version of the source		6	Exhibit 33 it says, "Environmental Protection Agency, 40	
7	test manual?		7	CFR, Part 61"?	
8	A. As far as I'm aware.		8	A. Yes.	
9	O. Can you look at Chapter 109? That's about		9	Q. Is that the same reference that's in the	
10	three-fourths of the way through the document.		10	Allegheny County source test manual, Chapter 109?	
11	A Grav. I'm still looking for it.		11	A. Sorry, which one is the source testing manual?	
12	O That's okay, I'll wait for you. It says "Chapter		12	Q. Yeah, it's Exhibit 22.	
13	109 " It would be a page on the right-hand side.		13	A. Yeah, except for the Appendix B, 109, it is 40	
11	UPADING OPETCED SIDEEP. Coke owen inspection		14	CFR. 61.	
14	HEARING OFFICER SLALER. Whe over inspection		15	O. Okay. Let's go back to Exhibit 22. If we go to	
15	procedures?		16	the next page on Exhibit 22, there are actual paragraphs	
16	MR. DELUCA: No, back one page.		17	related to the different emissions points that are	
17	MR. DAUSCH: Yeah, back.		10	abcount he county inspectors: is that correct?	
18	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Oh, I gotcha.		10	A ground by the county inspectors, is that correct.	
19	BY MR. DAUSCH:		19	A. Correct.	
20	${\sf Q}.$ Are we all on the page that says "Chapter 109" on		20	Q. Section C relates to door leaks; is that correct:	
21	the right-hand side?		21	A. Yes.	
22	A. Yes.		22	Q. It says, "Observations of door area emissions	
2.3	$Q.\ \mbox{Mr. DeLuca,}$ is this the chapter that is used by		23	shall be made from a minimum distance of 25 feet from	
24	the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors to do		2.4	each door;" is that correct?	
25	their observations of the batteries at Clairton?		25	A. Correct.	
			-		
		444			446
1	A. Yes.	444	1	$Q. \ \mbox{And} \ \mbox{if we look on the next page, there's a}$	446
1 2	A. Yes. Q . And it says, "Determination of visible emissions	444	1 2	$\mathbf{Q}.$ And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the	446
1 2 3	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental 	444	1 2 3	Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct?	446
1 2 3 4	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as 	444	1 2 3 4	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? 	446
1 2 3 4 5	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air 	444	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct?	444	1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — 	446
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? 	444	1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" <pre>COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to</pre> read it — <pre>MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it</pre>	446
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it.	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELLCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yeeh, I don't know what Method 109 is. 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELLCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yeeh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAISCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yeeh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" (CURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EPA Method 109; 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" (COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - MR, DELICA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EPA Method 109: 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door- 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yeeh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 is when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EPA Method 109? 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 is swhen you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EPA Method 109: A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EPA Method 109: 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" (CURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at one side? 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as modified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 was when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors on EEA Method 109? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, because there was no training a parallel following EED Method 109; is that fair? 	444	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT PERCETER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - MR. DELICA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at one side? 	446
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CER 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as indified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. Tatt is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of studid 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yeeh, I don't know what Method 109 is. Q. Okay. And you didn't know what that Method 109 is when you issued the enforcement order? A. Correct. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors to EPA Method 109? A. dorrect. Q. And as far as you know, the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, because there was no training, weren't following EPA Method 109; is that fair? 	444	1 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 if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT PERCETER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it — MR. DELICA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at one side? 	446
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	 A. Yes. Q. And it says, "Determination of visible emissions from coke oven batteries, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR 61, Appendix B, Method 109 as indified by the Allegheny County Health Department Air Quality Program;" is that correct? A. That is what it says, yes. Q. And before issuing the enforcement order, you never reviewed Method 109; is that fair? A. Not specifically for the enforcement order, no. Q. Okay. And the Department didn't have a copy of Method 109 in this building; is that fair? A. Yesh, I don't know what Method 109 is. A. Korment. Q. And as far as you know, there is no training for any of the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors to IEEA Method 109; A. Cornect. Q. And as far as you know, the Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, because there was no training, weren't following EPA Method 109; is that fair? 	444	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	 Q. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - MR. DELUCA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it says it. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County Kealth Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. Q. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at one side? A. Well, we don't count the other side at all. It festically counts as a "not observed" even in the reloalation. 	446
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	<list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item>	444	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	 9. And if we look on the next page, there's a requirement that the observer observe both sides of the battery; is that correct? A. Is that in that first paragraph? Q. Yes. A. "The observer shall continue this" CORRENERER: I'm sorry, if you're going to read it - M. DELICA: Sorry, I won't read it. Yes, it sys it. D. Okay. So there's a specific requirement in the source test manual that inspectors look at both sides of the battery during a door-leak inspection? A. Correct. O. Okay. And we know that the Allegheny County field the Department inspectors do not look at both sides of the doors on the B battery, correct? A. Correct. O. And the Department enforces Article 21 in door-leak regulations even though the inspectors only look at source side? A. Wall, we den't count the other side at all. It batically counts as a "not observed" even in the battery. 	446

	44	7		449
1	So whenever the ACHD inspectors or Keramida	1	test manual to find a violation of Article 21?	
2	inspectors do their inspection, the entire coke side of	2	A. Yeah, we don't read under the shed, so yeah.	
3	the battery is considered as "not observed." So the	3	${\sf Q}.$ The very last sentence in that paragraph on the	
4	denominator is just the pusher-side doors.	4	right page the very last sentence in Section C,	
5	${\sf Q}_{\ast}$. Let me ask it again. The Allegheny County Health	5	Doors, it says, "Compliance with this section shall be	
6	Department inspectors don't observe both sides of the B	6	calculated by application of the following formula,	
7	battery; is that correct?	7	which excludes two door areas representing the last oven	
8	A. Correct.	8	charged from the numerator and obstructive door areas	
9	${\sf Q}. \ $ And under the source test manual, they are	9	from the denominator;" do you see that?	
10	required to, if you follow the terms of the source test	10	A. Yes.	
11	manual?	11	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And the source test manual has a	
12	A. Yes.	12	compliance calculation that shall be used according to	
13	${\sf Q}.$ There are no exceptions in the source test	13	the source test manual, correct?	
14	manual; is that fair?	14	A. According to the source testing manual, yes.	
15	A. I don't see any.	15	$Q. \ \ \mbox{The Department doesn't follow this calculation?}$	
16	${\bf Q}.$ Okay. And even though the Allegheny County	16	A. At this point we are, 'cause we decided to use	
17	Health Department inspectors only look at one side of	17	based off the meeting with U.S. Steel last year, we went	
18	the B battery, the Department still issues violations	18	back to subtracting two door leaks at all times.	
19	related to the B battery doors; is that correct?	19	$Q.\;$ So it is your testimony that the Department does	
20	A. I mean, on the sheet, it has "doors obstructed	20	follow the calculation that is contained in the source	
21	from view." I don't know. This might go back to your	21	test manual for door leaks?	
22	previous question.	22	A. The portions of it the 10 percent or less is	
23	But on the denominator it says, "Minus the number	23	no longer relevant. So ignoring that portion of it, we	
24	of door areas obstructed from view." So they're all	24	do count the number of door areas with visible	
25	obstructed because of the shed. So that's - we don't	25	emissions. We are currently subtracting off two of	
1	448 count the shed side in addition to the 25 foot.	1	those before we got anywhere for enforcement .	450
2	Q. And so the Department finds violations of Article	2	And then the denominator with the operating	
3	21 even in situations where its inspectors don't inspect	3	ovens, we just subtract the non-operating ovens and we	
4	both sides of the battery?	4	subtract the door areas obstructed from view.	
5	A. Yeah, if there are encuch leaks on the pushing	5	Q. But you don't include the last piece of the	
6	sida, yes.	6	calculation?	
7	Q. And is this one of those situations where the	7	A. The door areas obstructed from view are	
8	Department chooses not to follow the terms of the source	8	subtracted off the bottom if a pushing machine or	
9	test manual?	9	something is in the way blocking the inspectors.	
10	A. Yes. Well, we don't follow we follow the	10	Q. The calculation says, "Ten percent or less is	
11	source testing manual for the 25 feet. That's why we	11	compliance;" is that correct?	
12	don't observe underneath the shed.	12	A. Yeah, we don't follow that 'cause that standard	
13	But we aren't following Article 21 in the sense	13	no longer applies. That was for the older batteries.	
14		14	The newer standards are more stringent than that.	
15	that we should be observing both sides. We are			
	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel	15	${\sf Q}.$ And so is that another situation where the	
16	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath	15 16	\mathbf{Q}_{\star} And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the	
16 17	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneeth that shed.	15 16 17	Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written?	
16 17 18	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up.	15 16 17 18	Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written?A. Yes.	
16 17 18 19	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneeth that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay.	15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual 	
16 17 18 19 20	that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing menual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door-	15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less door- 	
16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing memual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door- leak standard even though it doesn't follow the source</pre>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less door- leak violations; is that fair?	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing manual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Ckay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door- leak standard even though it doesn't follow the source test manual as it's written?</pre>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less doorleak violations; is that fair? A. The standard doesn't apply anymore; but using it, 	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing menual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door- leak standard even though it doesn't follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes.</pre>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less doorleak violations; is that fair? A. The standard doesn't apply anymore; but using it, yeah, there would be less leaks. 	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing memual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door- leak standard even though it doesn't follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. That's one of the situations where the Department</pre>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less door- leak violations; is that fair? A. The standard doesn't apply anymore; but using it, yeah, there would be less leaks. Q. Significantly less?	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>that we should be observing both sides. We are following the source testing menual to give U.S. Steel a little bit more leniency on that 25 foot underneath that shed. Q. Let me back up. A. Okay. Q. The Department will find a violation of a door- leak standard even though it doesn't follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. That's one of the situations where the Department has determined that it doesn't need to follow the source</pre>	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Q. And so is that another situation where the Department will enforce Article 21 but not follow the source test manual as it's written? A. Yes. Q. If the Department followed the source test manual as it's written, there would be significantly less doorleak violations; is that fair? A. The standard doesn't apply anymore; but using it, yeah, there would be less leaks. Q. Significantly less? A. I don't know. 	

14)

		451		453
1	Q. Well, let's look at your Exhibit 14. Will that		1 testing manual for, doviously, subtracting off two doors	
2	tell us?		2 and not following the regulation for the second half of	
3	A. I don't know what 14 is. Let's find out.		3 '17. A couple of those doors were calculated per the	
4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This is U.S. Steel 14?		4 regulation and not the source testing manual.	
5	MR. DAUSCH: Yes.		5 Q. And which battery did that apply to?	
6	MR. DELUCA: Okay.		6 A. Fifteen affected compliance, and 20 also had an	
7	BY MR. DAUSCH:		7 error but didn't affect compliance.	
8	Q. If the Department uses the compliance calculation		8 Q. All of the mistakes that occurred with respect to	
9	that shall be used pursuant to the source test manual		9 the third quarter of 2017, those weren't mistakes that	
10	terms, how would that affect violations of door areas?		10 U.S. Steel caused; is that fair?	
11	A. Using the 10 percent from the source testing		A. Well, the violations were caused by U.S. Steel	
12	manual, the first quarter of 2018, there was one that		2 actually, but not the actual mistakes.	
13	was over 10 percent		13 O Okay The mistakes were either the Department or	
14	and then in the fourth quarter of 2017 there		A Karamida?	
15	And then in the folicit quarter of 2017, there			
16	and then the third surface of 117 which surget		A. Correct.	
17	And then the third quarter or '1', which weren't		Q. And there were more keramida mistakes?	
10	initially counted, were all also less than 10 percent,		A. Not in this one, no.	
18	both of those.		Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 15?	
19	Q. So one total violation?		A. Okay.	
20	A. Yeah, to an old standard, yes.	2	Q. This is an exhibit where there were more Keramida	
21	Q. Okay. So if the Department followed the source	2	1 mistakes, correct?	
22	test manual as it's written, there would only be one	2	A. Yeah, this is the Battery 15 doors.	
23	door-leak violation in the entire enforcement order?	2	3 Unfortunately, these two that were part of the third	
24	A. Yes.	2	4 quarter were not initially incomporated, and then they	
25	Q. You mentioned a moment ago a mistake that was	2	5 we were informed they should be incorporated and then we	
		452		454
1	made in the third quarter of 2017?	452	1 were informed they should not be again.	454
1 2	made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of 	454
1 2 3	made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. 	454
1 2 3 4	made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been.	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? 	454
1 2 3 4 5	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a 	452	 ware informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Karamida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department dich't go back and fix the 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Karamida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. 	452	 ware informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. just overlooked? 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed — I don't know how exactly it 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't = weah, they were just 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal. I don't know all the procedures on 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't — yeeh, they were just overlooked and not part in. 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Karamida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Miased. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2016, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't — yeeh, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? 	452	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the mission of the put in the side of the put in the mistion in the side of the put in the mistic of the put in th	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the - that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the engineer had them on the draft sheet but they didn't 	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. Q. Where is that? 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Karamida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the — that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Miased. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the engineer had them on the draft sheet but they didn't mese it onto the final sheet. So they were all missed 	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. Q. Where is that? A. I honestly couldn't tell you where it is right 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the engineer had them on the draft sheet but they didn't missed and not put into the order. 	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wean't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. Q. Where is that? A. I honestly couldn't tell you where it is right now. I don't know if U.S. Steel has gotten a copy or 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the - that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the engineer had them on the draft sheet but they didn't missed and not put into the order. Q. What was Keramida's mistake? 	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wasn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department dich't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. Q. Where is that? A. I honestly couldn't tell you where it is right now. I don't know if U.S. Steel has gotten a copy or not. 	454
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 made in the third quarter of 2017? A. There were inspections that weren't initially counted in the third quarter enforcement order which should have been. Q. That was a mistake from one of your engineers? A. It was a combination, unfortunately. There was a mistake on Keramida's side and on our internal side. Q. Okay, explain the mistake on the Department's side. A. There were violations which simply didn't get added in that were on the - that should have been added in. Q. And why didn't they get added in? A. Missed. Q. Just overlooked? A. The column wasn't yeah, they were just overlooked and not put in. Q. And do you know how that occurred? A. Error in transcription, I guess. It was the orgineer had them on the draft sheet but they didn't missed and not put into the order. Q. What was Keramida's mistake? A. There was a calculation error with Battery 15 for 	452 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2	 were informed they should not be again. So, unfortunately, those two door leaks of Battery 15, the third quarter, went both ways. Q. So there were double mistakes? A. It goes back to the original, yeah. Q. And these mistakes are still in the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal? A. The order as written, yes. This was found September 20th, 2018, this e-mail here in '15, so that would have been after the order was issued. So it wesn't known until after the order was issued. Q. And the Department didn't go back and fix the enforcement order after these mistakes were found? A. No. We informed — I don't know how exactly it was that the information was transferred, but because it's under appeal, I don't know all the procedures on how it has to be done. But we did find that error afterwards and we have done the recalculation for excluding those errors. Q. Where is that? A. I homestly couldn't tell you where it is right now. I don't know if U.S. Steel has gotten a copy or not. Q. Can you pull out Exhibit 14, please? It probably 	454

			-		
		455			457
1	separately.		1	in the enforcement order right now?	
2	A. Okay.		2	A. Yeah, 'cause we didn't go through a formal	
3	${\sf Q}.$ Exhibit 14 is all of the alleged violations that		3	modification, whatever it's termed, because it's under	
4	are in the enforcement order, correct?		4	appeal.	
5	A. Yeah, this is what I sent over after, yes.		5	${f Q}.$ Okay. And it looks like after you received this	
6	${f Q}.$ Okay. So let's look back at Exhibit 15, which is		6	e-mail on September 20th, 2018 that identified mistakes	
7	the e-mail from Keramida.		7	on Battery 15, you received another e-mail saying that	
8	A. Okay.		8	there were mistakes for Battery 20; is that correct?	
9	Q_{\star} Okay, let's start at the very bottom e-mail. Can		9	A. Yeah, the same day, yes.	
10	you explain to us what's happening here?	1	10	${f Q}.$ Okay. So the same day after the enforcement	
11	A. Yeah. This is where Brian Harrington from		11	order was issued, you received two e-mails from Keramida	
12	Keramida sent me an e-mail saying that he had called		12	about mistakes in their calculations, correct?	
13	me on the phone right beforehand saying that was a		13	A. Well, not the day after the enforcement order was	
14	formula error with the Battery 15 doors. He gave me an		14	issued but on the same day, September 20th, yes, we	
15	attachment with what actually happened before and		15	received both.	
16	afterwards, and these are the dates that were impacted		16	Q. And did that concern you?	
17	with compliance.		17	A. Yeah.	
18	${f Q}.$ And the formula error is because the Keramida		18	${f Q}.$ And did you go back and do any QAQC on the other	
19	inspectors aren't using the source test manual to do		19	Keramida calculations in the enforcement order?	
20	their inspections, correct?		20	A. I had a phone call with Keramida and we went back	
21	A. That's not the cause of the error. The error was		21	and looked at the background data at that point to see	
22	that ACHD was enforcing as per the regulation in the		22	where the error was, what created it.	
23	first half of 2017; and then somewhere around the middle		23	And then they came forward afterwards with what	
24	of 2017, we went back to the source testing manual to		24	they are going to do with corrective actions so it	
25	always subtracting two doors.		25	doesn't happen again. And as part of that, we did go	
1					
		456			458
1	So the calculation error was in the formula where	456	1	back to see if the calculations were done correctly.	458
1 2	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as	456	1 2	back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through	458
1 2 3	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two.	456	1 2 3	back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order	458
1 2 3 4	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to	456	1 2 3 4	back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly?	458
1 2 3 4 5	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance?	456	1 2 3 4 5	<pre>back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked,</pre>	458
1 2 3 4 5 6	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we	456	1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked</pre>	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not.	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those.</pre>	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance?	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance? A. Determinations of compliance, yes. The	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recall if I did more than 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance? A. Determinations of compliance, yes. The bedground data is a lot harder to do. We get their	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recall if I did more than that or not. 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance? A. Determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, apecifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance? A. Determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance? A. Determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it.	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the enforcement order?	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recall if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the enforcement order? A. Correct. We took the data from the sheets and	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of then that we checked, generifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as per the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the enforcement order? A. Correct. We took the data from the sheets and put them in the enforcement order and then we checked	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? A. I can check right now. They should be in there, 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as ger the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the inforcement order? A. Correct. We took the data from the sheets and put them in the enforcement order and then we checked — or the engineer checked the data in the — versus what	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, aperifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recall if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? A. I can check right now. They should be in there, yea. 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven charged as get the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to determine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their determinations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the monthly report is what we were using. But checking the background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the enforcement order? A. Correct. We took the data from the sheets and put them in the enforcement order and then we checked — or the engineer checked the data in the — versus what we were putting in ours to make sure there was an 	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, aperifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? A. I can check right now. They should be in there, yes. Q. So let's look at the very last page of Exhibit 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<text><list-item><list-item>So the calculation error was in the formula where it was subtracting only if it was the oven changed as get the reg, not per minus two. Q. And does the Department rely on Keramida to dotermine compliance? A. They provide the information to us and then we determine compliance or not. Q. Okay. And do you do any QAQC on their doterminations of compliance, yes. The background data is a lot harder to do. We get their sheets and the monthly reports, and whatever data is in in the monthly reports, and whatever data is in the two background data lead into it. Q. And so the Department did not check any of Keramida's calculations for all of the mistakes that were identified here and then put those in the information to reler? A. Correct. We took the data from the sheets and put them in the enforcement order and then we checked - or the engineer checked the data in the - versus what were putting in ours to make sure there was an excedence but not the background data that led to that</list-item></list-item></text>	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of them that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recell if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? A. I can check right now. They should be in there, yes. Q. So let's look at the very last page of Exhibit 14. 	458
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<text><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></text>	456	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 back to see if the calculations were done correctly. Q. And so the Department itself went back through all of the alleged violations in the enforcement order and made sure that they were calculated correctly? A. There were only a few of then that we checked, specifically the ones listed here. But yeah, we checked those. Q. Okay. You only checked the ones that Keramida identified as errors? A. To be honest, I can't recall if I did more than that or not. Q. Okay. So you don't know if you went back and rechecked Keramida's calculations after they identified errors in two separate batteries? A. I went back and rechecked them; I'm just not sure to what extent. Q. Okay. And if we look at Exhibit 14, which includes all of the alleged violations, we would see these violations that were really errors, correct? A. I can check right now. They should be in there, yes. Q. So let's look at the very last page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. 	458

		459			461
1	counted in the third quarter of 2017 but should have		1	${\sf Q}.$ And it continues on to the next page, which is	
2	been counted, correct?		2	10413, correct?	
3	A. Yes.		3	A. Yes.	
4	Q. That's what it says?		4	Q. And there are eight alleged door violations from	
5	A. Yeah.		5	the first quarter of 2018 in the enforcement order,	
6	$Q,\;\;So$ these were errors that were missed originally?		6	correct?	
7	A. Correct.		7	A. For the door leaking percentage, yes.	
8	${\sf Q}. \ $ And then there were more errors that Keramida		8	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And we know that not all of those are	
9	identified in its e-mail which is Exhibit 15?		9	actually violations, correct?	
10	A. Yes.		10	A. I would have to go back and check. Yeah, 2/26 is	
11	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. For example, the doors, the second alleged		11	listed here and that's listed in both of them, so yes.	
12	violation is from September 11th.		12	Q. Okay. So February 26th, which is on ACHD10413,	
13	A. Okay.		13	is identified as a violation, correct?	
14	Q. Do you see that?		14	A. Yes.	
15	A. Yes.		15	${f Q}.$ U.S. Steel paid a penalty in escrow for that	
16	Q. That is alleged as a violation in this		16	alleged violation?	
17	enforcement order, correct?		17	A. Yes.	
18	A. Yes.		18	Q. And it's not actually a violation?	
19	Q. There is a penalty that was issued based on this		19	A. Connect. And then it was	
20	alleged violation?		20	Q. March 5th	
21	A. Yes.		21	MR. WILLIS: Could you let him finish?	
22	Q. U.S. Steel has submitted a check into escrow for		22	MR. DELUCA: I wanted to expand a little on it	
23	this alleged violation?		23	too. There were a couple that weren't listed here that	
24	A. Yes,		24	still were non-compliant, but they were non-compliant to	
25	0. It's not actually a violation?		25	a lower severity based off the ACHD's interpretation for	
		460			4.62
1	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through	460	1	that minus two.	462
1 2 2	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards.	460	1 2 3	that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as	462
1 2 3	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and necalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it end one. But the final of the million and see that in 	460	1 2 3	that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well,	462
1 2 3 4	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is	460	1 2 3 4	that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations.	462
1 2 3 4 5	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because	460	1 2 3 4 5	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, did then other ones had a decreased severity,</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not.	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we want back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still sightly included. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the exercise of these violations charged</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations.	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR_DRUGCU.</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we want back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH:	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keremida made?</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A most data are are available and re used it work are</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that's 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to charge them. I more if them is a mistake.</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake and and events to be and the severe of t</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeeh, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I bevicelly went to correct it.</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opedity choors. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it.</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more esurers violations?</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because up were following hericle 21</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Well, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch, I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 remains and that is shown that the severe in contact it. 	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch, I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. Yes, 10412? 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 previously and that's where the error came in on Keremide's groundwheat we used it or why the</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is slightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch, I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. Yes, 10412? Q. Correct. A. Chery. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 previously and that's where the error came in on Keramida's spreadsheet, we were subtracting only the last one change and there we were crite to context in the penalty were the error came in the severe of the s	462
1 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's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Well, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch, I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. Yes, 10412? Q. Correct. A. Ckay. Q. 10412 starts the alleged door violations for the second. 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 previously and that's where the error came in on Keramida's spreadsheet, we were subtracting only the last oven charged and then we were going to enforce it as to minus tao. The severity on those violations</pre>	462
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Ckay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. Che very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch. I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. Y. Correct. A. Ckay. Q. 10412 starts the alleged door violations for the first quarter of 2018. The theorem of 2018 is that correct? 	460	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically want to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 previously and that's where the error came in on Keramida's spreadsheet, we were subtracting only the last oven charged and then we were going to enforce it as to minus two. The severity on those violations 	462
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	 A. Wall, that's what I said, as we went back through and recalculated what it should have been afterwards. But because of the appeal process, I don't know what it ended up. But the final of the million and some that is in the enforcement order is alightly incorrect because of a couple violations which are not. Q. Mr. DeLuca A. Wall, they are not enforced, sorry. They are still violations. Q. Let's look at the second page of Exhibit 14. A. Okay. Q. At the very bottom, there are alleged door violations from the first quarter of 2018. Do you see that? A. The very bottom - the 52 is for high-opecity doors. Q. At the very bottom, it starts on the second page of the exhibit. A. Ch, I'm sorry, I was looking at the third page. 10412 S. Okay. Q. Correct. A. Okay. Q. 10412 starts the alleged door violations for the first quarter of 2018; is that correct? A. Yee. 	460	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	 that minus two. So a couple of them were removed completely as non-violations that were initially violations well, enforced as violations. And then other ones had a decreased severity, which moved them down on the penalty scale. So even there are a couple beyond here that were still listed as violations. We had to review them to see if the severity of those violations changed. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. And so the county changed the severity of violations based on mistakes that Keramida made? A. That data came available and we used it, yeah, so we had to change them. I mean, if there is a mistake made and somebody tells me that it is incorrect, I typically went to correct it. Q. And are you saying that the Department found more severe violations? A. No. Because we were following Article 21 previously and that's where the error came in on Keramida's spreadsheet, we were subtracting only the last oven charged and then we were going to enforce it as to minus two. The severity on those violations decreased. So it may have gone from a major to a moderate, for example. 	462

ſ

		463		465
1	$Q.\ $ Well, let's look back at ACHD10413 where there		1 minus two. But in reality, it still is a violation of	
2	are door leak violations alleged from the first quarter		2 Article 21.	
3	of 2018.		3 Q. Well, Keramida says that its mistake moved this	
4	A. Ckay.		4 date to in compliance?	
5	Q. Do you see March 5th?		5 A. Connect.	
6	A. Yes.		6 Q. Is Keramida mistaken about its mistake?	
7	Q. That's alleged as a violation?		7 A. The terms used there are "not in compliance" and	
8	A. Correct.		8 "in compliance," and that's based off of what we have	
9	Q. And U.S. Steel paid a penalty into escrow for		9 told then what the interpretation is.	
10	that alleged violation?	1	Q, Does the Department just pick and choose what it	
11	A. Correct.	1	1 wants to follow for violations?	
12	Q. That's not a violation?	1	2 A. No.	
13	A. It's not enforced as a violation. It still is a	1	3 Q. So the March 5th date	
14	non-compliant condition, but because we are currently	1	4 A. I realize it is complex, but yeah.	
15	enforcing as per the manual because of our agreement	1	5 Q. The door leak that Keramida says was a mistake	
16	with U.S. Steel, it's a violation that wouldn't have an	1	6 that should be in compliance, is that considered	
17	associated penalty.	1	7 compliant?	
18	Q. Isn't this one of the dates that Keramida said	1	8 A. We are this is where it gets really confusing.	
19	was a mistake and there wasn't actually a violation?	1	9 I understand your confusion with it.	
20	A. Yeah, connect, but that is using that	2	0 It is a violation of Article 21. The number of	
21	interpretation. It's still non-compliant with Article	2	l leaks observed, subtracting out the last oven charged,	
22	21. It just wouldn't be enforced as to the way ACHD is	2	2 is a violation of Article 21; however, the Department is	
23	currently doing it.	2	3 currently following that manual for the minus two leaks.	
24	Keramida, in their e-mail, wrote, "not in	2	4 So subtracting those two leaks out, that moves it to in	
25	compliance to in compliance" because of the way that we	2	compliance, which is what Keramida stated here.	
1	are enforcing it. But the reality is that that still is		So that's what they're referring to, I believe.	
2	a non-compliant condition based off of Article 21 that		2 But not in compliance refers to that of the the way	
3	we aren't enforcing.		we are interpreting it to in compliance off that	
4	Q. So is it a violation or not a violation?		interpretation.	
5	A. It's a violation.		Q. So the way the Department is interpreting	
6	${\sf Q}.$ And should it be in the enforcement order or		compliance today, is this a violation or not a	
7	shouldn't it be?		violation?	
8	A. In my opinion, it should be.	8	A. The basis of your question is different. It's a	
9	Q. It should be?	9	violation; we are not enforcing it.	
10	A. But it's not.	10	Q. So the way the Department is interpreting	
11	${f Q}_{{f \cdot}}$ And your opinion is that for the enforcement	11	violations or compliance today, this should be compliant	
12	order, you should change the agreement you have with	12	and not in the enforcement order?	
13	U.S. Steel to use calculations consistent with the	13	A. The way we are enforcing it, it should not be in	
14	source test manual?	14	the enforcement order.	
15	A. No, no. I think we should be following the	15	Q. So we can take that one out?	
16	regulation if the regulation and the manual disagree.	16	A. Yeah.	
17	Currently, for this door - for this minus two doors, we	17	Q. Okay.	
18	are following the manual.	18	A. It's still a violation; we just aren't enforcing	
10		19	it right now.	
19	My opinion is we would be following the			
19 20	My opinion is we would be following the regulation. It's still a violation, this February —	20	Q. What about the one below it, March 8th?	
19 20 21	My opinion is we would be following the regulation. It's still a violation, this February — I'm sorry, March 5th, because it's 6.67 percent leaking	20	Q. What about the one below it, March 8th?A. Again, like I said, I redid this calculation with	
19 20 21 22	My opinion is we would be following the regulation. It's still a violation, this February — I'm sorry, March 5th, because it's 6.67 percent leaking as per the regulation. That's a non-compliant	20 21 22	Q. What about the one below it, March 8th? A. Again, like I said, I redid this calculation with all these changes in it somewhere. March 8th is in the	
19 20 21 22 23	My opinion is we would be following the regulation. It's still a violation, this February — I'm sorry, March 5th, because it's 6.67 percent leaking as per the regulation. That's a non-compliant condition; however, because we are subtracting two at	20 21 22 23	Q. What about the one below it, March 8th? A. Again, like I said, I redid this calculation with all these changes in it somewhere. March 8th is in the same category as March 5th.	
19 20 21 22 23 24	My opinion is we would be following the regulation. It's still a violation, this February — I'm sorry, March 5th, because it's 6.67 percent leaking as per the regulation. That's a non-compliant condition; however, because we are subtracting two at all times from the leaks, that knocks it down below the	20 21 22 23 24	 Q. What about the one below it, March 8th? A. Again, like I said, I redid this calculation with all these changes in it somewhere. March 8th is in the same category as March 5th. Q. So is March 8th a violation or not a violation? 	

1	it's a violation which ACED is not recalizing	1	Keramida's calculations?	469
	2. O. So the March 5th calculation is incorrect; is	2	A. No. that's - again. I don't remember the extent	
3	3 that correct?	3	that I went back to. I know I checked the ones that	
4	A. The calculation listed there is based off of	4	were under note with that of Battery 15 and 20, I	
5	Article 21.	5	checked those specific ones. I don't remember how much	
6	Q. And that's incorrect based on the agreement that	6	was done beyond that.	
7	the Department has with U.S. Steel?	7	Q. You know how to do the door-leak calculations per	
8	A. Connect.	8	the source test manual; is that fair?	
9	Q. Okay. So that should come out?	9	A. Using the equation of the source testing manual,	
10	A. Yes.	10	I can follow the equation.	
11	Q. How many did we take out of the first quarter of	11	Q. Why don't we look at the page that is ACHD10415?	
12	2018, three?	12	A. Okav.	
13	A. Again, I have to verify the accuracy of it, but	13	Q. And there are door-leak violations on this page,	
14	there are three dates listed in the first quarter of	14	correct?	
15	2018, yeah.	15	A, Yes.	
16	Q. That should come out?	16	Q. Let's look at the one that is at the very bottom.	
17	A. Again, I want to verify before I confirm that,	17	There's a November 17th door-leak violation, correct?	
18	but it appears that way.	18	A. Yes.	
19	Q. Well, look at Keramida's e-mail.	19	Q. And that's for the C battery?	
20	A. This isn't everything. I just can't do it from	20	A. Connect.	
21	this. I would rather go beyond this to confirm it under	21	Q. And Keramida calculated that at 3.01 percent?	
22	oath for certainty. Yes, there are three dates listed	22	A. I don't know if that was Keramida or ACHD.	
23	here that should have been changed.	23	Q. Can you look at Exhibit 62 and keep this page	
24	Q. Are there more mistakes that we don't know about?	24	out?	
25	A. Wall, all of the Battery 15 was subtracting those	25	A. Is that in Volume 2?	
	468	1		470
1	two. So it's the same time period that had the same	1	Q. That would be in Volume 2.	
2	issues.	2	A. So you want me to go to this November 17th date?	
3	Keramida brought to our attention the ones where	3	Q. Yeah, it would start on page 22 of Exhibit 62.	
4	the compliance changed. The severity of those	4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Page 22 you said?	
5	violations may have changed also but still have been a	5	MR. DAUSCH: Yes.	
6	violation. There would not be ones beyond that time	6	MR. DELUCA: Is that 3737?	
	period.	7	BY MR. DAUSCH:	
8	Q. So three of the eight door-leak violations in the	8	Q. Or I'm sorry, Exhibit it is page 20 of Exhibit	
9	encorcement order should be changed from non-compliant	9	b2.	
10	to compliant?	10	A. Okay.	
	A. We are enforcing it, yes.		Q. And then I want to walk through these documents	
12	Q. Three of eight?	12	and make sure we understand what they are. If we start	
13	A. Yes.	13	on Exhibit 62, page 20, which has Bates label	
14	Q. So what's the Department's compliance percentage	14	ACHD003758, are you at that document?	
15	on issuing door penalties correctly?	15		
10	A. I think that's sarcastic. But I'm not sure.	10	Q. This is a handwritten inspection sneet that was	
10	what do you mean?	10	prepared by Keramida?	
10	 what is that compliance percentage? A Fire correction? 	10	A. Well, this is just a daily summary of what the	
7.9	A. Five over eight?	19	inspectors write when they get back to their trailer,	
20	\mathbf{A} System and a \mathbf{b} 12	20	O Okny and one we tall the number of locks the	
22	Do you consider that to be good?	22	where found on the C betters on Neurother 17th 20172	
22	A No I don't like when mightables are made without	22	A I never used this for enforcement. It looks like	
24	And you I compact that the Denastment didn't go	24	there is some but T smildely use that as the first are	
			Themale deuter rife whill here has that an this title res	
25	back and check to see if there were more mistakes with	24	unere's seven, but I wouldn't use that as the filled one	

		471	473
1	or anything.		1 Q. Well, let's do the math and see if it matches
2	${\sf Q}.$ Would you use the document that's on page 21 that		2 their numbers. Instead of 5 divided by 168, the new
3	is ACHD3736?		3 calculation would be 5 divided by 166. What does that
4	A. Yeah, that's more of what the engineers start		4 give you?
5	with.		5 A. 3.01.
6	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And does this document show the November		6 Q. 3.01?
7	17th, 2017 C battery door-leak inspection?		7 A. Yeah.
8	A. Yeah. It has seven leaks.		8 Q. What's in your alleged violation?
9	${\bf Q}.$ Okay. And so using the calculation that's in the		9 A. 3.01.
10	source test manual, can you explain to us how we	1	.0 Q. 3.01 is a non-compliance?
11	determine compliance?	1	1 A. Yes.
12	A. So not following the regs but following the	1	.2 Q. The way you did the calculation was 2.97,
13	source testing manual?	1	.3 correct?
14	Q. Following the source test manual. Which is what	1	4 A. The 5 over 168 is 2.97.
15	the agreement is with U.S. Steel; is that correct?	1	5 Q. That is compliant?
16	A. Yeah, I just wanted to make sure. So what we	1	6 A. Yes, 5 well, 5 over 168 is less than 3, so
17	would do there is we would take the seven number of	1	7 yes.
18	leaks and then subtract off the two to give you five	1	8 Q. Another mistake?
19	leaks for Battery C.	1	9 A. Potentially. I just say "potentially" because
20	And then the denominator would be the number of	2	0 I'm not certain of all the background data that went
21	observed doors. So November 17th has zero non-observed	2	1 into 301; but based off of that information here, yes.
22	doors. So they would take the demoninator there of 168.	2	2 Q. And you are not certain because after Keramida
23	Q. Okay. And so it would be 5 divided by 168?	2	3 identified at least two batteries where there are
24	A, Yes,	2	4 mistakes, the Department didn't go back and check the
25	Q. Can you here is a calculator.	2	5 other calculations; is that fair?
1 2 3	A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeab.	472	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break
1 2 3 4	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? 	472	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now?
1 2 3 4 5	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the 	472	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our
1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using 	472	 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? 5 HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the 	472	 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not 	472	 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. 	472	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? 		 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to 	472	 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? 	472 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, 	472 2 4 4 5 4 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? 	472 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELUCA, I want to refer you back to Exhibit
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the demoninator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than changed 	472 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 474 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELUCA, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door 	472 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHD10415.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 care from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their 	472 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHDI0415. A. Okay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the demoninator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than changed and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? 	472 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHD10415. A. Okay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sure what this refers to. Sorry. I'm 	472 2 2 4 2 2 2 4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as scon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit I4, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHD10415. A. Ckay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sure what this refers to. Sorry. I'm just trying to review this first right now, which makes 	472 2 2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHDI0415. A. Ckay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd? A. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 care from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the demoninator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than changed and the total number of doors observed and two door lesks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sure what this refers to. Sorry. I'm just trying to review this first right now, which makes it more difficult. I don't think I could speak to that 	472 2 2 3 4 5 6 4 5 6 6 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as soon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHDI0415. A. Okay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd? Q. Okay. And that's for the B battery, correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 169, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sure what this refers to. Sorry. I'm just trying to review this first right now, which makes it more difficult. I don't think I could speak to that without knowing more, taking more time. 	472 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as scon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELUCA, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHDI0415. A. Okay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And that's for the B battery, correct? A. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 cane from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the demminator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yee, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than charged and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sure what this refers to. Sorry. I'm just trying to review this first right now, which makes it more difficult. I don't think I could speak to that without knowing more, taking more time. Q. Keramida is subtracting two from the numerator 	472 2 2 3 4 5 6 4 5 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as scon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHD10415. A. Okay. Q. Do you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd? A. Yes. Q. Can you keep this out and look at Exhibit 62 on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. 2.976. Q. 2.976? A. Yeah. Q. What do you have listed on Exhibit 14? A. 3.01. That's why I wanted to see more of the background, to see where that 3.01 came from. But using this here, 5 over 168, what may have happened is the denominator may have changed one or two. I'm not positive. Q. The calculation that you did, 2.97 is compliant? A. Yes, it's definitely one that is very close to the standards. Do I need the calculator? Q. Yeah, keep it. If you look at the next page, 22, at the footnote, does that help you? A. Excludes the two door errors less than changed and the total number of doors observed and two door leaks. Okay, so that's where their Q. That's another mistake? A. I'm not sume what this refers to. Sorry. I'm fust trying to review this first right now, which makes it more difficult. I don't think I could speak to that without knowing more, taking more time. Q. Keramida is subtracting two from the numerator and denominator, aren't they? 	472 2 2 2 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 4 5 1 6 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	 A. I wouldn't have done that check. Q. If you look back at MR. DAUSCH: Is it a good time to take a break now? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Sure, we can take our afternoon break. Let's go off the record. (The hearing recessed at 2:30 p.m. and reconvened at 2:41 p.m.) HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Well, let's try to get this done as scon as we can. I don't know how long this will take. BY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Mr. DELuca, I want to refer you back to Exhibit 14, U.S. Steel 14. Look, again, on the page that is Bates labeled ACHDI0415. A. Ckay. Q. Ito you see the door violation that's alleged for November 3rd? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And that's for the B battery, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you keep this out and look at Exhibit 62 on page 18?

		475		477
1	Q. And can you tell us what Exhibit 62, page 1	B is?	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And how many total doors on operating	
2	A. That's a daily inspection sheet from ACHD for	2	2 ovens were observed?	
3	November 3rd on B battery for doors.	3	A. One twenty.	
4	${\bf Q}.~$ And this is an inspection of doors on this ${\bf c}$	date 4	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And can you do that calculation again	
5	that was performed by an Allegheny County Health	5	based on the formula that's in the source test manual	
6	Department inspector?	e	and tell me what you get?	
7	A. Yes.	7	A. So you are doing the 8 leaks over - 8 minus 2,	
8	$\mathbf{Q}.$ And this inspection only included one side of	of the 8	so you have 6 over 120, 5 percent.	
9	battery; is that correct?	9	Q. Five percent. What's contained in the	
10	A. Correct.	10	enforcement order?	
11	Q. There was only inspection on the push side a	and 11	A. 5.08.	
12	not on the coke side, correct?	12	Q. Five percent would be compliant, correct?	
13	A. Yes.	13	A. I'm not positive. I don't know if it's five or	
14	Q. And following the source test manual as it's	. 14	gneater than five. I don't - I don't know.	
15	written, this is not a proper procedure, correct?	15	O. Okay. If it is greater than five, would it be	
16	A. Correct.	16	compliant?	
17	O. Okav. Is there a violation alleged in the	17	A. Yeeh, if it would be five or less, it would be	
18	enforcement order based on this inspection from Nove	mber 18	compliant.	
19	and 20172		Q Okay Do you know what the answer is?	
20	Δ νοσ	20	A No I don't have if the standard is fire or	
20	A les.	20	A. NO, I CONTENIEW II the standed is live of	
21	Q. And is this a situation where the bepartment	21	greater or greater than it.	
22	issued a violation and didn't follow the source test		Q. II the standard is greater than live, then this	
23	manual as it's written?	23	should be compliant instead of non-compliant; is that	
24	A. Connect.	24	fair?	
25	Q. Can you look again on U.S. Steel Exhibit 14,	25	A. Yes, if it's allowed to be five or less, then it	
		476		478
1	ACHD10415, at October 18th?	476	would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these	478
1 2	ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay.	476 1 2	would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but	478
1 2 3	ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that?	476 1 2 3	would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five	478
1 2 3 4	ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes.	476 1 2 3 4	would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake?	478
1 2 3 4 5	ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent,	476 1 2 3 4 5	<pre>would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but</pre>	478
1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct?</pre>	476 1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes.</pre>	478
1 2 4 5 6 7	<pre>ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes.</pre>	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual,</pre>	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Otay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12;</pre>	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 2 8	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 127 A. Okay.</pre>	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12: A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ? 8 9 10	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 2 8 9 10 10	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Chay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 10 11 12	<pre>would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. BY MR. DAUSCH:</pre>	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 10 12 13	<pre>would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for</pre>	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 2a, 11 12 13 14	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Otay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Otay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Wall, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten elect from them, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 12 13 14 15 15	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Gray. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Oray. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 12 13 14 15 16	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12: A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 12 13 14 15 16 17	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Wall, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from them, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks were 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 7 8 15 16 17 7 8 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 16 17 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Chay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. Cotober 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Chay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from them, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 18 19	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? <pre>MR. DAUSCH: Correct. </pre> MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, correct?	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Gray. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Oray. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 re 18 19 20	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: WIR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, correct? A. Yes. 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. Cctober 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Ckay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 19 20 21	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the Department didn't apply the formula as 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Okay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Wall, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? Battery 13 on October 18th, from this sheet, it looks like eight. 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DEUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the Department didn't apply the formula as written in the source test manual for the enforcement 	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Gray. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Oray. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? Battery 13 on October 18th, from this sheet, it looks like eight. Q. Okay. If you look at page 13 on Exhibit 62, 	476 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 re 18 19 20 21 22 does 23	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DAUSCH: MR. DAUSCH: MR. DAUSCH: MR. DAUSCH: MR. DAUSCH: MR. DAUSCH: M. DEUCA: Okay. MR. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH: M. DEUCA: Okay. M. DAUSCH: M. DEUCA: Okay. M. DAUSCH: M. DAUSCH:	478
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Gray. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. October 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Oray. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from them, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? Battery 13 on October 18th, from this sheet, it looks like eight. Q. Okay. If you look at page 13 on Exhibit 62, that tell you how many door leaks were observed? 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 re 18 19 20 21 22 does 23 24	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula, correct? A. Yes. Q. And the Department didn't apply the formula as written in the source test manual for the enforcement order; is that fair? A. I forget. There are sone standards that are 	478
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	 ACHD10415, at October 18th? A. Ckay. Q. For doors, do you see that? A. Yes. Q. There is an alleged violation, 5.08 percent, correct? A. Cctober 18th, yes. Q. Okay. Can you look at Exhibit 62 on page 12? A. Ckay. Q. And Exhibit 62 on page 12 is a handwritten inspection sheet from October 18th, 2017 from Keramic correct? A. Well, not an inspection sheet; but it is a handwritten sheet from then, yes. Q. Okay. And the handwritten sheet that reflect inspections that were done on that date? A. Yeah, not QC, but yes. Q. Okay. And how many Battery 13 door leaks wer found that day? A. Battery B? I'm sorry, which battery is this? Battery 13 on October 18th, from this sheet, it looks like eight. Q. Okay. If you look at page 13 on Exhibit 62, that tell you how many door leaks were observed? A. October 18th, Battery 13, yesh, eight. 	476 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 re 18 19 20 21 20 21 22 does 23 24 25	 would be compliant. Again, I didn't do these calculations either, but Q. Right, and if the standard was allowed to be five or less, this would be another mistake? A. It would be, based off of that minus two; but yes, that's how we are enforcing it, so yes. Q. I want to go back to the source test manual, which is Exhibit 22, and look again at Chapter 109. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: 109? MR. DAUSCH: Correct. MR. DELUCA: Okay. EY MR. DAUSCH: Q. Chapter 109D provides the county's procedure for inspecting charging ports; is that correct? A. D, yes. Q. And the very last sentence of that procedure says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and there is a formula as written in the source test manual for the enforcement order; is that fair? A. I forget. There are sone standards that are still — I think some batteries still have 2 percent 	478

		479			481
1	lead leaks, but there are definitely ones that are less		1	A. Yes.	
2	than two, more stringent.		2	${\sf Q}. \ $ And the Department did not apply this formula for	
3	Q. So the Department did not apply the charging		3	compliance in the enforcement order, correct?	
4	ports provisions in the source test manual as they are		4	A. Not on all batteries.	
5	written in the enforcement order; is that fair?		5	${\sf Q}.$ Had it applied the formula that's in the source	
6	A. There were times we did not, yeah, correct.		6	test manual, there would be less violations in the	
7	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And had the Department applied the		7	enforcement order, correct?	
8	charging ports procedure that's in the source test		8	A. Most likely. I will look through the data now;	
9	manual as it's written, there would be less violations		9	but yes, there would be less.	
10	in the enforcement order?		10	Q. Chapter 109A is charging, correct?	
11	A. As long as there were actual inspections from 2		11	A. Yes.	
12	to either .6 or 1 percent, yes, they would be less.		12	${\sf Q}. \ $ And there are charging violations alleged in the	
13	${\bf Q}.~$ And can you tell that by your Exhibit 14?		13	enforcement order, correct?	
14	A. Going back to 14, yeah, there are some here less		14	A. Connect.	
15	than 2 percent.		15	${\sf Q}.\ $ Very last sentence of the charging section in the	
16	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. So if the Department had followed the		16	source test manual says, "Compliance shall be determined	
17	source test manual for charging ports, there would be		17	by summing the seconds of charging emissions observed	
18	less violations than there are in the enforcement order?		18	during each of the four charges," correct?	
19	A. Yes.		19	A. Yes.	
20	${\sf Q}.~$ And are you able to tell how many less?		20	${\sf Q}.~$ And so based on the terms of the source test	
21	A. Well, I can tell which ones are less than two,		21	manual, four charges are supposed to be used for	
22	but 10417 sheet has 11 lids of, which three of them are		22	compliance, correct?	
23	gneater than 2 percent.		23	A. The source testing manual says "four charges."	
24	${\sf Q}.$ And so if the Department had applied the source		24	The older standard is four chargers for 75 seconds, and	
25	test manual as written charging ports, there would only		25	the newer one is five at 55.	
		190			182
1	be three total violations?	480	1	Q. And so the Department did not apply the source	482
1 2 3	be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17.	480	1 2 3	Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are	482
1 2 3	be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total?	480	1 2 3	Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct?	482
1 2 3 4	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yos all together for the possible participation. 	480	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source 	482
1 2 3 4 5	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is == it's just an otheral platter because 	480	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual there would be less violations for 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are orderer than 2 percent. and then the fourth quarter 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. O. Okay. So how many less violations would there be 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedances. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedances. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedances. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeeh. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedances. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Ckay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Okay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? A. Yaes. 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges – if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge – because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Ckay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? A. Yaes. Q. And on the next page, there's a sentence that 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedances. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. So if we are reading five charges, we would have to take either one to four and two to five and add those to take either one to four and two to five and add those to total sumation. 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Ckay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? A. Yes. Q. And on the next page, there's a sentence that says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 9. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. 9. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth farage — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. So if we are reacting five charges, we would have to take either one to four and two to five and add those y and ignore the other one. So I don't know based off the total sumation. Q. Okay. And just so we're clear, the Department 	482
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has aix listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Okay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? A. Yas. Q. And on the next page, there's a sentence that says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and then there is a formula 	480	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 9. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. 9. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges – if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be exceedences. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge – because based off this, it would be each of the total sumation. So if we are reacting five charges, we would have to take either one to four and two to five and add those or and ignore the other created one of the total sumation. Q. Okay. And just so we're clear, the Department did not apply the source test manual as written for 	482
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	 be three total violations? A. For this quarter, for the fourth quarter of '17. Q. Okay. How many total? A. You mean in the other quarters? Q. Yes, all together for the penalty period. A. This is it's just an odd calculation because it's not the regulation. But the first quarter of '18 has six listed in the order, of which two of them are greater than 2 percent, and then the fourth quarter the third quarter of '17 doesn't have any lids. Q. Okay. So how many less violations would there be if the Department had followed the source test manual as written? A. Twelve. Q. Twelve less violations? A. If you followed the manual, yeah. Q. Okay. I want to look back at Exhibit 22 and Chapter 109 and now look at E, offtake piping. A. Ckay. Q. Offtake piping goes on to the next page, correct? A. Yees. Q. And on the next page, there's a sentence that says, "Compliance shall be determined by application of the following formula" and then there is a formula for compliance, correct? 	480	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	 Q. And so the Department did not apply the source test manual as written when it found violations that are contained in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. Correct. Q. Okay. And had the Department applied the source testing manual, there would be less violations for charging? A. I'm not certain on that one actually 'cause the four charges — if the first four charges were greater than 55 seconds on those other batteries, it would still be essectiones. So I'm not certain on that one. I would have to go to the individual charging sheets. Q. And so you're not sure if there would be less violations for charging because the Department did not use the source test manual as written, correct? A. I'm not certain, no, because it's the fifth charge — because based off this, it would be each of the four charges. So if we are reading five charges, we would have to take either one to four and two to five and add those of and ignore the other one. So I don't know based off the total summation. Q. Okay. And just so we're clear, the Department did not apply the source test manual as written for charging? 	482

	483		485
1 A. For the batteries that have a standard of five at		A. That's for the 15-second increment for Method 9.	
2 55, it did not.		2 Q. And the way we read the form is you can see how	
3 Q. There are alleged soaking violations in the		3 many seconds of visible emission opacity that was	
4 enforcement order; is that correct?		4 recorded based on the row and the time that's associated	
5 A. Yes.		5 with that row; is that correct?	
6 Q. And on Exhibit 14, the page that's Bates labeled		6 A. You would you'd - typically, it's assumed to	
7 ACHD10414, there are two soaking violations for January		7 be true. In this case, it's an instantaneous standard.	
8 of 2017; is that correct?		8 So the first line would lead to non-compliant. If	
9 A. Yes.		9 there's - since they're not looking at it continuously,	
10 Q. And can you keep that page out and look at	1	0 the assumption is if you have the same opacity, then	
11 Exhibit 64 on page 3?	1	1 it's cocurring for that entire duration.	
12 A. Okay, January 17th, okay.	1	2 Q. And how does an inspector know when to start	
13 Q. Is Exhibit 64 at page 3 the inspection sheet that	1	3 recording opacity on one of these forms?	
14 correlates to the January 17th alleged soaking	1	A. Typically, whenever they push.	
15 violation?	1	5 Q. And how does an inspector know that?	
16 A. Yes.	1	6 A. You'd have to ask them. I don't know	
17 O. Okay. Exhibit 64, page 3 is a Department form	1	7 socifically	
18 for observing soaking: is that correct?	1	A O Okay There's no guidance or instructions that	
10 A voc	1	increators have to know when to stop reading oppoint for	
20 0 Whe excepted this form?	2	analyzed and the control when to stop reading opacity for	
20 Q. Who created this form?	2	Soaking:	
21 A. It may have been me. It may have been	2.	A. I think it's defined in Article 21, the soaking	
22 secretaries. I'm not positive.	24	process. And then they can they have been told they	
2.3 Q. Okay. Do you know when it was created?	2.	can hear the ram movement of when the push actually	
24 A. No.	24	a starts.	
25 Q. This is the standard form that all of the county	23	Q. And is it your testimony that Article 21	
1 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct?	484	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop	486
 inspectors use for scaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. 	484	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing scaking observations?	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 	484	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? 	484	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. 	484	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? 	484] 2 3 4 4 5	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21.	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Mathod 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. 	484 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Mathod 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity 	484 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity 9 requires a certification? 	484 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing scaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that scaking is the pre-pushing process, so scaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing scaking? 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. 	484 12 33 44 5 6 7 7 8 9 10	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. 	484 12 33 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing scaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that scaking is the pre-pushing process, so scaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing scaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a 	484 12 33 44 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I meen, once they see an excedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an excertance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. 	484 12 33 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an excertance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probebly is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total 	484 13 23 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an excetance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. Q. Who makes that call? 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total time period for observations? A. It fits on one sheet. 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop starts. I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. Q. Who makes that call? A. It starts with the engineer. The engineer 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total time period for observations? A. It fits on one sheet. Q. Is that the sole reason? 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an excetance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspectors, do they make the final call on whether inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. Q. Who makes that call? A. It starts with the engineer. The engineer reviews it and determines compliance and then it comes 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EPA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total time period for observations? A. It fits on one sheet. Q. Is that the sole reason? A. Yesh. 	484 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop at a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. Q. Who makes that call? A. It starts with the engineer. The engineer reviews it and determines compliance and then it comes up to me for a secondary review. 	486
 inspectors use for soaking; is that correct? A. Right now, yes. Q. On this form, there's a section for Method 9 readings; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. That's because Method 9 is used to read opacity? A. Method 9, yeah, it's an opacity reading. Q. And the EFA's Method 9 for reading opacity requires a certification? A. Yes. Q. And are Allegheny County Health Department inspectors certified in Method 9? A. Yes. Q. And on this form, there's a total of a potential total of 21 readings; is that correct? A. It's the first five minutes on this form. If it goes beyond five minutes, they would extend it. I don't know if it's 21 or not, but it probably is. Q. Do you know why the form has a five-minute total time period for observations? A. Yesh. Q. Okay. Do you know why the different observations 	484 13 23 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 instructs Allegheny County observers as to when to stop doing soaking observations? A. I'd have to check. I know that soaking is the pre-pushing process, so soaking would end whenever pushing starts. I just don't know if it's specifically in Article 21. Q. If it's not in Article 21, do you know any other document that a health inspector could look at to know when to stop observing soaking? A. I don't know if they have any requirement to stop start a certain point. Q. So you are not aware of any documents? A. No. Because, I mean, once they see an exceedance, they could stop, in theory, at that point. Q. The Allegheny County Health Department inspections are compliant or non-compliant with the regulations? A. No. Q. Who makes that call? A. It starts with the engineer. The engineer reviews it and determines compliance and then it comes up to me for a secondary review. Q. Okay. And as the enforcement chief, do you make 	486

		487			489
1	non-compliant?		1	would deviate or not deviate?	
2	A. Most of the time, although I don't go into as		2	A. No.	
3	much detail of the background counts as the engineer		3	${\sf Q}.~$ Is there any guidance document or policy within	
4	would.		4	the Department that you know of that tells you when it's	
5	${\sf Q}.~$ And do you make final calls on whether or not the		5	appropriate to deviate or not deviate from the source	
6	Department will deviate or not deviate from the source		6	test manual?	
7	test manual?		7	A. Just go back to the regulation. You keep going	
8	A. I could.		8	back to the manual. It's the starting point. I start	
9	Q. Do you?		9	with the regulation.	
10	A. I suppose I do at times. And again, a lot of		10	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. So other than the regulation, you are not	
11	this is carryover from the way it was done prior to my		11	aware of any written document or guidance that tells you	
12	starting.		12	when you can deviate or not deviate from the source	
13	Q. Okay. And so since you've started, you've been		13	testing manual?	
14	the person whose made decisions on whether or not to		14	A. No. I mean, the penalty policy may indirectly	
15	deviate from the source test manual when determining		15	say it, but no.	
16	compliance?		16	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. I want to switch topics now and talk to	
17	A. I don't know if that is even a conscious		17	you about the 2016 Consent Judgment. You're familiar	
18	decision. I typically refer more to the regulation than		18	with that document, correct?	
19	the manual. I don't look at the source manual as much.		19	A. Yes.	
20	I know it exists and I know what it is, but I look more		20	Q. This was negotiated between U.S. Steel and	
21	at the regulation.		21	Allegheny County's Health Department in March of 2016?	
22	${f Q}.$ And so sometimes, you unconsciously deviate from		22	A. Yes.	
23	the source test manual?		23	Q. You were the enforcement chief at that time?	
24	A. Potentially, yes.		24	A. Yes.	
23	Q. And sametimes do you consciously deviate from it?		20	Q. And you are one of the main individuals	
			-		
1		488	1	recordible for orfering the 2016 Concert Judgment?	490
1	A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know	488	1	responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment?	490
1 2 3	A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. O Okay. So constitutes you intertionally deviate and	488	1 2 3	A. Yes.	490
1 2 3 4	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? 	488	1 2 3 4	responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not	490
1 2 3 4 5	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it. 	488	1 2 3 4 5	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. 	488	1 2 3 4 5	<pre>responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment?</pre>	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, ves. 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yesh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeah, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. There are times - the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like u.s. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the source test manual, is there any way to know? 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeah, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? A. Yeah, and then the work that may or may not have 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. There are times — the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unitentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the source test manual, is there any way to know? A. Wall, the regulation wouldn't say that, 'Dean is 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? A. Yeeh, and then the work that may or may not have been required to achieve better compliance with them. 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. There are times - the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unintentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like u.s. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulation. Q. And the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation, not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the source test manual, is there any way to know? A. Wall, the regulation wouldn't say that, "Deen is going to deviate it." Because, I mean, the regulation 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the COMS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? A. Yeeh, and then the work that may or may not have been required to achieve better compliance with them. Q. And can we also agree that the most effective 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. There are times - the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate and sometimes you unintentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unitentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like U.S. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. I'm not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the source test manual, is there any way to know? A. Wall, the regulation woulch't say that, "Deen is going to deviate it." Because, I mean, the regulation would be the outstanding condition that would be 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeah, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? A. Yeah, and then the work that may or may not have been required to achieve better compliance with them. Q. And can we also agree that the most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental 	490
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. There are times - the doors, for example, I know about that one. Q. Okay. So sometimes you intentionally deviate; is that fair? A. I could. I don't know for certain if I do it unitentionally or not. Q. Okay. And is there any way for a company like us. Steel to know in advance when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Follow the regulations will tell U.S. Steel when you are going to deviate and not deviate from the source test manual? A. Tim not just going to willy-nilly ignore it. I would have a reason for it. If the regulation overrides the manual, I would look at the regulation not the manual. Q. Okay. And if the regulation doesn't tell U.S. Steel whether or not you are going to deviate from the source test manual, is there any way to know? A. Wall, the regulation wouldn't say that, "Deen is going to deviate it." Because, I mean, the regulation would be the outstanding condition that would be followed. 	488	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 responsible for enforcing the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. Yes. Q. But that has not expired yet, correct? A. It has not. Q. There's still a compliance determination that is in existence for the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. For the CONS, yes. Q. The 2016 Consent Judgment applies not to just COMS but also to pushing and soaking on batteries 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Correct. Q. And there is a procedure for penalties related to those things: COMS, pushing, soaking on 1, 2 and 3, correct? A. Yeeh, it's stipulated penalties in that consent judgment. Q. And can we agree that the major focus of the 2016 Consent Judgment was the battery stacks or the COMS compliance? A. Yeeh, and then the work that may or may not have been required to achieve better compliance with them. Q. And can we also agree that the most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site, the Clairton site, would be 	490

		491		493
1	A. That's the best way to look at the state of the	1	A. Yeah, I'd say major improvement; from before and	
2	battery, not the way it's being operated but the actual	2	after the 2016 judgment.	
3	state of it, yes.	З	$Q_{\rm \cdot}$ And you calculated the first quarter 2008 (sic)	
4	${\bf Q}.$ Would you agree that that's the most effective	4	battery stacks COMS compliance percentage for purposes	
5	surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental	5	of this case, correct?	
6	performance at the site?	6	A. Yes.	
7	A. The whole site is different than the stacks	7	Q. 99.384 percent?	
8	themselves. That is the best surrogate for the stacks	8	A. That sounds right.	
9	themselves. That stack implies the condition of the	9	Q. That's a high compliance percentage?	
10	battery, of the walls in the battery itself. So based	10	A. Yeah, there's a lot of violations in that .6	
11	off of that, yes.	11	percent. But yeah, it's pretty high.	
12	Q. And is your testimony it's not the best	12	Q. $$ 98.5 is the target that was agreed to in the 2016	
13	environmental surrogate for the whole site that's	13	Consent Judgment, correct?	
14	measurable?	14	A. I wouldn't categorize it as a target, but that is	
15	A. It's well, the problem is that you have a	15	where the stipulated penalties came in.	
16	condition of the site is different than operating the	16	Q. Okay. And that's the compliance demonstration	
17	site. The condition of the site, the COMS are the best	17	that has to be met, 98.5 percent?	
18	surrogate for that because it tells you whether there	18	A. I'd have to check to remind myself. That sounds	
19	are holes in the walls between the ovens, and any leaks	19	right. I'd have to just to check to make sure.	
20	would go into there and eventually would go out the	20	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And that would be in the 2016 Consent	
21	stacks.	21	Judgment itself? It's a written document, right?	
22	But if you operate it, that's different than the	22	A. Yeah.	
23	way that the COMS exceedance would come in. So the	23	Q. Mr. DeLuca, I want to talk a little bit about the	
24	operations is more like the pushing, the charging, and	24	enforcement order now that's the subject of this appeal.	
25	things like that as the operational side of things.	25	That's at Exhibit 1 in the U.S. Steel binders.	
-				-
	4	0.2		101
1	4	92	A should T get 14 book in?	494
1	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most	92	A. Should I put 14 back in?	494
1 2 3	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for	92	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. 	494
1 2 3	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack	92 1 2 3	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. A. Ind Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the 	494
1 2 3 4	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no?	92 1 2 3 4	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes.	92 1 2 3 4 5	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack CQMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct?	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. The there 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. Um correct? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. It the better of page 2, there's a section that's 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Gravet them is an COME	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Correing and Deteriorating Issues." is that 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. Ind since the performance at the 2016 Concept Indement has 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has populated in major improvement in battery stacker; is that	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that for in a start of the start of th	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 2 3	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. and in this conting. this is a section that yer. 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you baland propage correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 100 11 12 13 14	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot here a more than the compliance of those yeah. 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedence. 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. Ind whet you did is you identified trends that 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedence. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually surjubble, there has been a major improvement in the fair? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stord out to you in terms of decreasing correliance. 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedance. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedence. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best correct is a correct. 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 10	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yee. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yee. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the eviro? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedence. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the site? 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then specifically looking at the last few years or so, and 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedance. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the site? A. If the best data available you are referring to intervent of the period of the second of	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then appecifically looking at the last few years or so, and then figured out ones that were different than they were 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the site? A. If the best data available you are referring to is the number of non-compliant hours with the COMS, yes, 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then apecifically looking at the last few years or so, and then figured out ones that were different than they were previously; and yes, that led to a lot of the lower 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 4 9. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. 9. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. 9. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. 9. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot face secondaries. 9. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 - or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the site? A. If the best data available you are referring to fis the number of non-compliant hours with the ODS, yea, there's been much less exceedances from there. So there has been a major improvement in the 2016 site of non-compliant hours with the ODS, yea, there's been much less exceedances from there. So there has been a major improvement in the 2016 site of non-compliant hours with the ODS, yea, there's been much less exceedances from there. So there 	92 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24 25 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Gkay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then specifically looking at the last few years or so, and then figured out ones that were different than they were previously; and yes, that led to a lot of the lower compliance which I put into here. 	494
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	 4 Q. And let me back up to my question. The most effective surrogate that's actually measurable for environmental performance at the site is battery stack opacity; do you agree with that? Yes or no? A. The best individual surrogate? Yes. Q. There are no battery stack COMS violations in the enforcement order, correct? A. No. Q. I'm correct? A. Correct, there's no COMS. Q. And since the the 2016 Consent Judgment has resulted in major improvement in battery stacks; is that fair? A. In the compliance of those, yeah, there's a lot less exceedance. Q. Okay. And in using the best data that's actually available, there has been a major improvement in the 2016 - or since the 2016 Consent Judgment and the best overall surrogate for environmental performance across the site? A. If the best data available you are referring to is the number of non-compliant hours with the COMS, yea, there's been much less exceedances from there. So there is been improvement there. 	92 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	 A. Should I put 14 back in? Q. Yeah, you can. A. Okay. Q. And Exhibit 1 is the enforcement order that's the subject of this appeal, correct? A. Yes. Q. Can you look at page 2 of that enforcement order? A. I'm there. Q. At the bottom of page 2, there's a section that's called "Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues;" is that correct? A. Okay, yes. Q. And in this section, this is a section that you helped prepare, correct? A. Yes. Q. And what you did is you identified trends that stood out to you in terms of decreasing compliance, correct? A. I looked at the compliance over time and then specifically looking at the last few years or so, and then figured out ones that were different than they were previously; and yes, that led to a lot of the lower compliance which I put into here. Q. Right. You identified trends that stood out to to to put the section is the stood out to you in terms of the lower compliance which I put into here. 	494

	495			107
1	A. Yes.	1	A. Well, the door area on this inspection has	491
2	${f Q}.$ And you identified those different trends by the	2	Battery 1 and 3 listed and high-opacity door has other	
3	type of inspection, correct?	3	batteries listed. I'm not sure if that answers it or	
4	A. Connect, and the battery individually.	4	not.	
5	${f Q}.$ Okay. And then you put compliance percentages	5	Q. Okay. The door area emissions section doesn't	
6	that you associated with those trends, correct?	6	identify any B battery door ongoing and deteriorating	
7	A. Based off ACHD numbers, yeah.	7	issues; is that fair?	
8	${\sf Q}.$ And that goes to my question. In the enforcement	8	A. Yeah, there is none.	
9	order, you used inspection data from both Allegheny	9	$Q_{\scriptscriptstyle \rm C}$ Okay. So when you were looking for trends that	
10	County Health Department inspectors and Keramida	10	stood out, you didn't find any trends with respect to	
11	inspectors, correct?	11	the door area emissions from the Battery B?	
12	A. Yes.	12	A. Correct.	
13	Q. Okay. That's what you used for compliance in the	13	${\sf Q}.$ The order is not supposed to include any	
14	enforcement order?	14	penalties for battery stack violations, pushing and	
15	A. Yeah, for the inspection half of it, yes.	15	soaking on 1, 2 and 3; is that correct?	
16	${\sf Q}.~$ And that's what you used for penalties in the	16	A. Connect.	
17	enforcement order?	17	Q. Can you look at paragraph 65?	
18	A. Yes.	18	A. Okay.	
19	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. In the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issue	19	Q. I'm sorry, paragraph 59, which is on page 18 of	
20	section, you didn't use that same data set?	20	Exhibit 1.	
21	A. Connect.	21	A. Okay.	
22	Q. You used less data?	22	Q. This paragraph is where it specifically stated	
23	A. I had less data to look at in Excel, yes.	23	that the Department is not taking action with respect to	
24	Q. You used only the Allegheny County Health	24	pushing, combustion stacks, or soaking on batteries 1, 2	
-		-		
	496			498
1	issues?	1	A. Yes.	
2	A. Yes.	2	Q. And that's because that's already covered by the	
3	Q. And those inspection compliance percentages are	3	2016 Consent Judgment?	
4	lower than the Keramida inspector compliance	4	A. Yes.	
5	percentages?	5	Q. Paragraph 65 on the next page, page 19,	
0	A. I can't say across the board; but a majority of	6	Identifies a violation for soaking from Battery 2?	
0	The time, yes, ACHD has a lower compliance.	6	A. It's not supposed to be listed there, inere was	
o Q	Q. So if you actually used all the data that you	0	O Is that apothor error?	
10	Issue section, the numbers would look different?	10	A York it's a two in the order	
11	A They would definitely look different I would	11	Ω So there shouldn't be a soaking penalty for	
12	assume most of them would look better. But I don't	12	Battery 2 in the enforcement order?	
13	Just like, for example, I'm just on page 3	13	A. Not in this one. no.	
14	randomly in the midfile, it says. "Battery 14 has	14	Ω . The enforcement order includes a baseline	
15	declined from 100 percent in 2014 to 81 in 2017." The	15	calculation as part of the corrective action, correct?	
16	contract and a constraint of the and a second	10	a contraction do part of the controlotive dotten, controlat	
10	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent	16	A. Yes.	
17	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant.	16	A. Yes. O. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of	
17 18	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the	16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's 	
17 18 19	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they	16 17 18 19	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? 	
17 18 19 20	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the	16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yesh. 	
17 18 19 20 21	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section?	16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yesh. Q. And that baseline includes fugitive emissions 	
17 18 19 20 21 22	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section? A. No.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yeah. Q. And that baseline includes fugitive emissions points and battery stack compliance, correct? 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section? A. No. Q. And the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yesh. Q. And that baseline includes fugitive emissions points and battery stack compliance, correct? A. Yes. 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section? A. No. Q. And the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section doesn't identify any ongoing and deteriorating door-leak	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yesh. Q. And that baseline includes fugitive emissions points and battery stack compliance, correct? A. Yes. Q. It includes battery stack compliance as half of 	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24 25	Battery 14 in 2014 numbers may not have been 100 percent compliant. Q. If a member of the public was to pick up the enforcement order and just read it as written, they wouldn't know that you only use selective data for the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section? A. No. Q. And the Ongoing and Deteriorating Issues section doesn't identify any ongoing and deteriorating door-leak issues; is that fair?	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. Yes. Q. So the way that works is, in the first quarter of 2018, the Department has determined U.S. Steel's baseline compliance percentage for the batteries? A. Yesh. Q. And that baseline includes fugitive emissions points and battery stack compliance, correct? A. Yes. Q. It includes battery stack compliance as half of the baseline? 	

T

Г

1	A voc	499	1	the entire better performing	50
	And bettony stack compliance is compressed by the		2	and if we beight wick at that parties of it	
3	2016 Consent Judgment?		2	and that notantial gristence, it gould trigger bet idle	
4	A. Yes		4	but I don't I wouldn't consider that to be a penalty	
5	Ω . The baseline also includes functive emissions		5	by itself. It's not a financial negative on both orders	
6	points that are covered by the 2016 Consent Judgment.		6	0. Your testimony is hot idling two batteries is not	
7	correct?		7	a renalty to U.S. Steel?	
8	A. It incomposites all of the inspection data so		8	A It's not a direct financial nonality. It's a	
9	not just the 2016 stuff but exercitive that we have	1.1	9	renalty use	
10	O. So the baseline also includes pushing emissions		10	O Do you think there are direct financial	
11	which are governed by the 2016 Consent Judgment		11	consequences for bot idling 20 percent of the Clairton	
12	miler die governee by ene 2010 oonsent blegnene,		12	plant?	
13	A. Yesh it includes all muching and then all		13	A A majority of the time I would say use I don't	
14	soaking also for 1, 2, 3		14	know the production endedules of where they are at with	
15	O. And so the baseline includes both pushing and		15	production. I can see a possibility existing where they	
16	soaking for 1 2 and 3, which are fugitive emissions		16	can meet all the requirements with eight batteries. I	
17	points that are already governed by the 2016 Consent		17	don't know I don't know II S. Steel's production	
18	Judgment, correct?		18	schedule and remunants.	
19	A. Yeeh. it's just rut in there as a metric for		19	Q. Well, let's assume that hot idling two batteries	
20	moliane. veah		20	does cause a financial impact to U.S. Steel.	
21	Ω And there is a rotential situation where rushing		21	A Olav	
22	compliance could cause II S. Steel not to meet the two		22	O In that situation if pushing was the driver for	
23	successive quarters improved upon the baseline: is that		23	both bot idling and caused a penalty under the 2016	
24	correct?		24	Consent Judgment II S. Steel would affectively be	
25	A any potential bettery cald yeah		25	renalized twice for its pushing compliance; is that	
		500			502
1	$\ensuremath{Q}\xspace.$ And one of those potential points could be	500	1	fair?	502
1 2	${\sf Q}.$ And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct?	500	1 2	fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes.	502
1 2 3	Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct?A. Yesh.	500	1 2 3	fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply	502
1 2 3 4	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is 	500	1 2 3 4	<pre>fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3?</pre>	502
1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? 	500	1 2 3 4 5	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yesh. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yeah, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yeah, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order. 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order at the same time; it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order at the same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing compliance is lower than it was, then that would be 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing compliance is lower than it was, then that would be lower overall compliance, yes. 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing compliance is lower than it was, then that would be lower overall compliance, yes. Q. Okay. And in that situation, there would be provide the the construction of the situation. 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; is that fair? 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing compliance is lower than it was, then that would be penalties for both the 2016 Consent Judgment and a hot idle penalties for both the 2016 Consent Judgment and a hot 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; is that fair? A. Yesh. Q. Ind it is significently bights then that? 	502
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing compliance is lower than it was, then that would be penalties for both the 2016 Consent Judgment and a hot idle because of pushing compliance? 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; is that fair? A. Yesh. Q. And it is significantly higher than that? 	502
1 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 one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeeh. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order at the same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing toppliance is lower than it was, then that would be penalties for both the 2016 Consent Judgment and a hot idle because of pushing compliance? A. That goes to where you define the word "penalty." 	500	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	 fair? A. They would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past operation. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; is that fair? A. Yesh. Q. And it is significantly higher than that? A. Yesh, 99.152 is greater than 95. Q. And that's a fairly higher rate of compliance 	502
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	 Q. And one of those potential points could be pushing, correct? A. Yeah. Q. And pushing could be a reason that a hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order as it's written? A. It could. Q. And there could be a situation where U.S. Steel would receive a penalty under the 2016 Consent Judgment and also have to hot idle under the enforcement order at the same time; is that correct? A. Wait, ask that again. I forget the initial part. Q. So back to the situation where pushing compliance is the reason that hot idle is triggered under the enforcement order, it could also be a scenario where that same pushing compliance results in a penalty pursuant to the 2016 Consent Judgment? A. So if everything else stays stagnant and pushing fourpliance is lower than it was, then that would be penalties for both the 2016 Consent Judgment and a hot idle because of pushing compliance? A. That goes to where you define the word "penalty." 	500	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	 fair? A. they would be effected under both orders, yes. Q. And the same hypothetical situation could apply if we used soaking on 1, 2, and 3? A. Yes. Q. Or battery stack compliance? A. Yesh, it's keeping everything else stacked, yes. Q. The first time that the county calculated the baseline calculation that U.S. Steel has to meet has to beat and then beat again was after the enforcement order was already issued, correct? A. Yes. Q. So the enforcement order was drafted and issued and the Department didn't know what the baseline calculation was? A. No, it was based on just improving off past percent; is that fair? A. Yesh. Q. And you have already testified under oath that you thought it was in the 90s, maybe above 95 percent; is that fair? A. Yesh. Q. And it is significantly higher than that? A. Yesh, 90.152 is greater than 95. Q. And that's a fairly high rate of compliance, 98 152 neveent? 	502

	503			505
1	A. If you look at the compliance percentage, yeah.	1	BM2.5.	
2	I mean, there are a few hundred violations in there,	2	${\sf Q}.$ Can you tell me what exactly are the pollutants	
3	though.	3	in the gaseous emissions that would be emitted?	
4	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. I want to talk to you about the B battery	4	A. Raw coke oven gas, coke oven emissions, BTEX,	
5	door-leak standard that's in the enforcement order.	5	H2S, potentially some SO2 maybe as a lower amount.	
6	What pollutants was the Department trying to	6	Q. Anything else?	
7	regulate with this standard?	7	A. There's a whole - I don't know all of them.	
8	A. It was the well, it's looking at visible	8	Q. Anything else that you know about?	
9	emissions. So the visible emissions would have any	9	A. I've heard carbon disulfide, carbonyl	
10	particulate matter. And as a surrogate, you would	10	sulfide, naphthalene, anomia. I don't know all of them.	
11	assume, whenever you see visible emissions, that there	11	${\bf Q}. \ \ \mbox{Did}$ you tell me all the ones that you do know?	
12	is also gaseous emissions coming out in that open area	12	A. As I recall right now.	
13	from the doors.	13	${\sf Q}.$ And the Department didn't do any risk assessment	
14	And then from those gaseous emissions, it creates	14	or analysis to determine the maximum level of any of	
15	a lot of sulfur compounds that eventually come into SO2	15	those pollutants that could come from B battery coke-	
16	and creates particulate matter. It would have the BTEX	16	side doors and still be protective of public health,	
17	coming out also. There are a good bit of compounds that	17	safety and welfare; is that fair?	
18	cane out.	18	A. None of which I'm aware.	
19	${\bf Q}.~$ And so the pollutants that were specifically	19	${\bf Q}.$ Okay. And the B battery coke-side doors has a	
20	regulated would be PM, SO2, and BTEX. Anything else?	20	shed, correct?	
21	A. What do you mean by "specifically regulated"?	21	A. Yes.	
22	${\sf Q}.$ Was there an intent to regulate or control	22	${\sf Q}.~$ And that shed is a control device that controls	
23	specific pollutants with the B battery door-leak	23	PM2.5 emissions; is that fair?	
24	standard?	24	A. Yes.	
25	A. I was aware of a reduction in it, and that would	25	${\sf Q}.$ No other battery at Clairton has a shed designed	
1	cause the reduction of the two non-attainment areas for the EM and the SO2.	1	to control PM2.5 emissions, correct? A. Not a full shed, no.	
2	O and the goal was to focus on the two criteria	3	O Okay The B battery onke side has better PM	
4	collutants that are identified in the enforcement order:	4	controls than any other battery at Clairton; is that	
5	SO2 and PM2.5?	5	fair?	
6	A. Just basically to decrease emissions back to	6	A. From the coke side, yeah. It has the bag house.	
7	where it was, and the cause of that would be a decrease	7	 You were testifying during your direct about the 	
8	in those emissions of those collutants.	8	data that you used to develop the B battery door-leak	
9	O. Okay. So the Department didn't have any	9	standard for the coke side. Do you remember that?	
10	hazardous air pollutants or gaseous emissions in mind to	10	A. Yeeh.	
11	regulate with the B battery door-leak standard?	11	Q. That data is in U.S. Steel Exhibit 8, correct?	
12	A. I don't think I can speak for the whole	12	A. Yes.	
13	Department.	13	Q. And the data that you used goes back to January	
14	Q. Well, you came up with the standard.	14	of 2016, correct?	
15	A. Yeah.	15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. Did you have any gaseous emissions or hazardous	16	Q. And the data that you used to develop the B	
17	pollutants in mind that you were trying to regulate with	17	battery coke-side door-leak standard shows that U.S.	
18	the B battery door-leak standard?	18	Steel would never have met it on any six-month basis,	
19	A. Well, all of the gaseous emissions aren't	19	correct?	
20	controlled. So any of the gaseous emissions would be	20	A. Going back retroactively when they weren't	
21	improved by reduction of leaks on the B side shed.	21	focusing on it, yes, connect, there's not a consecutive	
22	So the gaseous emissions would incorporate the	22	six-month period.	
23	SO2, the BTEX, naphthalene, any of the coke oven gas	23	${\sf Q},\;$ Right. And so the data you used to develop the	
24	emissions, all of that would be controlled better by a	24	standard shows that U.S. Steel would never have met it;	
25	reduction in emissions. The bag house controls the	25	is that fair?	

		507			509
1	A. Well, never have met it implies that they didn't.		1	A. Yes.	
2	They were attempting to do it and focusing on it at that		2	$Q.\ $ Which is depicted on Exhibit ACHD 11, correct?	
3	point.		3	A. Yes.	
4	The past data does not show a six-month period		4	${\sf Q}.$ Let's assume we can go back in time and go back	
5	and this order does require a six-month period. So this		5	to January 14th or January of 2014. Let me back up.	
6	order has to do alightly better than had been done in		6	The B battery coke-side door-leak standard	
7	the past.		7	becomes effective January 1, 2019, correct?	
8	${\sf Q}.$ Right. So the standard of the data you used to		8	A. I wouldn't call it a standard, but the portion of	
9	develop this standard didn't show one scenario where the		9	the order referring to that does, yes.	
10	standard had been met?		10	Q. The requirement that, if U.S. Steel has more than	
11	A. Conzect.		11	10 coke-side door leaks on the B battery using the yard	
12	Q. ACHD 11 is additional data that you looked at		12	equivalent, that it has to hot idle two batteries, goes	
13	subsequent to issuing the enforcement order.		13	into effect starting January 1st of 2019; is that	
14	A. Are you referring to the sheet that goes back to		14	correct?	
15	2014?		15	A. Correct.	
16	Q. Correct. Why don't you find that?		16	0. It lasts for six months, correct?	
17	A. Okav.		17	A. Correct.	
18	O. Looking at ACHD 11. this is data that you went		18	O. And if U.S. Steel has 11 leaks in any of those	
19	and looked at subsequent to issuing the enforcement		19	months using vard equivalent, it has to hot idle two	
20	order, correct?		20	hatteries?	
21	A. Yee		21	A Ves	
22	And why did you do that?		22	O Okay. So let's pretend we can do back in time to	
23	$\mathbf{A} \textbf{Well} \textbf{borrison} = \textbf{kind of borrison of the}$		22	2014 in January and this standard evicts. From the	
24	A. Well, because - Kin of because of the		23	first four months, what would have been the result - or	
24	representation measurer you guys were saying that there		24	thist four months, what would have been the result or	
2.5	WASH C BLK OWNERCHICKNESS, I WELL DECK OD DETOT.		20	the first six months, i m sorryr	
		508			510
1	years to see if it actually did happen.	508	1	A. January, February, March were all greater than	510
1	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it	508	1 2	A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it	510
1 2 3	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening	508	1 2 3	 January, February, March were all greater than April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater 	510
1 2 3 4	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over	508	1 2 3 4	A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard.	510
1 2 3 4 5	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it.	508	1 2 3 4 5	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed	508	1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016.	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place.	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place.	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data?	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data?</pre>	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm and more inf it is a after the deposition of a little bit. I'm 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm not sume if it was after the deposition or not. I know 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm not sure if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order went out. 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B shed side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little hit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the regulations already in place. A. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for sume if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order went out. 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wan't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the seculations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for sume if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the deposition you realized that the data you used to develop the standard shows that it had never here the deposition or not. 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20	years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't arything that was requiring them to do that beyond the sequalations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for sume if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order went out. Q. Okay. At some point, you realized that the data you used to develop the standard shows that it had never here it is a first the standard shows that it had never here it is a first the standard shows that it had never here it is a first were if it was after the standard shows that it had never here it is a first were if it is a standard shows that it had never here it is a first were if it is a standard shows that it had never here is a first be standard shows that it had never here here here is a first be standard shows that it had never here here here.	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. January, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been January of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and Sptember would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 20	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the sequlations already in place. A. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for sums if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order want out. Q. Okay. At some point, you realized that the data you used to develop the standard shows that it had never here it is not some if it was after the deposition are not. I know it was after the order want out. A. Correct, for six consecutive months. 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so January would have been under it. 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the soulations already in place. A. So after the deposition, you realized that the fot suce if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the deposition shows that it had never net the deposition mark. A. Onerect, for six consecutive months. B. so you went back a few more years to see what the data is to never. 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so January would have been under it. Q. Okay. So there would have been a hot idle in 	510
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the seculations already in place. Q. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for tarse after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order went out. Q. Okay. At some point, you realized that the data you used to develop the standard shows that it had never been met? A. Correct, for six consecutive months. Q. So you went back a few more years to see what the data showed? 	508	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have resulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so January would have been under it. Q. Okay. So there would have been a hot idle in that scenario? 	510
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	 years to see if it actually did happen. So whenever I first created it, I looked at it and saw that more than half the time it was happening and then there were a couple months that were just over it. So if U.S. Steel focused on the Battery B sheft side, it would be easily able to reduce those a little bit just by focusing on it. 'Cause in March of 2016, for example, with the half of a leak, there wasn't anything that was requiring them to do that beyond the sequences already in place. A. So after the deposition, you realized that the data you used showed that U.S. Steel had never met the standard, so you went back and looked at more data? A. I'm not I let me retract a little bit. I'm for sure if it was after the deposition or not. I know it was after the order went out. Q. Okay. At some point, you realized that the data point used to develop the standard shows that it had never met? A. Creact, for six consecutive months. G. So you went back a few more years to see what the data showed? A. Yah, I went back two more years. 	508	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	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have greater exceeded that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have greater exceeded that standard. A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if the standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and then October would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so January would have had to hot idle. And the next five months would have been under it. Q. Okay. So there would have been a hot idle in that scenario? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's look at the second half of the year five months would have been under it. 	510
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	<text><text><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></list-item></text></text>	508	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	 A. Jamary, February, March were all greater than 10. April, May and June were all 10 or less. So it would have been Jamary of 2014 that would have greater tensented that standard. Q. And so the first six months of 2014 would have greater tenseulted in a hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay, let's look at the second half of the year for 2014. If we use the second half of the year, the six months of 2014, what would the result have been if its standard was in place? A. July, August and September would have met and tense of the year would have been greater than 10. Q. So U.S. Steel would have had to hot idle? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2015 and look at the first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? A. January, they were just over at 11 and a half, so function would have been under it. Q. Okay. So there would have been a hot idle in that scenario? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Well, let's look at the second half of in the year first six months in 2015. If this standard was in place, what would the result have been? 	510

		511			513
1	2015, that six-month period. If the standard was in		1	${\bf Q}.~$ You didn't do any analysis to see if the standard	
2	place then, what would the result have been?		2	was technologically achievable; is that fair?	
3	A. That would have been a July '15 was greater		3	A. I didn't know I would have to if it was met, so	
4	than 10.		4	no.	
5	${\sf Q}.~$ So there would have been a hot idle?		5	${\sf Q}.$ You didn't do any risk assessment to determine if	
6	A. Yeah.		6	the standard was necessary to protect public health?	
7	Q. Okay. Well, let's go to January of 2016 and look		7	A. No.	
8	at the first six months of 2016. If the standard was in		8	${\sf Q}.$ You didn't do any analysis to see what the impact	
9	place then, what would the result have been?		9	would be on the ambient air quality by imposing this	
10	A. January was greater than 10 and then February,		10	standard?	
11	March, April and May were under and June was over.		11	A. No.	
12	Q. So there would have been a hot idle?		12	Q. You didn't do any health-based risk emissions	
13	A. Yes.		13	standard analysis?	
14	Q. Okay. Well, let's look at the second half of		14	A. No. It was just thought if you have less	
15	2016, for that six-month period. If the standard was in		15	emissions, you have less in the air; but no, no	
17	A Blue Nerrot and Emterhor some under: Ortobor		17	The standard didalt as through any submaking	
18	A. ULLY, Adjust, and september were under; occuber		18	Q. The scaluard dian't go through any rulemaking	
19	under So there would be a bot idle for that 10 and a		19	A $T'm$ assuming we are referring to the order 10	
20	half.		20	leaks?	
21	O. Okay. What about the first six months of 2017.		21	0. Tam.	
22	if the standard was in place, what would have happened?		22	A. No.	
23	A. They were all greater than 10, so it would be a		23	Q. It wasn't reviewed by the Board of Health?	
24	hot idle.		24	A. No.	
25	Q. Okay. What about the second half of 2017 if the		25	Q. There was no public comment?	
1	A They were all greater than 10 so bot idle		1	A. No. Ω There was no public bearing?	
2	A. They were all greater than 10, so hot idle.		2	Q. There was no public hearing?	
1	Q. Okay. What about the first six months of 2016 if		1	A. NO.	
5	the standard was in prace, what would the result have		5	A No	
6	A. They were all meater than 10, so bot idle		6	O. No input from ILS Steel?	
7	0. Your process for coming up with the 10 door-leak		7	A. No.	
8	standard was pretty simple?		8	Q. If U.S. Steel does what it's supposed to do under	
9	A. Yes.		9	the enforcement order with respect to the baseline and	
10	Q. You just looked at the 2016 data and thought that	1	10	it exceeds it in the first quarter of 2019 and then it	
11	10 was something that was repeatable?	:	11	exceeds that number in the second quarter of 2019 but it	
12	A. I looked at — well, 2016 through 2018 and saw	-	12	has one month with 11 coke-side door leaks on B battery	
13	that the numbers were a lot higher in '17 and '18; and	1	13	using the yard equivalent, it has to hot idle two	
14	went back up and saw that in 2016, there were a lot of	1	14	batteries?	
15	months, 9 out of the 12, that were under 10. So that	1	15	A. That's what the order has, yeah.	
16	was something that could be achieved, especially 'cause	1	16	Q. It seems like a lot, right?	
17	if you are not focusing on samething, you are going to	1	17	A. It's something that can be done.	
18	typically do a little bit worse than if you focus on it.	1	18	Q. Does it seem like a lot?	
19	$\mathbf{Q}.$ So you looked at the data that is in U.S. Steel	1	19	A. A lot in the sense if it's a strict standard.	
20	Exhibit 8 and thought that 10 was a number that looked	2	20	Q. Strong penalty?	
21	to be repeatable?	2	21	A. It's strict. I mean, it's something that -	
22		2	22	Like I said, in 2016, it was done without focusing on	
23	A The dependence and a many be light analysis?		23	is it a lot to be the bar the betterion idled for it? This	
24	The order of a mar and the second sec	14	- 11	TO TO TOT TO HAVE TWO DECONTRACTION TOTAL TOL TC: TC 13	
25	I helieve that 9 of the 12 months that saw when	0	25	up to intermetation. It's a strict neral ty	

		515			517
	1 Q. It's excessive?		1	agree that it's excessive?	
	2 A. It's strict.		2	A. It's what I said there.	
1	3 Q. Would you agree that it is excessive?		3	Q_{\cdot} Okay. We looked earlier well, actually, on	
	4 A. I don't think so, because it's achievable.		4	direct, your counsel showed you the penalty policy that	
	5 Q. Okay. Did you do you remember testifying in a		5	was enacted in 2018?	
	6 deposition a few weeks ago?		6	A. Yes.	
1	7 A. Yes.		7	${\bf Q}.~$ And that penalty policy covers a variety of	
1	8 Q. Do you remember you were under oath?		8	different sources, correct?	
1	9 A. Yes.		9	A. Yeah.	
10	${\sf Q}$. Do you remember you were in my office, I was		10	${\sf Q}.$ It doesn't just cover coke ovens, it covers other	
1:	1 asking you questions?		11	sources?	
12	2 A. Yes.		12	A. Correct.	
13	${\sf Q}$. Do you remember saying that the B battery coke-		13	${\sf Q}.~$ And do you know if that penalty policy went out	
14	4 side door-leak standard was excessive?		14	for public comment?	
15	A. I remember you asking me a lot of questions along		15	A. It did not.	
10	o the same lines. I don't know all of the answers.		16	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. You also looked in your direct at a prior	
17	7 Q. Okay.		17	policy which was Exhibit 11, correct?	
18	A. I think it may have been my opinion, I'm not		18	A. Yes.	
19	e sure.		19	${\sf Q}.~$ And this policy, it was in existence until	
20	Q. So is it fair to say that you had an opinion that		20	January of this year?	
21	the door-leak standard was excessive?		21	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This is U.S. Steel 11?	
22	A. I'm sure you have the document closer than I do.		22	MR. DAUSCH: Correct.	
23	I don't recall.		23	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay, just making sure.	
24	${\sf Q}.~$ In this it's underneath one of your binders.		24	MR. DELUCA: Yes.	
25	A. Ch, okay.		25	BY MR. DAUSCH:	
1	$Q_{\boldsymbol{\cdot}}$ Your deposition is the first one. If you look at	010	1	$\ensuremath{Q}\xspace.$ This penalty policy, which is U.S. Steel 11, is	.010
2	page 181 starting with my question on line 4, "For		2	specific to coke ovens, correct?	
3	example, if U.S. Steel had 11 door leaks on the coke-		3	A. Yes.	
4	side B battery, that would be an excessive penalty to		4	Q. It doesn't apply to other sources?	
5	require it to hot idle two batteries?"		5	A. It does not.	
6	Your answer: "Excessive might be different than		6	${\sf Q}.$ Can you look at the second page of this penalty	
7	strong, but it's a strong penalty, yeah."		7	policy please, sir? That page is Bates labeled	
8	My question: "You wouldn't agree that it would		8	ACHD010179, correct?	
9	be excessive?"		9	A. Yes.	
10	Your answer: "I don't know how to define		10	Q_{\star} Do you see the section that is "Compliance	
11	excessive. But, I mean, it seems like a lot for having		11	Frequency"?	
12	one bad month of door leaks, but it's also something		12	A. Yes.	
13	that has been repeated in the past. Indirectly, I guess		13	${\sf Q}.$ And in this section, reasonable compliance	
14	it is excessive. It really depends on how you define		14	efforts during a quarter is the same as a compliance	
15	it."		15	rate above 95 percent, correct?	
16	Is that your testimony?		16	A. Both of those conditions lead to a factor of	
17	A. That's what it says here, yeah.		17	zero.	
18	Q. Okay. So you testified earlier that the B		18	Q. Right. And so, they are the same thing?	
19	battery door-leak standard was excessive?		19	A. No, either condition — so if you have reasonable	
20	A. I said, "Indirectly, I guess it's excessive."		20	compliance efforts during a quarter that leads to a zero	
21	Q. Okay. Do you still stand by that statement?		21	or a compliance rate gneater than 95, it's up to the	
22	A. I mean, the whole statement is, "Indirectly, I		22	engineer doing it to determine if it's reasonable or	
23	guess it is excessive, but it really depends how you		23	Not.	
24	Certine 1t."		24	Q. And your restimony now is that reasonable	
20	V. UKAY. USING YOUR DELINILION OF EXCESSIVE, WE		60	Comparative errore during a quarter does not equate to	

		519			521
1	compliance above 95 percent?		1	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Let's resume	
2	A. I'm just saying either of those conditions leads		2	at 3:40.	
3	to a zero.		3	(The hearing recessed at 3:35 p.m. and reconvened	
4	${f Q}.$ Are they the same thing under this policy? Are		4	at 3:43 p.m.)	
5	they equivalent?		5	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right. Let's go	
6	A. Yeah, yeah. In the sense that they both lead to		6	back on the record then.	
7	a zero, yeah, they are the same.		7	BY MR. DAUSCH:	
8	O . Okay. So if reasonable compliance is a		8	Q. In the enforcement order, Mr. DeLuca, there is no	
9	compliance above 95 percent, U.S. Steel had reasonable		9	exception or discretion built in if the B battery coke-	
10	compliance?		10	side doors have any problems or malfunctions that causes	
11	A Where or what?		11	them to have more than 10 door leaks per month using the	
12	\mathbf{O} In the penalty period for all of the batteries.		12	vard equivalent; is that fair?	
13	A This is a different metric. This included ACHD		13	A. No, there's nothing in the order, that's correct.	
11	The second of th		14	O. The order, the enforcement order, has a	
15	which we would be the start of the wind of the		15	methodology for determining the worst performing	
10	any was.		16	batteries: is that correct?	
10	Q. Let's take this policy for what it says and say		17	A Voc	
17	that compliance above 95 percent is the same as		10	• And that is is a bot idle is triggered there has	
18	reasonable compliance. If that's the case, U.S. Steel		10	Q. And that's if a not take is thiggered, there has	
19	would be above reasonable compliance?		19	to be a calculation of the two worst perionialing	
2.0	A. Yeah, that the plan total is above 95 percent.		20	batteries pursuant to the entoroament order; is that	
21	${f Q}.$ Right. And so if we were using the penalty		21	right?	
22	policy in existence during the first two quarters that		22	A. Yes.	
23	are at issue in this case, we would be using Exhibit 11?		23	Q. And as part of this appeal, the Department did	
24	A. Yeah. The reason I'm hesitating is because the		24	that calculation for first quarter 2018 to show how it	
25	fourth quarter, we wouldn't have had all the information		25	works; do you recall that?	
-					
		520			522
1	to do it until after that.	520	1	A. Right, yes.	522
1 2	to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about	520	1 2	A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that	522
1 2 3	to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy	520	1 2 3	A. Right, yes.Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery?	522
1 2 3 4	to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever cocurred in that period when this policy existed.	520	1 2 3 4	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. 	522
1 2 3 4 5	to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred,	520	1 2 3 4 5	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever cocurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence?</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever cocurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct.</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? 	522
1 2 4 5 6 7 8	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S.</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence?</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<pre>to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes.</pre>	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 14	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness uo. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. MR. WILLIS: I still have questions after, by the way. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. MR. WILLIS: I still have questions after, by the way. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. Q. And C battery has traditionally been the best 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. MR. WILLIS: I still have questions after, by the way. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. Q. And C battery has traditionally been the best battery with respect to CONS or stack compliance? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yeah, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. MR. WHILIS: I still have questions after, by the way. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay, for redirect? MR. WILLIS: Yes. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. Q. And C battery has traditionally been the best battery with respect to COMS or stack compliance? 	522
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel this this this the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel the penalty policy finish this witness up. M. DAUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. M. WILLIS: I still have questions after, by the way. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay, for redirect? MR. WILLIS: Yes. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. 	520	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. Q. And C battery has traditionally been the best battery with respect to CONS or stack compliance? A. To CONS, yes. Q. C battery has different emission limits than the 	522
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	 to do it until after that. Q. Yeah, I'm talking about A. Whatever occurred in that period when this policy existed. Q. Right. When the third quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that is Exhibit 11 was in existence? A. Yes, correct. Q. When the fourth quarter of 2017 occurred, the penalty policy that's identified as Exhibit 11 U.S. Steel was in existence? A. Yes. Q. And in the beginning of the first quarter of 2018, the penalty policy in existence was U.S. Steel Exhibit 11? A. Yesh, for the first 10 days or so. MR. DRUSCH: Mr. Slater, I would suggest that we take a short break and see if I can get everything done so we can officially finish this witness up. MR. WILLIS: I still have questions after, by the way. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay, for redirect? MR. WILLIS: Yes. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. MR. DAUSCH: So maybe just a short five to 10 days of an and the period of the short five to 10 days of the short	520	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	 A. Right, yes. Q. And do you recall that one of the batteries that was identified was the C battery? A. Yes. Q. And so based on the methodology and the enforcement order, C battery was determined to be one of the worst performing batteries, correct? A. Yes, during that period. Q. And you were surprised that the B battery showed up, correct or C battery? A. I was, yes. Q. And part of the reason is that C battery is the newest battery? A. Correct. Q. And has the most advanced technology? A. That's what I've been told. Q. And did you do any analysis to determine why it was that C battery showed up? A. No formal analysis, no. I went back and kind of looked at it. I think it was C soaking that came up. Q. And C battery has traditionally been the best battery with respect to CONS or stack compliance? A. To CONS, yes. Q. C battery has different emission limits than the other batteries at Clairton. correct? 	522

		523		,	525
1	A. Yes.		1	A. Yeah, we followed the manual. But again, it's	
2	Q. It's more stringent limits?		2	the regulation disagnees with the manual, but	
3	A. For most of them, yes.		3	${\sf Q}.$ On December 15th, there's also a charging	
4	${\sf Q}.$ All right. And so there are certain times where		4	violation in 2017; is that correct?	
5	B battery would have an exceedance that wouldn't be an		5	A. Yeah.	
6	exceedance on another battery?		6	${\sf Q}.$ And that is, again, on Exhibit 14, page	
7	A. Correct.		7	ACHD10415, correct?	
8	${\sf Q}.~$ And there's no control for that in the worst		8	A. Yeah, Battery 14, 58 seconds.	
9	performing battery methodology, correct?		9	Q. If you look at Exhibit 63 on page 128	
10	A. No, it's based off of compliance.		10	A. Okay.	
11	Q. Can we look back at if you can take Exhibit 14		11	Q. Actually, let's look at page 129 of Exhibit 63.	
12	out again, I have a few more questions.		12	A. Okay.	
13	Mr. DeLuca, I want to talk about charging. Do		13	${\sf Q}.$ This page is the Keramida inspection report for	
14	you recall from the source test manual the charging		14	Battery 14, correct?	
15	section says that, "Compliance shall be determined by		15	A. Yeah, for December of 2017.	
16	summing four charges"?		16	Q. And it would include the December 15th, 2017	
17	A. Yeah, from earlier today, yes.		17	violation that's included in the enforcement order,	
18	Q. Okay. On October 10th of 2017, there was a		18	correct?	
19	charging violation for Battery 14.		19	A. Yes.	
20	A. October 10, 2014 (sic.)		20	${\sf Q}.~$ And if the Department had followed the terms of	
21	Q. Do you see that?		21	the source test manual to determine compliance with	
22	A. Sixty-one and a half seconds?		22	charging, can we agree that there would be no violation?	
23	Q. Yeah. And that is on ACHD10415, correct?		23	A. There would not be.	
24	A. Yes.		24	Q. I'm correct?	
25	Q. The total seconds identified is 61.5, correct?		25	A. Yes, you are correct, there would not be a	
1	A	524	1	violation following the manual.	526
	A. Ies.		2	O. Okay. Look back, please, if you would at Exhibit	
2	A draw		3	14. again on page ACHD10415. There's a charging	
1	• Jost a look at page 45 of Evhibit 63		4	violation for October 23rd, 2017, correct?	
4	A all wight I'm there		5	A. Yeah. Battery B, 58 seconds.	
5	A. All right, I'll there.		6	O. Okav. Can vou look at Exhibit 63 on page 68?	
7	A These it is from the Kommids worthly reports		7	A. Okay.	
0	A. I KINW IT'S ITOM THE Relative instancy reports.		8	O. Are you familiar with this document?	
0	Q. And are you faililiar with how to read uns.		9	A. Yeah, this is an ACHD charging inspection sheet.	
10	A. les.		10	O. Okay. And based on this charging inspection	
11	for the month of October of 2017 correct?		11	sheet, can you tell whether or not there would be a	
12			12	violation for charging on October 23rd, 2017 if the	
13	And can you find October 10th, 2017?		13	Department had followed the terms of the source testing	
14			14	manual?	
15	And how many charges were included for this date?		15	A. There would not be.	
16	A Fire		16	O. Okav.	
17	(1. XIVE)				
10	And so if the Department had followed the terms		17	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have.	
10	Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms		17 18	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis?	
10	Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this data for charging?		17 18 19	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you.	
19	 Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this date for charging? A. No four oppositive charge greater than 75 cm. 		17 18 19 20	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION	
19 20 21	 Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this date for charging? A. No four consecutive charges greater than 75, so correct, there wouldn't be an exceedance. 		17 18 19 20 21	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. WILLIS:	
19 20 21	 Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this date for charging? A. No four consecutive charges greater than 75, so correct, there wouldn't be an exceedance. Q. Okay. So if the Department had followed the 		17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Mr. DeLuca, it seems that, based on your	
19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this date for charging? A. No four consecutive charges greater than 75, so correct, there wouldn't be an exceedance. Q. Okay. So if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, there would be no 		17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Mr. DeLuca, it seems that, based on your testimony during your deposition, that you had a little	
19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. And so if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, can we agree that there would be no violation for this date for charging? A. No four consecutive charges greater than 75, so correct, there wouldn't be an exceedance. Q. Okay. So if the Department had followed the terms of the source test manual, there would be no charging violation for October 10th, 2017 for Battery 		17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Mr. Willis? MR. WILLIS: Thank you. <u>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</u> BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Mr. DeLuca, it seems that, based on your testimony during your deposition, that you had a little bit of confusion about the term "excessive" and what it	

25 meant; would that be fair?

25 14, correct?

		527			529
1	A. I think it is defined different by different		1	BY MR. WILLIS:	
2	people, yes.		2	${\tt Q}.~$ I'm just taking a cursory glance, and if you look	
3	$Q.\ $ Okay. Well, let me provide you with a		3	to what is labeled as ACHD004893, do you see that?	
4	definition. I just took an opportunity to look at the		4	A. Yes.	
5	Merriam-Webster Dictionary online and "excessive" is		5	${\sf Q}.$ Look to the number Violation Number 10 on	
6	defined as: "Implies an amount or a degree too great to		6	that.	
7	be reasonable or acceptable."		7	A. Okay.	
8	Do you believe that the condition the		8	${\sf Q}.~$ It is in the first quarter of 2018. Do you see	
9	corrective action with respect to B battery, coke-side		9	the violation, the gravity-based penalty?	
10	shed and the leaked limit that's imposed, do you think		10	A. Yes.	
11	that is too great to be reasonable or acceptable?		11	${\sf Q}.$ Is that the penalty for one violation, 2,750?	
12	A. No, 'cause it was something that was met in the		12	A. Those would be prior to adjustment.	
13	past.		13	${f Q}.$ What is it per violation after adjustment, or do	
14	Q. Okay. I'm just going to run through my questions		14	you know?	
15	just to get them covered as quickly as possible.		15	A. I would have to calculate it from here, but it	
16	There are, as you recall, over 300 violations		16	would be the 2,750 is the gravity-based portion. The	
17	that were noted in the enforcement order that's at issue		17	adjustment would be that is the lids. So that would	
18	today, right?		18	go over to the left table, 2.2, 2,750 times 2.2, so	
19	A. Yes, for the - correct.	1	19	about 5,700, 5,800.	
20	Q. Of those 300, how many were Keramida discussing?		20	Q. 5,800. So at 10 violations at the maximum	
21	A. I don't know the exact number, but I would say		21	violation that I've been able to discover, we are	
22	less than 10.		22	talking about \$58,000?	
23	Q. Less than 10?		23	A. I'm sorry, I just remembered I had a calculator	
24	A. Yes, 10 or less.		24	here. Yeah, about 6,000. Sorry, what was that question	
25	Q. Ten or fewer. Do you recall from your penalty		25	again?	
		500			530
1	calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any	528	1	Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 $$	530
1 2	calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation?	528	1 2	Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000?	530
1 2 3	calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day.	528	1 2 3	Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes.	530
1 2 3 4	calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number?	528	1 2 3 4	Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty?	530
1 2 3 4 5	<pre>calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm exercy?</pre>	528	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define 	530
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Oh, the highest amount for each individual 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm exercy? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Oh, the highest amount for each individual violation? 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Mathed 22, correct? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm exercy? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be caused from Method 22? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'n aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware — you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gong through any sort of promulgation 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2019. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. It's 13.</pre>	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'n aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gone through any sort of promulgation proceess for regulation? Has it been before the Board of 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 20	<pre>calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. It's 13. BY MR. WILLIS: O one you turn to 12 place?</pre>	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. So if we were to say - well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gone through any sort of promulgation process for regulation? Has it been before the Board of Board of Health for review? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. It's 13. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Can you turn to 13, please? 	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gone through any sort of promulgation process for regulation? Has it been before the Board of Board of Health for review? A. No. 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. It's 13. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Can you turn to 13, please? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This is U.S. Steel 13? WD. WILLIS: Yee</pre>	528	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gone through any sort of promulgation process for regulation? Has it been before the Board of Board of Health for review? A. No. Q. Has it been before county council? 	530
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 calculation sheet what the maximum penalty was for any one violation? A. It's 25,000 per violation per day. Q. But you don't recall the exact number? A. Of the maximum — I'm sorry? Q. The actual penalty that was imposed for any one violation, do you remember what the max — what the highest number would have been? A. Ch, the highest amount for each individual violation? Q. Yes. A. No, I don't recall that. Q. Let's find that. Sorry, I'm looking for the penalty calculation sheet. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Is that U.S. Steel 11? MR. WILLIS: 11? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's the one before 2018. MR. WILLIS: No, not that one. Oh, here it is. It's 13. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. Can you turn to 13, please? HEARING OFFICER SLATER: This is U.S. Steel 13? MR. WILLIS: Yes. MR. WILLIS: Yes. 	528	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	 Q. So if we were to say — well, at 6,000 at 10 violations, that is \$60,000? A. Yes. Q. Out of a \$1,000,000 penalty? A. Yes. Q. Is that a significant error in a monetary basis? A. That would be 60,000 over 1,000,000. No, 6 percent, I mean, that depends on how you define "significant" there. But it's a small portion of the total penalty. Q. That's enough. Are you aware you're aware of Method 22, correct? A. Yes, maybe not the specific details but I know of it. Q. Do you know if there is any certification that can be gained from Method 22? A. None of which I'm aware. Q. The source testing manual is that regulation? A. It is not. Q. Has it gone through any sort of promulgation process for regulation? Has it been before the Board of Board of Health for review? A. No. Q. Has it been before county council? A. No. 	530

	531			533
1	Q_{*} Okay. So it's not a law that is regulated under	1	emission reading; is that correct?	
2	Allegheny County Health Department rules and	2	A. For doors.	
3	regulations?	3	$Q,\;\;\text{For doors.}\;\;\text{Is that possible to do at the shed?}\;\;$	
4	A. It's not a final regulation. It just is	4	A. Not safely.	
5	a manual, so no.	5	${\sf Q}.~$ So by virtue of that, we have not taken in	
6	${\sf Q}$. But the manual does contain references to	6	consideration the violations on that side?	
7	regulations?	7	A. No. I mean, they could read it from the bench	
8	A. I would have to review the manual to make sure,	8	which would be less than 25, but to meet that 25-foot	
9	actually.	9	standard, they haven't done that safely. So we have not	
10	Q. Okay.	10	considered that.	
11	A. But I'm not positive.	11	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And at one point, we were taking readings	
12	${\sf Q}, {\sf W}$ hat is the source testing manual?	12	from both sides of the coke Battery B?	
13	A. I think it was 22.	13	A. I'm not certain on that.	
14	MR. PARKER: Yes, 22.	14	Q. Okay. There was a point in which U.S. Steel	
15	EY MR. WILLIS:	15	asked that we not make use of that regulation but to	
16	${\sf Q}.\;$ Let's take a look at the source testing manual	16	defer to the source testing manual?	
17	real quick. There was a reference to Chapter 109, the	17	A. That 25 foot was in place whenever I started, so	
18	determination of visible emissions from coke oven	18	it would have predated me. I don't know when that	
19	batteries.	19	started.	
20	A. Yes.	20	${\sf Q}.~$ But in terms of our actual application of that	
21	${\bf Q}_{\star}$ It's an EPA reference. Have you seen that	21	portion of the source testing manual, that was something	
22	reference, that document before?	22	that was specifically requested that we make use of as	
23	A. The 40 CFR, Appendix B, Method 109, no.	23	opposed to going with the regulation?	
24	${\bf Q}.$ Okay. Let's go to 33 which was referenced in	24	A. I would assume that, but I can't speak certainly	
25	relation to that documment. If you look at Exhibit	25	because it's been we've being doing the "more than 25	
1	33	1	facture T started	534
2	Δ	2	O De une remember bering the commendation with U.C.	
2	• could you road that for line where it caus	2	Q. Do you remember having the conversation with 0.5.	
1	"Rederal Register"	5	A ver	
5	A Hadama Basister Maluma 52 Madaga 79	5	O De unu remember any requests being made with	
6	A. Pedelal register, volume 32, Mulder 70,	6	Q. Do you remember any requests being made with	
7	0 So as of 1997 this particular item here is just		respect to now we enforce based off the source testing	
9	2. So as of 1967, this particular frammere is just		A York that use the minus the deep leaks	
q	A le it states there use I coult enable to the	G	A. Teal, dat was the minus two door leaks?	
10	whole downent thruth	10		
11		11	And notwithstanding the fact that the regulations	
12	A It's a nonnead rule up top there	12	would have us make use of the readings off of those two	
13	0 Okay look to the whole document. Is there any	13	door leaks we opted to go with the source testing	
14	place that it does not notate that it is anything but a	14	manual?	
15	proposed rule?	15	A. In this race was	
16	A. No. it's "monoser" on all the headers	16	O. Okay And that was at the request of U.S. Steel?	
17	Q. Okay. I'm not asking for any particular legal	17	A. Correct.	
18	knowledge, but you would know the difference between a	18	0. And to the extent that we would have made use of	
19	proposed rule and a final rule?	19	the source testing manual, that would have benefited	
	L-L sere and a street total			
20	A, Yeah,	20	U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of	
20 21	A. Yeah.O. And a rule that has been promulgated?	20	U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of penalty?	
20 21 22	 A. Yeah. Q. And a rule that has been promulgated? A. A final rule has been promulgated: a proposed 	20 21 22	U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of penalty? A. By subtracting two leaks at all times, that would	
20 21 22 23	 A. Yeah. Q. And a rule that has been promulgated? A. A final rule has been promulgated; a proposed rule would not be. 	20 21 22 23	U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of penalty?A. By subtracting two leaks at all times, that would lead to lower leaks and almost every time lead to lower	
20 21 22 23 24	 A. Yeah. Q. And a rule that has been promulgated? A. A final rule has been promulgated; a proposed rule would not be. Q. Okay. The source testing manual requires a 25- 	20 21 22 23 24	 U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of penalty? A. By subtracting two leaks at all times, that would lead to lower leaks and almost every time lead to lower penalties for violations. 	
20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. Yeah. Q. And a rule that has been promulgated? A. A final rule has been promulgated; a proposed rule would not be. Q. Okay. The source testing manual requires a 25-foot distance from the coke oven to do a visible 	20 21 22 23 24 25	 U.S. Steel financially in terms of the calculation of penalty? A. By subtracting two leaks at all times, that would lead to lower leaks and almost every time lead to lower penalties for violations. Q. Would it be fair to say that any time in which we 	

		535	53
1	make use of the source testing manual and adhere to the		1 A. Idan't know.
2	source testing manual over the regulation, that that		Q. Does U.S. Steel follow or is it required to
3	would actually work to the benefit of U.S. Steel in its		3 follow the regulation?
4	current form, the source testing manual?		4 A. Yes.
5	A. As I can recall now, yes.		5 \mathbf{Q} . Is it required to follow the conditions of its
6	Q_{\star} Would any of that be because some of the		6 permit?
7	regulations have changed with respect to the things that		7 A. Yes.
8	are covered under the source testing manual?		Q. You mentioned with respect to paragraph 65 in the
9	A. Yeah. For example, the ones we were going over		9 enforcement order where it mentions the soaking of
10	before, like the 10-percent door leaks, it's listed as	1	0 Battery B as a violation?
11	10 percent or less in the source testing manual but none	1	A. Sorry, that was enforcement order, paragraph 65?
12	of the batteries currently apply to that 10-percent	1:	Q. Yes, sir.
13	standard.	1	A. Is that Exhibit 1?
14	So anything that would be so the source	1	4 MR. PARKER: Yes.
15	testing manual would be less stringent than the	1	MR. DELUCA: What was the question?
16	regulation; and whenever we followed it for the minus	1	6 BY MR. WILLIS:
17	two door leaks, that made it less stringent than the	1	Q. You characterize the inclusion of Battery 2 with
18	regulation. So there would be less violations enforced.	18	B respect to soaking as an error?
19	$Q.\ $ Okay. To your knowledge, does Keramida do	19	A. Connect.
20	quality assurance on its own data?	20	Q. Is that a typographical error?
21	A. Yes.	2:	A. Yeah, 'cause Batteries 1, 2 and 3 wouldn't be
22	${\sf Q}.~$ Do you rely on their ability to do quality	22	2 included for soaking.
23	assurance on their own data?	23	Q. So the insertion of 2 there is not an insertion
24	A. I have to, yeah.	24	of violations with respect to 2?
25	Q. Why is that?	25	A. No.
1		536	538
1 2 3	A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and GAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on	536 1 2	538 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order?
1 2 3 4	A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and GAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's GAQC.	536 1 2 3 4	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that
1 2 3 4 5	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? 	536 1 2 3 4 5	538 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Pattery B, is that regulated by visible emissions?
1 2 3 4 5 6	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. 	536 2 3 4 5	538 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Karamida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. 	536 1 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: 	536 2 3 4 5 7 8	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QMQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QMQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QMQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida 	536 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and GMQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's GMQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and GAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's GAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and GMQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's GMQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed 	536 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? A. If we had always followed the regulations — no 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six months without having violated this new standard that we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. MEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? A. If we had always followed the regulations — no — yeah, 'cause their error was following the 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six months without having violated this new standard that we have in the enforcement order; is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Neramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? A. If we had always followed the regulations — no - yeeh, 'cause their error was following the regulation. So the errors would not have occurred if we 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six months without having violated this new standard that we have in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. That's correct, based off that data in the past.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I mean, it would be an onercus task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that U.S. Steel meeting. Q. Had we been following the regulation as opposed to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? A. If we had always followed the regulations — no — yeah, 'cause their error was following the regulation. So the errors would not have occurred if we continued to follow the regulation. 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the coke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the coke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six months without having violated this new standard that we have in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. That's correct, based off that data in the past. Q. Okay. But you would note and correct me if
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I mean, it would be an onerous task to go through all of the inspections because of the 44 databases and QAQC for all of them. So, you know, we rely on Keramida's QAQC. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: What is QAQC? MR. DELUCA: Quality assurance/quality control. HEARING OFFICER SLATER: Okay. EY MR. WILLIS: Q. But you did have a conversation with Keramida with respect to the quality assurance problems that they had with some of those inspections? A. Specifically with those doors, yes. Q. And those errors were based on our use of the source testing manual over the Article 21 regulation? A. The change in that interpretation, yes, from that to the source testing manual, would those errors have occurred? A. If we had always followed the regulations — no — yesh, 'cause their error was following the regulation. So the errors would not have occurred if we continued to follow the regulation. Q. Okay. Does U.S. Steel follow the source testing 	536 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Okay. Is it fair to say the visible emissions are regulated by the ooke-side standard that we've had installed in the enforcement order? A. Sorry, the ooke side for Battery B, is that regulated by visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. I'm saying, is the thing that is sought to be regulated visible emissions? A. Ch, yes. Q. Is it fair to say, and based upon your review of the enforcement order, that 2014 is a critical starting point for much of the deterioration that we saw in terms of compliance? A. That's when I noticed the higher compliance, was in '14; and then afterwards, it decreased. I don't know the exact months or years. Q. Okay. And I know opposing counsel has gone through a series of six-month spans beginning January to June of '15, '16, '17 to demonstrate that at no time during those periods that they could have gone six months without having violated this new standard that we have in the enforcement order; is that correct? A. That's correct, based off that data in the past. Q. Okay. But you would note and correct me if I'm wrong there was no obligation to meet that door

		539			541
1	A. Correct, it hasn't actually come into effect		1	A. No, it does not.	
2	until the first quarter of '19.		2	Q_{\cdot} Does it specify any of the information at all,	
3	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. But you did see a period from April of '14		3	specifically?	
4	to September of '14 of which there was a six-month		4	A. It does not, no.	
5	period that they were at or under 10 weeks on the coke-		5	${\sf Q}.$ Would I be correct in saying that the only	
6	side yard equivalency standard?		6	qualification for further enforcement is that there be	
7	A. April 2014 to September 2014, there were six		7	information available to it?	
8	consecutive months at 10 or less.		8	A. Yeah, the Department finds any information	
9	${\sf Q}.$ And that would put them in compliance with our		9	available.	
10	order not even trying?		10	Q. So any information, correct?	
11	A. If those were the six months used, yeah, six		11	A. Yes.	
12	consecutive meeting it.		12	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And on the following page, on the second	
13	Q. And that's without any order over their head?		13	line, could you read that?	
14	A. Connect.		14	A. "Emissions may otherwise reasonably be	
15	${\sf Q}.$ Would that suggest to you that there is some		15	anticipated to endanger the public health, safety or	
16	control over the battery in its operation?	1	16	welfare."	
17	A. It suggests that it was done before, something		17	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. You've been working with coke ovens as an	
18	that should be able to be done again.	:	18	enforcement chief for how many years?	
19	Q. Have you seen any violations to the NESHAP with	:	19	A. About five.	
20	respect to any of the inspections this year?	2	20	$Q.\;$ And you're aware of the types of emissions that	
21	A. I have not.	2	21	come out of a coke oven battery?	
22	Q_{\star} Okay. You mentioned that you and ${\tt I}$ don't know	2	22	A. Yes.	
23	if you characterized it, but it sounded as though you	2	23	${\bf Q}_{\star}$. Would you consider any of those emissions to be a	
24	allowed your inspectors to randomly do inspections	2	24	threat or to endanger public health if exposed to those	
25	throughout the facility so long as they hit one	2	25	chemicals that come out of a coke battery?	
1	inspection point per day, one inspection type?	540	1	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to the extent he	542
2	A. No. Well, I'm not their direct supervisor but		2	is asking for a legal conclusion based on this	
3	the second-level inspector for the coke oven inspectors.		3	regulation.	
4	But they are required - what I put on them was to have		4	MR. WILLIS: I'm asking for a factual conclusion.	
5	each battery inspected for each inspection type at least		5	I'm asking if there is anything that he would find that	
6	once a month.		6	would be a danger to public health.	
7	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. I want to direct you to ACHD Number 4. It		7	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: He can answer to the	
8	should be in that pile of papers there.		8	best of his knowledge.	
9	A. That's the part one enforcement, 2109, that		9	MR. DELUCA: There are a lot of hazardous air	
10	sheet?	1	0	pollutants that come out of coke batteries, particularly	
11	Q. Yes, sir.	1	.1	raw coke oven gas, and those emissions would be	
12	A. Okay.	1	.2	unhealthy for those persons to breath.	
13	Q. On page I3 it says, "2109-04A, general." Could	1	.3	BY MR. WILLIS:	
14	you just read that first line, please?	1	4	${\sf Q}.$ And could you continue reading the third line?	
15	A. 2109-A4?	1	5	Actually, start where it says, "It may" on the second	
16	Q. 04A.	1	6	line.	
17	A. Okay. "General A, general, whenever the	1	7	A. Okay. "It may order the person responsible for	
18	Department finds on the basis of any information	1	8	such source to comply with an additional or more	
19	available to it, that	1	9	stringent emission limitation."	
20	${\bf Q}.$ Okay, just the first line. Having read that, is	2	0	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Does that say that it has to go through	
21	there any requirement that any studies be done?	2	1	county council?	
22	A. No.	2	2	A. It doesn't mention county council at all.	
23	${\sf Q}.~$ Is there any requirement that all data be used?	2	3	${\sf Q}.$ Does it mention the Board of Health?	
24	A. Any information available, so no.	2	4	A. It does not.	

		543			545
1	which would be required for the institution of a more		1	data; isn't that correct?	
2	stringent standard?		2	A. Yes.	
3	A. No.		3	${\bf Q}. \ $ And that data would be during the six months	
4	Q_{*} . On the fourth line after the word "or," could you		4	during that compliance period, correct?	
5	read that, please?		5	A. Yes.	
6	A. 'Or it may order the immediate shutdown of the		6	${\sf Q}.~$ So in order to determine the worst two performing	
7	source or any part thereof."		7	batteries, you would already have to go through six	
8	Q. Okay. Do you you've seen the enforcement		8	months of that compliance period?	
9	order?		9	A. Yes.	
10	A. Yes.		10	${\sf Q}.$ So even if they knew that a shutdown would have	
11	Q_{\ast} Did we order any immediate shutdown of the		11	or a hot idle would have to come with respect to any	
12	facility?		12	two batteries, it would not happen until after the six	
13	A. No.		13	months of data gathering with respect to those two	
14	${\sf Q}.$ Did we order the immediate shutdown of any part		14	the performance, right?	
15	of the facility?		15	A. Yeah, after that six months and after the	
16	А. No.		16	determination was made to the actual two batteries	
17	Q. To the did we order any condition shutdown of		17	performing.	
18	any part of the facility?		18	Q. Okay. So if there was an exceedance at that 10-	
19	A. Hot idle, not a shutdown.	1.3	19	leak standard, there wouldn't be any repercussions from	
20	O. So there's a distinction being made between a		20	that until at least another four or five months down the	
21	shutdown of a battery and a hot idling of a battery?		21	road?	
22	A. Yeah.		22	A. It depends on which month it first exceeded. But	
23	O. What is the distinction?		23	if it exceeded during the first or the second month.	
24	A. A bot idle is a temporary stop in operation that		24	weah, it would have to wait until that full six-month	
25	could be restarted later on. To me, a shutdown is more		25	period passes.	
			2		
		544			546
1	permanent.	544	1	Q. And we would make that determination, as to what	546
1 2	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more.	544	1 2	Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on	546
1 2 3	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation	544	1 2 3	Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data?	546
1 2 3 4	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate	544	1 2 3 4	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. 	546
1 2 3 4 5	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a	544	1 2 3 4 5	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot icle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the	544	1 2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries.	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot icle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot icle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown.	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot icle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown,	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself.	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	permement. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permemently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and</pre>	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>permenent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permemently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required</pre>	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>permement. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permemently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediatelv2</pre>	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause ham to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't believe it was </pre>	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeeh. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeeh, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the COMS. That was the 2016 acreement. 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't balieve it was O. Let me ask you this: there is a metric for</pre>	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the COMS. That was the 2016 agreement. 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 permenent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permenently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't balieve it was Q. Let me ask you this: there is a metric for determining the worst two performing batteries: isn't 	544	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the COMS. That was the 2016 agreement. Q. So again, if they maintain COMS and improve on the inspections, compliance with the order should be 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>permement. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permemently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't believe it was — Q. Let me ask you this: there is a metric for determining the worst two performing batteries; isn't that correct?</pre>	544	1 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 would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation afterwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the COMS. That was the 2016 agreement. Q. So again, if they maintain COMS and improve on the inspections, compliance with the order should be sufficient? 	546
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause hann to the battery greater than a hot idle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process - if the batch processed, an immediate stops, it's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to be more hindrance to the battery itself. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't balieve it was Q. Let me ask you this: there is a metric for determining the worst two performing batteries; isn't that correct? 	544	1 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 we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeeh. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeeh, we would have to do that calculation attenwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the toxis. That was the 2016 agreement. Q. So again, if they maintain COMS and improve on the inspections, compliance with the order should be sufficient? 	546
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	 permanent. Well, let me think about that one a little more. 'Cause you can shut down a facility and stop operation permanently; and with the coke batteries, an immediate shutdown would cause harm to the battery greater than a hot icle. A hot idle would keep it heated so the refractory doesn't break or anything like that. So it is a different condition specific to coke batteries. A line that's more batch processed, an immediate process — if the batch process where it starts and it shutdown. A coke battery, from an immediate shutdown, that's going to have a different effect from that shutdown. Q. I understand. As the way the enforcement order is designed, say they have an exceedance of 10 leaks on the coke-side battery or the coke side of Battery B and a shutdown would be required, would that be required immediately? A. I don't balieve it was — Q. Let me ask you this: there is a metric for determining the worst two performing batteries; isn't that correct? A. Yes. 	544	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	 Q. And we would make that determination, as to what those two worst performing batteries would be, based on that data? A. Based on those six months, yeah. Q. And so we would know only after having reviewed that data, determine whether or not or to determine which of the 10 batteries that existed at Clairton Coke Works would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to go into hot idle? A. Yeah, we would have to do that calculation oftenwards to make a final determination. Q. All right. With respect to all of the corrective actions that have been requested or demanded as a part of this enforcement order, is there any requirement for a control device? A. No. Q. Is it fair to say that these are all operational requirements that we're asking for? A. To improve compliance, yeah. The only part that may be part of the battery is the maintenance for the COMS. That was the 2016 agreement. Q. So again, if they maintain COMS and improve on the inspections, compliance with the order should be sufficient? A. Yeah. I mean, if you improve compliance in one fact and have the other we starment it would be actioned to the context of the c	546

. .

1	the compliance percentage would increase.	1	I figured, "Well, I don't have a whole lot of	
2	${\sf Q}.~$ Is it possible for them to control the number of	2	money. Let me try to fix this." So I figured out a way	
3	exceedances in the future given how many exceedances	3	to actually get inside the headlight and clean it off	
4	they've had in the past?	4	and clean it so that it was clear enough to pass	
5	A. (No response.)	5	inspection.	
6	Q. Let me back up. Let me back up.	6	Wall, the rule was, I had to be able to pass	
7	You already mentioned that Keramida and U.S.	7	inspection with some sort of transparency that the	
8	Steel provide U.S. Steel with data on a daily basis with	8	mechanic decided for that headlight, and I met that	
9	respect to exceedances?	9	condition. The manual had a different way of meeting	
10	A. Yes.	10	it, which was just replacing the headlight.	
11	${\sf Q}.$ And let's say that in week three of month two	11	Q. I see. And so it really doesn't matter if U.S.	
12	they are getting pretty close, they know that they are	12	Steel adheres to the source testing manual because there	
13	not going to improve upon the first quarter. Is there	13	is really no requirement for them to do so?	
14	something operationally that they can do to remedy that	14	A. It's not a regulation.	
15	situation going forward?	15	Q. Okay. We've had errors with respect to	
16	A. Within week three of month two they find that	16	enforcement orders in the past; is that correct?	
17	their compliance is decreasing and they are not going to	17	A. Yes, unfortunately.	
18	meet that compliance percentage?	18	Q. When we find those errors, we revise the order?	
19	O. It looks like it's trending towards	19	A. Yeeh, if necessary. I mean, we would correct any	
2.0	non-compliance. Can they do something operationally to	20	mistakes we find.	
21	ensure compliance in that third month?	21	 And with respect to discipline, we are prepared 	
22	A. If you pay closer attention to it and do it more	22	to make that correction?	
23	slowly, the moved mes, the thought is you will have	23	A. Yes.	
24	less violations less avroatances. So van could bring	24	 Okay But we don't know exactly what that number 	
25	that compliance back up	25	would be?	
	5	48		55(
1	${\bf Q}.~$ So it's really in their hands to make sure that	1	A. I remember doing a calculation based off the data	
2	they comply with the terms of the enforcement order?	2	I had at that time. We would just we would reissue	
3	A. Yeah. I mean, it's the compliance and the	3	the violation with the connect penalty amount based on	
4	Battery B leaks. Both of those are in U.S. Steel's	4	the information we have. This one, I know, has some	
5	control, the number of leaks in the exceedances.	5	errors in it.	
6	${\sf Q}.~$ And I've spoken to you about the source testing	6	${\sf Q}.~$ And those violations and the corrections thereto	
7	manual in the past and you've provided an apt analogy	7	only affect the monetary penalty, it does not affect the	
8	with respect to how we should be thinking about the	8	other corrective actions that we've asked U.S. Steel to	
9	source testing manual and in comparison to Article 21.	9	make?	
10	I think it was something to do with a driver's	10	A. The compliance percentage - nothing I know of	
11	manual, and I think Jayme Graham has made that analogy	11	right now affects the compliance percentage.	
12	as well. Can you reiterate what you've how you would	12	${\sf Q}. \ {\sf And} \ {\rm in \ terms} \ {\rm of \ the \ performance \ of \ the \ corrective}$	
13	analyze analogize that?	13	actions, the errors with respect to the penalties has no	
14	A. The regulation in this case, or the law in this	14	impact on that?	
15	case, is you have to pass the inspection on a vehicle.	15	A. Sorry, ask that one again.	
16	You have to do the — in Pennsylvania, you have to do	16	Q. There are two aspects of the enforcement order:	
17	the emissions and inspection.	17	there is a civil penalty and the corrective action. The	
18	The manual tells you how to do certain	18	corrective action is not a penalty, is it?	
19	maintenance on the vehicle. I'm assuming you are	19	A. Not as I see it. It's a connective action.	
20	talking about the example I had with my headlights where	20	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. And so to the extent that there were	
21	I - my car - previous car didn't pass inspection.	21	errors with a penalty amount, does the penalty amount	
22	I had a couple issues with it. One of them was	22	have any bearing on the corrective action?	
23	that my headlights weren't clear enough. So the	23	A. No, they are separate categories. You can change	
24	assumption, if you go by the manual, would be to replace	24	the penalty amount and still have the same corrective	
25	the headlights.	25	actions.	

		551			553
1	Q_{*} Okay. You mentioned earlier there were thousands		1	been in that area, and I've driven by and seen Battery B	
2	of emissions points on the batteries; is that a fair		2	area generally.	
3	assessment?		3	Q. Have you seen the shed?	
4	A. Yeah. I mean, there are 10 batteries there, and		4	A. I'm sure I have, but I don't know specifically.	
5	each one has hundreds of emission points on it.		5	${\sf Q}.$ Okay. Let's take a hypothetical shed. Let's	
6	Q. And we don't regulate all of those emission		6	take a shed that has two open sides on it and one that	
7	points?		7	has a port at the top, let's say a chimney, and you want	
8	A. Not all of them. A good percentage of them but		8	to control the particulate matter or let's say there	
9	not all of them.		9	is a fire under that shed. You want to make sure that	
10	Q. Is there any practical reason why we don't?		10	the fire goes up the chimney and not outside the doors	
11	A. The regulations are written as they are.		11	of the shed. What would you do to control the	
12	Q. So the regulations described exactly what we are		12	particulate matter from or the smoke from going out	
13	to regulate?		13	the sides of the doors and going up the chimney?	
14	A. Yesh		14	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object based on	
15	O Okay Nonetheless, would you agree that each of		15	foundation, relevance.	
16	these emission points is an opportunity for a regulated		16	MR. WILLIS: It's a hypothetical.	
17	critical to loar and enter the open atmosphere?		17	MR. DAUSCH: We are getting way off track.	
10	A Yesh at an exist that grigging an error		18	MR WILLIS: It's a hypothetical.	
10	A. Yean, at any point that emissions can easily a,		10	WENDING OFFICER SLATER. He can answer to the	
19	yes.	4	20	harden of the browledge	
20	Q, You mentioned something about the sned and the		20	MR DELICA, You can increase canture by	
21	ability to close it off on either side because there's		21	MR, DELOCA: Fou can increase capture by	
22	an opening on both sides of the shed, correct?		22	increasing the draw of the ran at the top center of that	
2.3	A. Yes.		23	and that would pull in libre of the elussions from the	
24	Q. And I think what you were trying to get at was		24	outside.	
25	you were talking about the plastic flaps in front of a		25	You can develop ways to encrose it more than it	
		552	1	and presidently on that these emissions would be captured	554
1	door. I call them air curtains. Are you familiar with	1.5	2	was previously so that those allosions would be captured	
2	the concept?		2	through the control is bound the abod itself because	
3	A. Yes.		5	capture. The control is beyond the shed itself because	
4	${f Q}.$ Can you think I mean, you're an engineer,		4	it goes to the bag house which is a control device,	
5	right?		5	generally,	
6	A. Civil environmental.		6	But to figure out ways to enclose it more so that	
7	${f Q}.$ Okay. Can you, as an engineer, discern and		1	more of the emissions would be captured.	
8	granted, this is for purposes of this hearing but can		8	BY MR. WILLIS:	
9	you discern any technical difficulties in having some		9	Q. Okay. You testified earlier that because of the	
10	control, some sort of device at the site to ensure that		10	shed and because of the 303 method in which you're doing	
11	Chopseland and the set limited of reduced				
12	the gaseous emissions do are innited or reduced?		11	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that	
10	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation.		11 12	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery?	
13	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can		11 12 13	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it	
13 14	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's		11 12 13 14	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side.	
13 14 15	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to.		11 12 13 14 15	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal	
13 14 15 16	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16	the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that?	
13 14 15 16 17	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before.		11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. 	
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it.		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to.</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works?</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works? A. I've been to Clairton Coke Works.</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission observations may be skewed? 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works? A. I've been to Clairton Coke Works. MR. DAUSCH: You're talking about the shed?</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission observations may be skewed? A. I know it decreases the number. I'm assuming 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works? A. I've been to Clairton Coke Works. MR. DAUSCH: You're talking about the shed? BY MR. WILLIS:</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission observations may be skewed? A. I know it decreases the number. I'm assuming it's because you are closer. It's commonsense. I 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works? A. I've been to Clairton Coke Works. MR. DAUSCH: You're talking about the shed? BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you seen the shed?</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission observations may be skewed? A. I know it decreases the number. I'm assuming at's because you are closer. It's commonsense. I mentioned earlier that you are going to see more from 	
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>MR. DAUSCH: I'm going to object to foundation. I don't think there's been any foundation that he can devise controls for coke plants for batteries that he's never physically been to. MR. WILLIS: He says that he's been to them before. MR. DAUSCH: He drove by it. BY MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you been to Clairton Coke Works? A. I've been to Clairton Coke Works. MR. WILLIS: Q. Have you seen the shed? A. I've never been underneath the shed, I've never</pre>		11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 the visual emission inspections from the bench, is that from the side of the battery? A. Method 303 reads from the bench, which is it transverses along the length of the battery on the side. Q. Okay. And they're doing that because of federal regulation which requires them to do that? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the coke-side yard equivalent is designed to take into consideration that you are so much closer to the battery that your visual emission observations may be skewed? A. I know it decreases the number. I'm assuming it's because you are closer. It's commonsense. I mentioned earlier that you are going to see more from five feet than 25 feet if it's a small leak. 	

()

7	0. that Walked 200 rate word environment is
1	so that Mathod 303 coke yard equivalency is
2	are reading it closer. Not the amount of emissions.
2	are reading it crosser. Not the anount of counted leaks.
5	MR WILLIG. Okay that's all I have.
5	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
7	RY MR. DAUSCH:
8	O. Sir, do you know who had the burden of proof in
9	this case?
0	A. I believe it's ACHD.
1	MR. DAUSCH: That's all I have.
2	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: That's it?
3	MR. WILLIS: That's it.
4	HEARING OFFICER SLATER: All right.
5	
6	(The hearing recessed at 4:25 p.m.)
7	(110 1001113 1000000 at 1113 pint)
8	
9	
0	
1	
2	
4 7	
4	
_	
_	556
1	556 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
1	556 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA :
1 2 3	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY :
1 2 3 4	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY :
1 2 3 4 5 6	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commovealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth; that the testimony was reduced to writing under my
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth; that the testimony was reduced to writing under my supervision; that this transcript is a true record of the ottom of the truth of the truth is a true record of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth; that the testimony was reduced to writing under my supervision; that this transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witnesses. I further certify that I am neither attorney nor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth; that the testimony was reduced to writing under my supervision; that this transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witnesses. I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the partice to the action in which this bearing was taken.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY :
12 3456 7 8 9 0 1 2	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY : I, Heidi R. Hawk, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the said Commonwealth and County, do hereby certify that pursuant to the notice, the within named persons were sworn by me to testify to the truth and nothing but the truth; that the testimony was reduced to writing under my supervision; that this transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witnesses. I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken; and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties or financially interested in this action
12 3456 789 0123	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY :
12 3456 7890 1234	556 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u> COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY :
12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	DESCRIPTION DEPORTED COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY .
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	DESCRIPTION DEPENDENCY LVANIA :
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<section-header> DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DE DESCRIPTION DESCR</section-header>
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	<section-header> DETIFICATE OF REPORTER COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY <t< td=""></t<></section-header>
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<section-header> DESTITUTION DE DESTI</section-header>
12 3 456 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<section-header> <section-header></section-header></section-header>
12 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 6 7 8 9 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 9 9 0 0 1 1 2 9 9 0 0 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1	<section-header> DESCRIPTION DEPORTER COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : </section-header>
1234567890123456789012	Description of reported and solution of the solution in which this hearing was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any solution of the solution in which this bearing was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any solution of the solution in which this bearing was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any solution of the solution in which this bearing was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any solution and affixed my seal of office this December 26, 2018. My Commission Expires: My Commission Expires: My Commission Expires: My Comm
1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 0 1 2 2 3	<section-header> DESCRIPTION DEPORTOR COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA : </section-header>

	1			
\$	314:1, 314:6,	10:37 [1] - 351:3	392:14, 392:16,	473:2, 473:14,
Ŧ	320:14, 321:7,	10th [4] - 363:3,	451:1, 451:3, 451:4,	473:16
\$1,000,000 [1] - 530:4	321:9, 321:11,	523:18, 524:13,	454:24, 455:3,	17 [6] - 290:13, 380:4,
\$58,000 [1] - 529:22	321:12, 322:13,	524:24	458:17, 458:23,	382:8, 382:10,
\$60,000 [1] - 530:2	331:21, 336:21,	11 [26] - 290:4,	460:10, 472:4,	390:2, 405:24
	337:13, 337:17,	308:14, 341:18,	474:15, 475:25,	175 [1] - 408:8
	337:18, 342:21,	344:3, 345:22,	479:13, 479:14,	17th [7] - 469:17,
	342:25, 343:3.	345:24, 388:8.	483:6, 494:1,	470:2, 470:22,
'08 [1] - 292:17	343:23, 344:4,	388:10, 388:11.	496:14, 496:16,	471:7, 471:21,
' 13 [1] - 368:17	344:14, 348:10,	479:22, 507:12,	523:11, 523:19,	483:12, 483:14
'14 [6] - 343:25, 381:7,	348:11, 386:11.	507:18, 509:2.	524:10, 524:25,	18 [12] - 290:15,
381:8, 538:14,	396:2 401:16	509:18, 510:19,	525:6, 525:8,	359:10, 359:12,
539:3, 539:4	401.17 409.16	514:12 516:3	525:14, 526:3	360:9, 362:24,
'15 [6] - 294:13, 338:1,	449.22 451.11	517:17 517:21	140-degree [3] -	385:15, 388:3,
381:6, 454:9, 511:3,	451:13 451:15	518:1 519:23	355:4. 355:15.	388:5, 414:7,
538:18	451.17 509.11	520:6 520:9	355:18	474:24, 475:1.
'16 [2] - 369:5, 538:18	510.2 510.13	520.14 528.15	14441 [2] - 374:14.	497:19
'17 [12] - 322:7,	511:4 511:10	528.16	376:10	180 (11 - 380:9
332:25, 344:1,	511.18 511.19	11th (1) - 450:12	14446 (1) - 376:18	181 (1) - 516:2
344:13, 370:1,	511.23 512.2	12 1451 - 200.6	14581 (11 - 377.23	185 (1) - 410:5
406:14, 451:16,	512.6 512.7	208-14 227-19	14587 111 - 370-13	189 131 - 404-8 404-9
453:3, 480:2,	512:0, 512:7,	300.14, 337.10,	14596 (0) _ 380.1	A07.0
480:10, 512:13,	512:20 512:10	351.11, 351.12,	202.1	407.5 494b (5) 476-1 476-7
538:18	512.20, 513.19,	358:5, 356:16,	302.1	A76:44 A76:01
'18 [7] - 342:2, 342:3,	520.10, 521.11,	369.20, 391.7,	14596-14606 [1] -	470.11, 470.21,
364:12, 368:18,	523.20, 527.22,	430:23, 470:0,	290.14	4/0.20
406:15, 480:7,	527.23, 527.24,	476:10, 512:15,	14597 [1] - 361.20	19[/]-290.10,
512:13	529.0, 525.20,	512.25	14599 [1] - 361.10	370.23, 395.3,
' 19 [1] - 539:2	530.1, 535.11,	120 [4] - 345.2,	14600[1] - 380.4	395.4, 397.5, 397.7,
	539.5, 539.6,	378:10, 380:10,	14601 [1] - 380:15	490:0
0	544.10, 545.10,	477:8	14608 [1] - 380:1	1939[1] - 410.12
	040.7, 001.4	128 [2] - 378:15, 525:9	14th [3] - 342:23,	195[1] - 380:19
012 [2] - 391:2, 391:5	10-mmute [1] - 520.25	129 [1] - 525:11	385:21, 509:5	1987 [2] - 532:0, 532:7
013656 [1] - 353:16	525:10 525:12	12929 [1] - 390:1	15 [20] - 290:10,	1989 [1] - 377:22
04A [1] - 540:16	535.10, 535.12 400 (4) 351:20	12:08 [1] - 405:12	299:14, 323:19,	1:05 [2] - 405:11,
	100 [14] - 351.20,	13 [16] - 290:7,	333:5, 333:7, 334:2,	405:13
1	352:8, 350:10,	358:21, 365:2,	334:11, 374:6,	1st [2] - 3/5:21,
1 1381 - 290.9 314.23	350:23, 350.25,	368:1, 368:6,	380:10, 380:12,	509:13
324.23 325.5	357:8, 357:10,	377:24, 378:7,	452:24, 453:18,	-
325.16 327.12	362:10, 362:11,	378:19, 380:8,	453:22, 454:3,	2
346-3 346-4	379:6, 413:13,	476:18, 476:21,	455:6, 455:14,	2 (40) - 290:9. 314:23.
358.22 358.23	431:7, 496:15,	476:23, 476:25,	457:7, 459:9,	324.23 325:5
372.22, 336.20,	496:16	528:20, 528:22,	467:25, 469:4	325:16, 327:12
376.10 381.22	102[2] - 344:16,	528:23	15-second [2] -	332:20, 372:22,
382:13 384:18	344:22	130 [1] - 349:5	484:25, 485:1	376:9. 376:10.
384.22 395.21	10412 [2] - 460:20,	13655 [1] - 350:8	15.5 [1] - 342:17	376:19, 381:16.
395.22 401.22	460:23	13657 [1] - 354:23	150 [3] - 309:11,	381:18, 384:18,
401.24 442.24	10413 [1] - 461:2	13660 [1] - 356:14	314:7, 336:22	384:22, 469:25
470.12 400.0	10417 [1] - 479:22	13717 [2] - 357:22,	159 [1] - 380:24	470:1.477:7.
490.13 493.25	109 [17] - 443:9,	358:1	15th [2] - 525:3,	478:25, 479:11.
494.4 497.2	443:13, 443:20,	13769 [1] - 358:2	525:16	479:15, 479:23
497.15 497.20	444:4, 444:9,	13873 [1] - 368:13	16 [4] - 290:12,	480:9, 490:9.
497.24 499.14	444:12, 444:13,	13874 [1] - 370:13	377:14, 379:22,	490:13, 494:7.
499.16 500.25	444:14, 444:19,	13877 [1] - 371:24	379:24	494:9, 497:15.
502.4 509.7	444:23, 445:10,	13882 [3] - 371:25,	160 [6] - 349:15,	497:24, 498:6.
537.13 537.21	445:13, 478:8,	372:10, 372:20	349:16, 400:9,	498:8, 498:12.
1 000 11 - 314.1	478:9, 480:18,	14 [39] - 290:9, 368:7,	401:6, 401:7, 408:8	499:14, 499:16.
1 000 000 (4) - 530.7	531:17, 531:23	368:8, 373:3, 373:5,	165 [1] - 380:6	500:25, 502:4.
10 1721 - 206-23	109A [1] - 481:10	373:12, 373:19,	166 [2] - 407:20, 473:3	537:17. 537:21.
207-1 207-24	109D [1] - 478:13	373:20, 373:23,	168 [6] - 471:22,	537:23. 537:24
201.1, 201.21,	10:22 [1] - 351:2	374:2, 380:15,	471:23, 472:7,	2.750 (3) - 529:11.
000.10, 010.0,				
529:16, 529:18	338:2, 344:4,	496:15, 511:21,	408:2, 408:15,	554:25
---------------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------
2.2 [2] - 529:18	344:10, 344:11,	511:25, 520:5,	412:7, 415:12,	25,000 [5] - 361:4,
2.97 (3) - 472:10.	369:1, 369:3,	520:8, 523:18,	428:2, 428:3, 428:6,	361:5, 362:9,
473:12, 473:14	369:18, 370:2,	524:11, 524:13,	428:10, 428:21,	362:11, 528:3
2.976 [2] - 472:1.	370:9, 370:10,	524:24, 525:4,	429:4, 429:11,	25-foot [3] - 319:12,
472.2	370:24, 372:24,	525:15, 525:16,	429:17, 429:21,	319:16, 533:8
2/26 (1) - 461:10	378:3. 378:8.	526:4, 526:12	429:25, 431:16,	25.81 [1] - 395:22
20 (19) - 200.18	378:11, 378:15,	2018 [64] - 291:1,	435:12, 435:16,	26th [1] - 461:12
314.6 323.10	378:22, 379:2,	291:3, 298:6, 299:8,	436:2, 436:11,	27 [1] - 380:19
334.2 336.21	379:4, 380:22,	310:15, 321:1,	436:21, 437:7,	28 (1) - 380:10
356.8 361.20	380:24, 381:5,	324:18, 327:19,	437:10, 437:23,	28th [2] - 363:19,
397.13 397.25	385:21, 417:13,	332:23, 336:13,	446:20, 448:3,	375:7
401.12 414.17	439:20, 489:17,	341:3, 342:15,	448:13, 449:1,	29th [1] - 392:19
424.1 453.6 457.8	489:21, 490:1,	344:14, 346:11,	450:16, 462:19,	2:30 [1] - 474:8
469:4 470:8	490:6, 490:8,	359:2, 361:20,	463:22, 464:2,	2:41 [1] - 474:9
470.13 501.11	490:17, 492:11,	361:21, 363:3,	465:2, 465:20,	
20-percent (2) -	492:18, 493:2,	364:6, 364:9,	465:22, 467:5,	3
348.13 356.2	493:12, 493:20,	365:17, 365:24,	471:2, 484:15,	
200 (3) - 323.18	498:3, 499:3, 499:6,	370:15, 370:22,	484:18, 485:21,	3 [28] - 312:19,
323.20 407.20	499:9, 499:11,	370:24, 371:9,	485:25, 486:6,	314:23, 324:23,
2006 (11 - 293.11	499:17, 500:8,	371:12, 371:23,	486:7, 536:14, 548:9	325:5, 325:16,
2008 [2] - 439.20	500:16, 500:21,	374:8, 374:23,	21's [1] - 331:12	327:12, 332:21,
103.3	501:23, 506:14,	374:25, 375:21,	2103.12.h.6 [1] -	347:21, 372:22,
2012 (5) - 203·20	508:8, 508:25,	375:22, 388:13,	385:13	376:10, 381:10,
2012 [5] - 250.20,	511:7, 511:8,	388:17, 389:16,	2103.12.k [1] - 385:13	384:18, 384:22,
293.21, 311.13,	511:15, 512:10,	389:23, 392:19,	210521A [1] - 383:24	473:16, 483:11,
2014 ran 204:12	512:12, 512:14,	392:22, 406:17,	2109 [1] - 540:9	483:13, 483:17,
2014 [30] - 234.12,	514:22, 546:20	407:16, 407:17,	2109-04A [1] - 540:13	490:10, 490:13,
342.17 342.24,	2016-2017 [1] - 381:3	408:21, 409:16,	2109-A4 [1] - 540:15	496:13, 497:2,
343.17, 343.22,	2017 [79] - 309:22,	410:4, 419:11,	22 [27] - 290:21.	497:15, 497:25,
370.16 370.25	310:14, 310:15,	451:12, 454:9,	303:16, 407:4,	499:14, 499:16,
371.0 371.11	322:5, 332:23,	457:6, 460:13,	408:19, 408:24,	500:25, 502:4,
371.17 371.18	333:1, 333:8, 333:9,	460:24, 461:5,	434:4, 434:9,	537:21
378.3 378.6	333:23, 336:12,	463:3, 467:12,	434:11, 434:15,	3,725,000 [1] - 362:5
378.22 379.2	336:13, 343:22,	467:15, 498:18,	434:17, 434:19,	3,975,000 [1] - 362:7
379.4 380.6	344:8, 345:15,	500:24, 512:3,	434:24, 435:2,	3.01 [7] - 4 69:21,
380.16 381.2	361:16, 363:2,	512:12, 517:5,	442:23, 443:1,	472:5, 472:6, 473:5,
381:4, 381:13.	363:6, 364:8,	520:13, 521:24,	445:12, 445:15,	473:6, 473:9, 473:10
381:22, 496:15.	369:22, 372:3,	528:18, 529:8	445:16, 470:3,	30 [5] - 357:12,
496:16, 507:15,	377:22, 378:12,	2019 [4] - 509:7,	470:4, 472:13,	382:12, 412:6,
509:5, 509:23.	378:16, 379:2,	509:13, 514:10,	478:8, 480:17,	412:8, 412:10
510:3, 510:5, 510:9,	380:9, 380:19,	514:11	530:12, 530:16,	30-day [4] - 345:1,
510:10, 523:20,	381:5, 381:13,	208 [2] - 409:4, 409:5	531:13, 531:14	441:1, 441:4, 441:11
538:10, 539:7	381:22, 392:23,	209 [1] - 345:15	223 [1] - 369:25	300 [4] - 336:14,
2015 (8) - 344:4.	395:9, 398:12,	20th [3] - 454:9, 457:6,	23 [3] - 290:22,	336:15, 527:16,
370:11, 370:24.	398:16, 402:8,	457:14	380:13, 402:12	527:20
378:8, 381:4.	402:16, 403:1,	21 [72] - 290:19,	23rd [3] - 526:4,	301 [1] - 473:21
510:16, 510:17.	403:2, 403:5,	298:15, 298:19,	526:12, 532:6	303 [35] - 304:20
511:1	405:20, 406:2,	300:8, 302:24,	24 [3] - 290:24,	305:11, 305:14,
2016 [80] - 304:22.	406:10, 407:6,	303:18, 316:9,	380:11, 418:20	316:10, 318:18,
310:18, 310:20.	410:16, 410:22,	316:12, 331:15,	25 [20] - 318:12,	319:23, 331:13,
310:22, 311:4,	411:22, 411:23,	333:10, 334:4,	318:16, 318:23,	331:14, 332:6,
314:18, 314:25.	412:2, 412:25,	334:7, 334:12,	319:3, 319:5,	342:7, 347:20,
315:3, 322:7,	415:20, 415:25,	334:16, 334:24,	319:22, 356:15,	347:22, 348:1,
324:11, 324:17,	417:13, 417:22,	335:21, 356:6,	356:22, 401:6,	348:3, 398:25,
324:25, 325:2,	419:10, 451:14,	356:9, 357:13,	421:23, 424:1,	413:11, 420:17,
325:10, 325:19,	452:1, 453:9,	361:12, 382:22,	445:23, 448:1,	421:10, 420:19,
325:22, 326:16,	455:23, 455:24,	385:10, 405:18,	448:11, 448:16,	420.12, 420.14,
327:13, 336:24,	459:1, 470:22,	407:4, 407:5, 407:8,	532:24, 533:8,	431.12,432.1,
337:3, 337:16,	471:7, 475:19,	407:24, 407:25,	533:17, 533:25,	435-10 438-6
	4/6:11, 483:8,			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

438:13, 441:1,	290:22	62 [9] - 469:23, 470:3,	353:23, 353:25,	according [3] -
441:6, 441:8,	410 [2] - 290:22,	470:9, 470:13,	354:20, 355:7,	384:23, 449:12,
441:11, 554:10,	290:24	474:23, 475:1,	355:14, 355:22,	449:14
554:13	418 [1] - 290:24	476:8, 476:10,	408:21, 434:8,	accordingly [3] -
30th [2] - 375:20,	44 [3] - 347:22, 524:2,	476:23	434:12, 434:18,	296:18, 297:9, 386:1
375:22	536:2	63 [6] - 385:8, 524:2,	484:3, 484:0, 484:7,	account [1] - 301:9
31st [1] - 397:19	45 [2] - 524:2, 524:4	524:4, 525:9,	484:8, 484:12,	accounted [1] - 325:2
32 [3] - 397:10,	4717 [1] - 410:13	525:11, 526:6	460:1, 512:10,	accuracy [2] - 441:22,
406:19, 406:21	4724 [1] - 411:13	63.6(e)(1)(I [1] - 385:3	012.20	40/:13
33 [5] - 445:1, 445:5,	4729 [1] - 411:24	64 [3] - 483:11,	90 [1]-357.15	accurate [1] - 417:0
445:6, 531:24, 532:1	4735 [1] - 412:25	483:13, 483:17	905 [2] - 330.12,	accurately [1] - 420:9
340 [1] - 379:8	4739 [1] - 414:17	65 [4] - 497:17, 498:5,	04.7 (1) 279.9	ACHD [75] - 290:3,
341 [1] - 290:4	4743 [1] - 415:6	537:8, 537:11	94.7 [1] - 370.0	304:18, 304:24,
345 [1] - 290:4	4759 [1] - 415:22	6690 [3] - 397:8,	90 [8] - 002.19, 500.00 519.15	305:15, 306:2,
35.48 [1] - 395:23	4786 [1] - 410:13	397:16, 397:18	502:23, 510:15,	307:16, 307:20,
350,000 [1] - 362:3	4th [1] - 291:3	6740 [1] - 400:11	510.21, 519.1,	307:22, 307:25,
351 [1] - 290:6		68 [1] - 526:6	519.9, 519.17,	312.7, 315.10,
358 [2] - 290:6, 290:7	5	6820 [1] - 401:9	06 020 10 240:0	319.10, 331.12,
36 [3] - 344:6, 344:7,	51111-346-2 346-8	6866 [1] - 401:20	07.5 (1) - 378.12	345.22 345.24
380:25	347.24 471.23	6906 [1] - 402:11	09 4 (4) - 379.7	347.16 347.10
368 [2] - 290:7, 290:9	472:7. 473:2 473:3	6909 [2] - 402:6,	98.1[1] = 370.7 98.152 (4) = 341.12	347.25 348.2
3737 [1] - 470:6	473.14 473.16	402:10	347.11 502.23	351.11 354.1
374 [2] - 290:9, 290:10	477:8	6993 [2] - 402:15,	502.25	358-18 365-2
377 [2] - 290:10,	5 500 (4) - 349.10	402:19	09 294 (4) 348:23	373.3 373.5 374.2
290:12	349.11 349.12	6B [1] - 385:3	90.304 [1] - 340.23	376.19 378.20
379 [1] - 290:12	349.13		402:17	379.22 379.24
38.71 [1] - 395:24	5 700 (11 - 529.19	7	493.17	382.8 382.10
380 [1] - 290:13	5.800 [2] - 529:19	70 121 - 295:5, 379:12	- 99[1] - 371.10	385:14, 388:3.
382 [1] - 290:13	529.20	7084 [1] - 403:3	271.14	388:5, 389:23.
3821 [1] - 407:4	5.08 [2] - 476:5.	7171 [2] - 403:10,	00 384 ML - 348-24	394:4, 396:6,
3822 [1] - 407:3	477:11	403:24	348·25 340·24	396:17, 396:20,
385 [1] - 290:15	50 (5) - 322:13.	7208 [1] - 397:19	103.7	397:5, 397:7,
388 [1] - 290:15	356:17, 356:22.	7209 [1] - 397:9	400.7 00 20 (2) - 371.12	397:13, 397:25,
3907 [1] - 407:10	423:3.423:4	7210 [4] - 394:23.	371.18 371.10	399:5, 405:17,
395 [1] - 290:16	52 121 - 460:15, 532:5	395:2, 397:9	571.10, 571.15	410:22, 411:9,
397 [2] - 290:16,	55 [3] - 481:25.	74.5 [1] - 345:16	٨	411:11, 411:23,
290:18	482:10, 483:2	75 (5) - 320:11.	A	412:2, 413:11,
3:35 [1] - 521:3	58 (2) - 525:8, 526:5	356:17, 356:23,	a.m [3] - 351:2, 351:3,	415:21, 415:25,
3:40 [1] - 521:2	59 [2] - 384:14, 497:19	481:24, 524:20	396:11	418:20, 426:15,
3:43 [1] - 521:4	5C (1) - 385'9	77 [1] - 384:25	A13 [2] - 367:7, 368:2	427:11, 447:1,
3rd [3] - 474:19,	5th 71 - 461:20 463:5	78 121 - 379:18. 532:5	A15 [2] - 377:7, 377:9	455:22, 463:22,
475:3, 475:19	464.21 465.13		A16 [1] - 377:13	467:1, 469:22,
	466:23, 466:25	8	A20 [2] - 404:23,	475:2, 495:7, 496:7,
4	467:2		404:25	507:12, 507:18,
A 121 - 201-1 516-2		8 [4] - 477:7, 506:11,	A21 [1] - 408:17	509:2, 519:13,
+ [3] - 291.1, 310:2, 540.7	6	512:20	A22 [3] - 408:22,	519:14, 526:9, 540:7
10 rol - 357.12 205.0	V	80 [2] - 357:15, 409:21	408:25, 409:11	ACHD's [5] - 375:22,
40 [9] - 307.12, 300:0, 205-12 412-7	6 [5] - 384:15, 477:8,	81 [1] - 496:15	A23 [2] - 409:14, 410:9	376:23, 376:24,
393.12, 412.7,	479:12, 493:10,	86.7 [2] - 378:8,	A24 [1] - 418:18	394:22, 461:25
412:11, 444:4,	530:7	378:11	ability [5] - 302:17,	ACHD003758 [1] -
440.0, 440.10,	6,000 [2] - 529:24,	87 [1] - 379:18	302:21, 438:6,	470:14
001.20 400 m 270-2 270-5	530:1	8th [6] - 365:15,	535:22, 551:21	ACHD004893 [1] -
400 [2] - 3/9.2, 3/9.3	6.67 [1] - 464:21	365:16, 365:17,	ABLE [2] - 302:17,	529:3
404 [1] - 290.10	60 [4] - 295:5, 356:8,	466:20, 466:22,	302:22	ACHD010179 [1] -
400 1 - 290.19	379:12	466:24	access [4] - 307:2,	518:8
400 101 200.40	CO 000 500.7		329:4, 432:15,	ACHD013655 [1] -
408 [2] - 290:19,	60,000 [1] - 530.7			054.0
408 [2] - 290:19, 290:21	60-percent [1] - 356:3	9	432:17	351:8
408 [2] - 290:19, 290:21 4080 [1] - 410:1	60-percent [1] - 356:3 61 [3] - 444:4, 445:7,	9 9 (22) - 303'7 303'8	432:17 accommodation [3] -	ACHD014584 [1] -
408 [2] - 290:19, 290:21 4080 [1] - 410:1 4081 [1] - 409:17	60-percent [1] - 356:3 61 [3] - 444:4, 445:7, 445:14	9 9[22] - 303:7, 303:8, 303:9, 353:13	432:17 accommodation [3] - 336:5, 336:7	351:8 ACHD014584 [1] - 378:21

	1		1	
ACHD10413 [2] -	529:12, 529:13,	429:13, 441:3,	513:8, 513:13,	arbitrary [2] - 439:7,
461:12, 463:1	529:17	455:3, 458:3,	513:16, 522:17,	439:18
ACHD10414 [1] -	admissible [1] -	458:18, 459:11,	522:19	ArcelorMittal [1] -
483:7	362:20	459:16, 459:20,	analyze [2] - 309:17,	295:2
ACHD10415 (6) -	admission [8] -	459:23, 460:12,	548:13	area [15] - 297:4,
469.11 474.16	345:22, 373:3.	460:23, 461:4,	angle [4] - 355:3,	297:13, 297:14,
476.1 523.23	379:22, 382:8.	461:16, 463:2,	355:4, 355:15,	297:24, 319:7,
525.7 526.3	388:3 397:5	463:7, 463:10,	355:18	387:13, 424:2,
020.7, 020.0	404:21 404:23	473:8, 474:18,	annual (5) - 411:10.	425:1, 445:22,
405-04	admit (1) = 377:6	475:17, 476:5.	417:23, 426:20,	497:1, 497:5,
405.21	admitted (4) 245:24	481.12 483.3	426.22 427.1	497:11.503:12.
ACHD3/36[1] - 4/1:3	admitted [14] - 345.24,	483.14	anomalies (11 - 417.1	553.1 553.2
ACHD3995 [1] - 409:1	358:18, 368:2,	Allegheny (24) - 291:5		areas (8) - 447.24
ACHD4905 [1] -	3/4:3, 3/7:9,	201.9 202.4	447:22	AAQ.7 AAQ.8
367:21	379:24, 382:10,	201.0, 202.4,	417.22	440.7, 440.0,
ACHD6690 [1] -	388:5, 397:7,	292.11, 292.12,	anomia (1) - 505.10	450.7 451.10 504.
397:16	404:25, 408:17,	294.1, 294.9, 290.4,	answer [8] - 294:7,	400.7, 401.10, 004.
ACHD6735 [1] -	409:12, 410:10,	298:2, 305:21,	367:15, 412:16,	argosy [1] - 293.10
399:10	418:20	305:22, 311:9,	477:19, 516:6,	AITICIE [63] - 290:15,
CHD7209 [1] -	Admitted [1] - 290:2	313:13, 316:18,	516:10, 542:7,	298:19, 300:8,
397:17	advance [1] - 488:8	343:8, 432:20,	553:19	302:24, 303:18,
chievable [6] -	advanced [1] - 522:15	434:21, 435:4,	answers [2] - 497:3,	316:9, 316:12,
332:11, 343:2.	advertised [1] - 423:9	443:24, 444:5,	515:16	331:12, 331:15,
343:4. 513:2.	affected [2] - 369:7,	444:18, 444:21,	anticipated [1] -	333:10, 334:3,
514:23 515:4	453:6	445:10, 446:16,	541:15	334:7, 334:16,
chieve (2) - 332.2	afternoon [4] -	447:5, 447:16,	apologize [3] - 311:6,	334:23, 335:21,
400·21	366:15, 395:23,	475:5, 484:11,	345:19, 402:11	356:6, 356:9,
450.21	396.8 474.6	486:1, 486:15,	appeal [18] - 321:4,	357:13, 361:12,
	afterwards (81 - 341.9	489:21, 495:9,	321:17. 324:12.	382:22, 385:10,
ICTION [15] - 303.13,	454-18 455-16	495:24, 531:2	325:11, 331:19,	407:24, 407:25,
363:14, 363:10,	457:23 460:2	allow [3] - 318:10,	332:18 337:11	408:2, 412:7,
364:3, 364:4,	437.25, 400.2,	329:10, 393:9	341.2 375.5 393.1	415:12, 428:2,
372:21, 383:1,	470.25, 536.14,	allowed [5] - 301:5,	438-3 454-7	428:3, 428:6,
442:17, 497:23,	546:10	438:14, 477:25.	454:16 457:4	428:10, 428:21,
498:15, 527:9,	Again [1] - 300:12	478.3 539.24	460:2 403:24	429:4, 429:11.
550:17, 550:18,	Agency [3] - 296:13,	allows (4) - 307.2	400.5, 495.24,	429:17, 429:21,
550:19, 550:22	444:4, 445:6	220.9 422.13	494.5, 521.25	429.25 431.16
actions [6] - 368:21,	agreed [1] - 493:12	422.17	Appendix [3] - 444.4,	435.12 435.16
457:24, 546:12,	agreement [11] -	432.17	445:13, 531:23	436-1 436-11
550:8, 550:13,	308:3, 308:4,	almost [2] - 404.0,	apples [2] - 420:16	436.21 437.6
550:25	314:25, 364:6,	534:23	apples-to-apples [1] -	430.21, 437.0,
activity [1] - 305:24	384:4, 395:12,	alternate [2] - 306:15,	420:16	437.10, 437.22,
actuals [1] - 427:7	463:15, 464:12,	306:17	application [5] -	440.20, 440.2,
add [1] - 482:20	467:6, 471:15,	ampient [1] - 513:9	366:2, 449:6,	450.16 462.10
added [3] - 452:11.	546:20	amount [18] - 299:5,	478:17, 480:23,	463-21 464-2
452:13	ahead [2] - 298:11,	302:4, 302:9,	533:20	403.21, 404.2,
ddition (2) - 301:19	315:25	302:11, 330:4,	apprised [1] - 394:6	405.2, 405:20,
448.1	air [19] - 292:2, 294:5,	330:25, 339:15,	appropriate [3] -	405:22, 407:5,
dditional 151 -	301:1, 329:19,	360:7, 361:3, 362:1,	442:2, 442:12, 489:5	485:21, 485:25,
301.10 337.22	329:20, 329:22,	362:2, 505:5, 527:6,	approval [4] - 383:21,	486:6, 486:7,
367.4 507.12	339:6. 339:7.	528:9, 550:3,	430:2, 430:8, 514:4	536:14, 548:9
542-19	384:24, 385:5.	550:21, 550:24	April [14] - 309:15,	ascertain [1] - 310:24
042.10	385.6 404.12	amounts [2] - 366:17,	342:23, 374:24	aspect [1] - 422:19
address [3] - 327.17,	430:19 430:21	367:1	375:8. 375:20.	aspects [1] - 550:16
394:10, 394:19	504.10 513.9	analogize [1] - 548:13	375:22, 409:16.	assess [3] - 311:14,
agnere [3] - 334:23,	513.15 542.0 552.1	analogy [2] - 548:7.	510:2.511:11	311:20, 372:16
335:18, 535:1	Aleron 202:5 202:10	548:11	532.6 539.3 539.7	assessed [3] - 313:14
047.40	AIF[6] - 292:0, 292:10,	analysis (151 - 323-1	April/October (4)	325:10, 389:17
adneres [2] - 317:13,	1 000.00 00000	analysis [is] oroun	Whill Occopat [1] -	
adneres [2] - 317:13, 549:12	298:23, 299:3,	341.3 341.5 364.3	254.17	assessment 8 -
adneres [2] - 317:13, 549:12 adjust [1] - 441:21	298:23, 299:3, 391:16, 444:5	341:3, 341:5, 364:3, 427:18, 430:10	354:17	303:2, 309:6.
adneres [2] - 317:13, 549:12 adjust [1] - 441:21 adjustment [7] -	298:23, 299:3, 391:16, 444:5 airflow (1) - 331:4	341:3, 341:5, 364:3, 427:18, 430:10, 431:4, 505:14	354:17 apt [1] - 548:7	303:2, 309:6, 311:11, 321:22.
adneres [2] - 317:13, 549:12 adjust [1] - 441:21 adjustment [7] - 360:17, 360:18,	298:23, 299:3, 391:16, 444:5 airflow (1) - 331:4 alleged [26] - 386:16,	341:3, 341:5, 364:3, 427:18, 430:10, 431:4, 505:14, 512:22, 513:4	354:17 apt [1] - 548:7 AQ [3] - 393:23,	303:2, 309:6, 311:11, 321:22, 364:15, 505:13

	-			
513:5, 551:3	average (2) - 441:1.	485:4, 491:10,	+519:12, 521:16,	321:20, 321:25,
assessments (2) -	441:12	495:7, 502:16,	521:20, 522:2,	327:22, 329:7,
303.3 310.17	averages [1] - 441:4	513:12, 522:5,	522:7, 522:25,	329:8, 330:10,
assets (1) - 302.14	averaging (11 - 408:9	523:10, 526:10,	531:19, 535:12,	348:9, 357:3,
assistance (1) -	avoid [1] - 346.14	526:22, 529:9,	542:10, 544:4,	374:21, 376:2,
300.12	aware (32) - 309'2	529:16, 534:6,	544:8, 544:22,	377:24, 378:23,
accoriated 121 -	310.20 311.9	536:13, 538:9,	545:7, 545:12,	379:14, 385:4,
A63.17 A85.4 A05.6	311.18 312.9	538:22, 542:2,	545:16, 546:2,	396:15, 396:21,
403.17,400.4,400.0	315-5 316-4	546:2. 546:4. 550:1.	546:7, 551:2, 551:4,	396:22, 399:4,
275-0 419-22	316:15 325:22	550:3, 553:14	552:14	400:16, 401:19,
A21.22 A22.17	326.22 343.8	baseline [19] - 341:3,	Battery [103] - 312:19,	411:1, 413:12,
421.22, 422.17,	360.8 382.24	341:5. 341:6.	318:25, 319:18,	415:13, 416:1,
503·11 500·A	425.12 425.15	346:12, 347:3,	319:25, 320:11,	416:2, 418:6, 419:5,
522.24	427.10 427.21	347:4, 347:8,	322:1, 322:3, 323:2,	419:17, 421:19,
accumed (4) - 485/6	430.14 434.12	376:21, 498:14,	323:7, 323:13,	422:8, 422:9,
	434.14 440.3	498:19, 498:21,	323:20, 323:22,	422:12, 422:13,
242.15 246.5	440.11 440.15	498:25, 499:5,	323:23, 324:9,	423:19, 425:8,
343.13, 340.3,	443.8 486.12	499:10, 499:15,	328:2, 328:5,	425:14, 426:3,
312.1, 400.3,	489:11 503:25	499:23, 502:9,	328:23, 328:25,	427:3, 427:8,
400.10,421.13,	505:18 530:11	502:14, 514:9	330:6, 331:22,	427:25, 428:5,
421.14, 423.4,	530:17 541:20	basis [17] - 305:14.	333:5, 333:7, 342:6,	,428:7, 431:19,
437.10, 013.19,	000.17, 041.20	320:18, 322:8,	342:12, 357:13,	432:2, 432:10,
040.19, 004.22	D	323:20, 338:2.	374:18, 376:9,	438:10, 446:3,
assumption [4] -	D	338:4, 344:25,	376:10, 378:7,	446:14, 446:18,
320:0, 340:14,	B's [1] - 322:4	376:22, 395:14.	378:19, 379:13,	447:3, 447:7,
400.10, 040.24	backdated [1] -	432:8, 433:20,	380:8, 380:15,	447:18, 447:19,
assumptions [1] -	370:22	438:9, 466:8,	381:10, 381:16,	448:4, 453:5,
427.9	background [9] -	506:18, 530:6,	381:18, 381:22,	469:19, 470:22,
assurance [3] -	338:14, 416:10,	540:18, 547:8	395:21, 395:22,	471:7, 474:21,
535.20, 535.23,	456:11, 456:14,	batch [2] - 544:9,	399:12, 399:15,	475:3, 475:9,
530.10	456:23, 457:21,	544:10	399:18, 400:15,	476:20, 490:18,
assurance/quality [1]	472:6, 473:20, 487:3	Bates [6] - 350:12,	400:16, 401:4,	490:25, 491:2,
- 0.000	backside [1] - 397:20	377:11, 470:13,	401:5, 401:6, 401:7,	491:10, 492:3,
200.7	backwards [3] -	474:16, 483:6, 518:7	401:12, 401:22,	492:6, 492:12,
399.7	338:1, 381:9, 381:20	Batteries [2] - 314:22,	401:24, 403:2,	493:4, 495:4, 497:6,
atmosphere [1] -	bad [4] - 383:18,	537:21	403:4, 406:4, 406:5,	497:14, 498:22,
ottophod (4) 267:5	383:19, 387:1,	batteries [67] -	406:25, 407:17,	498:24, 499:2,
attached [1] - 307.5	516:12	305:18, 312:24,	409:6, 410:3, 412:3,	499:25, 501:1,
attachment [2] -	bag [10] - 328:5,	322:22, 322:24,	412:6, 412:8,	502:6, 503:4,
307.12,400.10	328:8, 330:2, 330:5,	323:6, 323:16,	412:10, 413:23,	503:23, 504:11,
attachments [5] -	330:17, 425:7,	323:22, 324:22,	435:19, 452:24,	504:18, 505:15,
307.10, 307.22,	425:13, 504:25,	325:6, 325:24,	453:22, 454:3,	505:19, 505:25,
307.23, 392.20,	506:6, 554:4	334:2, 347:2,	455:14, 457:7,	506:3, 506:4, 506:8,
J92.21	bar [4] - 368:22,	348:10, 372:22,	457:8, 467:25,	506:17, 509:6,
attainment [1] - 504.1	403:19, 403:21	379:19, 384:18,	469:4, 471:19,	509:11, 514:12,
attempting [1] - 507.2	base [1] - 303:3	384:22, 392:3,	476:18, 476:20,	515:13, 516:4,
attention [4] - 334:20,	based [53] - 323:10,	396:3, 401:24,	476:21, 476:25,	516:19, 521:9,
382:19, 468:3,	331:16, 332:8,	412:4, 412:5,	496:14, 496:16,	522:3, 522:6, 522:9,
547:22	343:2, 353:8,	413:21, 431:22,	497:2, 497:11,	522:10, 522:12,
attributable [2] -	360:21, 381:2,	433:8, 435:8,	498:6, 498:8,	522:13, 522:18,
363:5, 365:23	386:15, 387:2,	443:25, 444:3,	498:12, 508:6,	522:21, 522:22,
attributed [1] - 388:25	400:4, 401:3, 411:3,	450:13, 458:14,	523:19, 524:10,	522:24, 523:5,
audited [2] - 307:14,	430:9, 431:25,	473:23, 478:25,	524:24, 525:8,	523:6, 523:9, 527:9,
307:15	436:11, 441:22,	481:4, 482:10,	525:14, 526:5,	539:16, 540:5,
August [6] - 342:24,	449:17, 459:19,	483:1, 490:9, 497:3,	533:12, 537:10,	541:21, 541:25,
344:16, 398:11,	461:25, 462:12,	497:24, 498:19,	537:17, 538:4,	543:21, 544:5,
401:12, 510:12,	464:2, 465:8, 467:4,	501:6, 501:16,	544:17, 548:4, 553:1	544:13, 544:14,
511:1/	467:6, 473:21,	501:19, 509:12,	battery [134] - 305:12,	544:17, 546:19,
Australia [1] - 295:3	475:18, 477:5,	509:20, 514:14,	305:13, 312:16,	554:12, 554:14,
availability [1] -	478:5, 481:20,	514:24, 516:5,	312:23, 318:19,	554:20
324:24	482:17, 482:21,		319:4, 319:6,	bearing [1] - 550:22
		·		

beat [2] - 502:10	353:17	318:21, 359:7,	captured [5] - 330:24,	445:7, 445:14,
became [2] - 311:18,	blackened [1] - 404:5	360:3, 413:16,	331:6, 370:2, 554:1,	oballanga (4) 427
430:2	blank [1] - 403:23	449:6, 453:3, 458:4,	004:7	change (1) - 427
become [2] - 300:20,	blast [4] - 294:2,	469:21, 493:3, 502:8	car [10] - 319:7,	Change [6] - 333.10
313:3	294:11, 294:19,	calculation [53] -	319:14, 329:10,	334.22, 402.14,
becomes [2] - 320:20,	295:15	290:5, 298:16,	331:2, 415:11,	404.12, 000.10,
509:7	blasting [1] - 294:5	298:18, 299:3,	415:17, 548:21	000:23
beforehand [1] -	blocking [1] - 450:9	299:21, 299:23,	carbon [1] - 505:9	changed [12] - 313:
455:13	blue [1] - 352:3	300:1, 301:3, 312:4,	carbonyl [1] - 505:9	315:9, 333:23,
BEN [4] - 301:10,	board [2] - 362:15,	342:8, 346:10,	care [1] - 380:2	337:1, 462:9,
301:11, 301:13,	496:6	347:1, 347:9,	Careport [1] - 432:15	462:11, 467:23,
302:19	Board [4] - 513:23,	347:24, 348:6,	carried [1] - 333:6	468:4, 468:5, 468
bench [13] - 318:22,	530:21, 530:22,	359:2, 360:7, 361:8,	carrier [1] - 329:19	472:8, 535:7
319:10, 319:11,	542:23	366:16, 370:14,	carry [1] - 361:1	changes [4] - 312:1
320:10, 420:4,	body [1] - 386:10	370:19, 370:20,	carryover [1] - 487:11	355:11, 415:13,
420:6, 420:10,	book (3) - 350:6.	388:12, 389:3,	cartoon [2] - 355:1,	466:22
420:21, 421:15,	350:15, 350:16	422:1, 446:25,	355:2	Chapter [9] - 443:9,
533.7 554.11	booklet (11 - 392:16	449:12, 449:15,	case [16] - 297:13.	443:12, 443:20,
554:13	boss (11 - 301:3	449:20, 450:6,	316:14, 320:11.	445:10, 478:8,
beneath (11 - 360.18	bottom (1) - 200:5	450:10, 451:8,	340:23 360:9	478:13, 480:18,
benefit (11) - 301:10	247:17 256:7	452:24, 456:1,	367:15 388:20	481:10, 531:17
201-15 201-10	347.17, 330.7,	466:21, 467:2,	431.10 440.14	chapter [1] - 443:23
301.13, 301.13,	372.20, 300.11,	467:4, 471:9,	485.7 493.5	characterize [1] -
201.21, 201.23,	450.6, 455.9,	472:10, 473:3,	510:18 510:23	537:17
302.1, 302.2, 302.3,	400:12,400:15,	473:12, 477:4,	534:15 548:14	characterized [1] -
351.10, 390.10,	460:17, 469:16,	480:6, 498:15,	549:15	539:23
535:3	494:9	502:9, 502:15,	040.10	charge (3) - 412-21
benefited [1] - 534:19	bouncing [1] - 311:7	521:19, 521:24.	cases [1] - 300.10	412.23 482.17
benefitted [3] - 302:4,	box [1] - 362:1	528:1 528:14	categories [4] -	charged (101 - 333"
302:5, 336:7	breakdown [2] -	534:20 546:9 550:1	388:24, 389:1,	333.17 333.10
best [15] - 311:3,	372:15, 394:7	calculations (18) -	389:6, 550:23	333-21 335-23
338:24, 381:8,	breath [1] - 542:12	200.8 334.1	categorize [1] -	440-0 AFE-2
427:14, 491:1,	breeze [1] - 398:4	230.0, 334.1,	493:14	449:0, 400.2,
491:8, 491:12,	Brian [1] - 455:11	388:21 411:6	category [1] - 466:23	402.22, 405.21,
491:17, 492:5,	broke [1] - 414:20	300.21, 411.0,	caused [3] - 453:10,	4/2:10
492:16, 492:18,	broken [4] - 374:20,	411.20, 441.1,	453:11, 501:23	cnargers [1] - 481:2
492:21, 522:21,	376:2, 416:1, 416:2	450.10, 457.12,	causes [1] - 521:10	cnarges [10] - 481:
542:8, 553:20	BTEX 151 - 339:2.	457.19, 456.1,	caveat [1] - 427:6	481:21, 481:23,
big [4] - 303:6, 313:10,	503:16. 503:20.	458:13, 464:13,	center [1] - 553:22	482:9, 482:18,
326:24, 327:3	504:23, 505:4	409:1,409:7,	centralized [1] -	482:19, 523:16,
bigger [1] - 425:1	bubbler (11 - 328:18	473:25, 478:2	296:10	524:15, 524:20
Bill [2] - 393:23, 394:3	bubbles [1] - 328:20		certain [19] - 325:23,	charging [38] - 304:
billowing [1] - 340:18	Bucknell (3) - 293:6	4/1:25, 4/2:12,	327:2, 330:12,	314:11, 332:19,
binder (5) - 346:2,	293.7 293.13	529:23	357:5, 357:16,	359:17, 376:15,
362:25, 382:12,	building (3) - 424.6	calendar [3] - 309:13,	383:3, 394:17,	383:24, 383:25,
406:19, 454:25	A2A-7 AAA-12	309:18, 374:8	401:2, 412:17,	410:17, 410:23,
hinders (2) - 493:25.	424.7, 444.12	calendar-wide [1] -	473:20, 473:22,	411:1, 413:18,
515.24	521:0	309:13	482:8, 482:11	429:9, 429:13,
bit 1221 - 295:20	521.9 humah mu 220.2	Canada [6] - 294:2,	482:16, 486:11,	478:14, 479:3,
205.25 206.1	DUNCH [2] - 339:2,	294:8, 338:17,	488:5, 523:4.	479:8, 479:17,
200.20, 200.1,	420:22	384:9, 384:10,	533:13, 548:18	479:25, 481:10,
200.2, 200.1,	burning [2] - 361:13,	423:13	certainly (11 - 533-24	481:12, 481:15,
322-8 222-0	391:19	capacity [1] - 330:6	certainty (1) - 467:22	481:17, 482:7,
202-15 284-2	but [6] - 302:12,	capture [14] - 329:13,	cortification (4)-	482:12, 482:14,
303.13, 304.3,	319:15, 386:22,	329:21, 329:25,	252.12 424.22	482:25, 491:24,
300:21, 393:11,	389:24, 478:2, 525:2	330:2, 330:3,	303.10, 404.20, 494.0 500.45	523:13, 523:14,
412:21, 414:3,		330:15, 330:19,	404.9, 550:15	523:19, 524:19,
448:10, 493:23,	C	330:23, 331:4	certified [4] - 354:18,	524:24, 525:3,
503217 50828	aplaulate m 310.0	424:8, 424:20,	434:13, 434:19,	525:22, 526:3,
500.15, 540.40		and a second secon	484:1Z	
508:15, 512:18,	520.15	424:22, 553:21.		526:9, 526:10.
508:15, 512:18, 526:24	529:15	424:22, 553:21, 554:3	certify [1] - 353:25	526:9, 526:10, 526:12

	r	1	1	P
chart [6] - 368:22,	376:18, 377:19,	324:9, 326:22,	515:13, 516:3,	497:24
378:1, 378:3,	377:22, 385:20,	327:4, 327:22,	517:10, 518:2,	common [2] - 328:16,
378:12, 379:3,	387:9, 387:13,	330:10, 331:22,	521:9, 527:9,	434:18
412:17	387:18, 387:19,	331:24, 332:7,	531:18, 532:25,	commonsense [1] -
charts [1] - 378:6	394:3, 415:7, 422:3,	337:14, 338:3,	533:12, 538:2,	554:23
check [17] - 324:13,	426:24, 443:25,	339:5, 339:10,	538:4, 539:5, 540:3,	community [1] -
357:4, 397:10,	490:24, 501:11,	339:11, 339:15,	541:17, 541:21,	385:25
416:17, 416:20,	505:25, 506:4,	339:19, 340:11,	541:25, 542:10,	companies [7] -
417:10, 442:15,	522:25, 546:8,	340:24, 342:6,	542:11, 544:4,	293:4, 294:25,
456:15, 458:20,	552:20, 552:21	342:8, 342:10,	544:8, 544:13,	295:4, 295:6,
459:22, 461:10,	Clairton's [2] - 320:11,	342:21, 342:25,	544:17, 552:14,	301:15, 394:12,
468:25, 473:24,	382:14	343:3, 343:18,	554:18	394:19
474:1, 486:3,	clarify [1] - 315:18	344:16, 344:17,	coke-load [1] - 420:17	company [3] - 302:4,
493:18, 493:19	Clark [2] - 393:23,	344:24, 345:16,	coke-making [1] -	302:21, 488:7
checked [10] - 325:15,	394:3	351:16, 361:10,	295:19	compare [6] - 331:14,
417:2, 417:4,	class [4] - 294:19,	361:13, 374:8,	coke-side [37] -	420:9, 427:3,
456:20, 456:21,	384:9, 384:10	374:15, 375:22,	318:20, 320:6,	435:16, 436:5,
458:5, 458:6, 458:8,	clean [5] - 328:21,	384:7, 384:12,	320:12, 321:8,	436:24
469:3, 469:5	328:22, 380:2,	384:18, 384:22,	321:20, 322:4,	compared [3] - 332:7,
checking [2] - 375:17,	549:3, 549:4	385:4, 388:13,	322:12, 322:21,	419:16, 420:10
456:13	cleaner [1] - 328:22	389:18, 389:19,	322:25, 331:24,	comparing [2] -
chemicals [2] - 339:3.	clear-cut [1] - 383:23	391:14, 391:23,	337:14, 338:3,	413:12, 421:19
541:25	clock [3] - 348:8,	392:3, 392:8,	342:6, 342:10,	comparison [3] -
chemistry [6] -	348:14, 348:15	393:11, 399:15,	342:21, 343:3,	420:16, 427:16,
295:18, 295:21.	close (5) - 357:16.	399:18, 400:2,	343:18, 344:17,	548:9
295:22, 338:8.	423:22, 472:11.	400:7, 400:20,	344:24, 345:16,	complaint [6] - 296:4,
338:14, 338:17	547:12, 551:21	400:22, 401:1,	400:2, 401:4, 407:1,	296:10, 296:23,
chief [10] - 292:2.	closed [1] - 423:20	401:4, 401:14,	419:16, 419:21,	297:25, 386:5, 386:8
300:15, 308:19.	closer (81 - 319:3.	401:18, 402:4,	420:3, 423:19,	complaints [18] -
308:24, 313:3.	319:9, 420:6.	402:13, 402:24,	425:8, 505:19,	296:6, 296:8,
382:15, 437:20.	420:19, 515:22.	403:8, 403:14,	506:17, 509:6,	296:11, 296:17,
486:24, 489:23,	547:22, 554:20,	404:4, 404:15,	509:11, 514:12,	296:20, 297:2,
541:18	554:23	404:16, 405:25,	527:9, 538:2,	297:4, 297:13,
chief/program [1] -	closes [1] - 424:17	407:1, 407:9,	544:17, 554:18	385:20, 385:24,
301:2	coal (1) - 413:19	407:14, 409:4,	coking [1] - 414:6	386:10, 386:12,
chimney (3) - 553:7.	Coke (8) - 316:21.	409:7, 410:5,	Coleen [1] - 385:19	387:6, 387:7,
553:10, 553:13	356.10 357.1	410:23, 414:7,	collect [1] - 330:9	387:12, 387:14,
China [4] - 326:25.	387:9. 387:13.	415:14, 415:16,	collecting [1] - 330:14	387:15, 387:17
327:1. 327:3. 327:5	546:8, 552:20,	416:11, 418:1,	collection [3] -	complete [3] - 315:10,
choose (7) - 324:6.	552.21	419:16, 419:21,	329:23, 330:16	315:14, 315:19
433.6 438.15	coke (1911 - 293-25	420:3, 420:17,	collective [1] - 394:24	completed [2] -
439.6 439:15	294.3 294.12	421:2, 421:19,	collector [1] - 414:8	320:19, 347:1
439.18, 465:10	294.20 295.11	422:15, 422:20,	college [1] - 293:6	completely [5] -
chooses (11 - 448:8	295.15 295.19	422:21, 422:24,	color [2] - 352:3	319:15, 355:15,
citation (1) - 385:10	298.24 302.25	423:1, 423:5, 423:9,	column [9] - 333:3,	424:17, 424:19,
citation [1] - 385:11	303.5 303.21	423:12, 423:17,	359:13, 391:18,	462:2
citizone (2) - 386:19	304.18, 304:25	423:19, 424:10,	403:17, 412:16,	completes [1] -
287·A	305:2 305:12	424:17, 424:21,	412:17, 414:23,	305:16
oitizone' (4) - 387.1	312.11 312.12	425:8, 425:14,	452:16	completion [1] - 326:4
citizens [1] - 307.1	315:14 316:23	425:17, 425:19,	columns [4] - 359:12,	complex [2] - 422:16,
222-15 264-2	318.20 319.1	425:20, 425:24,	359:13, 359:16,	465:14
332.10, 301.2,	319:4.319:18	426:12, 426:17,	360:9	complexity [1] - 415:3
362-18 550-17	319:24 320:4	430:12, 435:8,	COM [6] - 326:18,	Compliance 161 -
552.10, 000.17,	320.6 320.12	438:23, 443:14,	348:16, 348:19,	449:5, 478:17.
	321.8 321.20	444:3, 447:2,	348:22, 349:3.	480:23, 481:16.
Giainton [32] - 305:1,	322.1 322.4	475:12, 504:23,	349:24	518:10. 523:15
303:10, 310:21,	322.12 322.17	505:4, 505:15,	combination (2) -	compliance [149] -
300:10, 307:1,	322.20 322.21	505:19, 506:3,	338:25. 452:6	290:11. 290:12.
303:2, 303:20,	322.25 323.5	506:6, 506:9,	combine [1] - 348:17	304:5, 310:25.
308:17, 370:15,	323.13 323.18	506:17, 509:6,	combustion (1) -	311:4, 313:17.
3/2:3, 3/4:18,	520.10, 520.10,	509:11, 514:12,		

				r
314:18, 326:13,	538:13, 539:9,	457:16	493:20, 498:3,	contractor [3] -
342:11, 344:19,	545:4, 545:8,	concerned [3] - 380:1,	499:3, 499:6,	304:20, 305:15,
346:11, 348:4,	546:18, 546:22,	394:22, 410:13	499:11, 499:17,	305:20
348:5, 348:16,	546:24, 547:1,	concerning [4] -	500:8, 500:16,	contractors [1] -
348:18, 348:19,	547:17, 547:18,	350:2, 351:15,	500:21, 501:24	305:20
348:22, 349:3.	547:20, 547:21,	380:15, 385:20	consent [5] - 324:15,	control [26] - 292:2,
349:4. 349:8.	547:25, 548:3,	conclusion [2] -	324:21, 369:2,	302:8, 307:8, 308:7,
349:16. 349:17.	550:10, 550:11	542:2, 542:4	369:7, 490:15	328:2, 328:12,
349:23, 349:25,	compliant [41] -	concurrently [1] -	consequences [1] -	328:14, 384:24,
353:25, 370:15,	347:18, 347:23,	359:22	501:11	385:5, 385:7,
370:17, 370:18,	347:25, 348:1,	condense [1] - 352:20	consider [9] - 340:5,	425:10, 503:22,
371:4. 371:11.	374:19, 374:20,	condition (23) -	358:2, 422:25,	505:22, 506:1,
371.12 375.25	378.7 378.13	318:15 321.7	423:5, 423:7, 433:7,	523:8, 536:6,
377.2 377.18	379.9 379.10	332:11 337:18	468:22. 501:4.	539:16, 546:14,
377.21 378.4	411.8 431.7 441.7	382.22 383.24	541:23	547:2, 548:5,
378.22 379.16	441.12 461.24	412:13 416:6	consideration (6) -	552:10, 553:8,
380.16 381.2	463.14 463.21	437:18 438:8	302:13, 303:12,	553:11, 554:3, 554:4
381.11 381.14	464.2 464.22	430.10 463.14	321:14, 321:19.	controlled [3] - 308:9,
381.17 381.21	464.25 465.17	453.13, 403.14,	533.6 554 19	504:20, 504:24
381.23 382.2	466:11 468:9	499-23 401-0	considered (3) -	controls (5) - 328:9.
382.4 411.6	468.10 472.10	400.23, 491.3,	447:3 465:16	504:25, 505:22,
302.4, 411.0, 411.10 413.7	400.10, 472.10,	491.10, 491.17, 519:10, 527:9	533.10	506:4 552:14
411.15, 415.7,	473.15, 477.12,	510.19, 527.0,	consistency (2) -	conversation (2) -
433.12, 433.10,	477.10, 477.10,	545.17, 544.0, 549.9	266:1 270:7	534.2 536.9
441.2, 449.12,	477.23, 470.1,		appointent (5) 285:6	conversations (1) -
400.11, 401.0,	400.0, 400.17,	331:21, 382:10,	207:22 417:1	346-23
403:0, 403:7,	400.20, 407.1,	383:11, 427:12,	307.23, 417.1,	040.20 converted (1) - 345.9
400.17, 400.0,	492.22, 490.17	438:11, 518:16,	435.19, 404.15	converteu [1] - 343.5
400:7, 400:9,	comply [3] - 340.14,	519:2, 537:5		
456:10, 463:25,	542:18, 546:2	conduct [1] - 316:19	305:12, 300:22	coordinate [1] -
464:25, 465:4,	composition [1] -	confirm [5] - 323:3,	construction [1] -	312:18
465:7, 465:8,	339:4	387:4, 408:11,	292:23	copied [1] - 4/0:25
465:16, 465:25,	compounds [5] -	467:17, 467:21	Construction [1] -	copies [1] - 433:16
466:2, 466:3, 466:6,	327:18, 327:24,	confirming [1] -	293:1	copy [6] - 307:23,
466:11, 468:4,	404:18, 503:15,	386:19	contact [1] - 416:24	399:7, 413:5,
468:14, 468:18,	503:17	conflict [1] - 324:14	contemplate [1] -	433:19, 444:11,
471:11, 473:10,	comprehensive [5] -	confusing [1] - 465:18	303:18	454:22
480:25, 481:3,	299:16, 390:19,	confusion [2] -	contemplated [3] -	corner [1] - 445:5
481:22, 486:22,	391:9, 391:10,	465:19, 526:24	315:3, 325:19,	Corporation [1] -
487:16, 490:5,	391:12	conscious [1] -	369:16	291:4
490:19, 490:21,	computer [1] - 433:21	487:17	contemplates [2] -	corrected [2] - 363:13
492:14, 493:4,	computing [1] -	consciously [1] -	369:22, 391:13	363:14
493:9, 493:16,	309:23	487:25	continue [2] - 446:6,	correcting [1] -
494:17, 494:19,	COMS [24] - 314:15,	consecutive [8] -	542:14	379:11
494:23, 495:5,	324:18, 324:21,	342:25, 343:5,	continued [2] -	correction [1] -
495:13, 496:3,	324:23, 324:24,	506:21, 507:25,	437:24, 536:23	549:22
496:4, 496:7,	326:8, 349:18,	508:21, 524:20,	continues [2] -	corrections [1] -
498:19, 498:22,	349:21, 490:7,	539:8, 539:12	352:12, 461:1	550:6
498:24, 499:2,	490:9, 490:13,	Consent [37] - 304:22.	continuing [2] - 297:6.	corrective [13] -
499:20, 499:22,	490:18, 490:25,	310:18 310:20	339:21	363:16, 364:3,
500:12, 500:15,	491:17, 491:23,	310:22, 311:4.	continuity [1] - 433:13	457:24, 498:15,
500:18, 500:19,	492:6, 492:10,	314:18 315:4	Continuous (1) -	527:9. 546:11.
500:22, 501:25,	492:22, 493.4,	324.11 324.17	314:15	550:8, 550:12,
502:6, 502:24,	500:25, 522:22.	325.10 325.19	continuous 151 -	550:17, 550:18.
503:1, 518:13,	522:23. 546:20.	325.23 326.16	339.25 348.7	550:19. 550:22.
518:14, 518:20,	546:21	327-13 336-24	348.0 348.21	550:24
	a a maaiwa biy w	337.3 370.2 370.0	256.12	correctiv (4) - 307.4
518:21, 518:25,	CONCEIVADIV -	1 001.0.010.C.010.J.	000.12	, sources [4] . 001.4,
518:21, 518:25, 519:1, 519:8, 519:9.	332·2	372.24 490.17	aantinuqualuutu	458 1 458 4 468 1
518:21, 518:25, 519:1, 519:8, 519:9, 519:10, 519:17,	332:2	372:24, 489:17,	continuously [1] -	458:1, 458:4, 468:1
518:21, 518:25, 519:1, 519:8, 519:9, 519:10, 519:17, 519:18, 519:19,	332:2 concept [1] - 552:2	372:24, 489:17, 490:1, 490:6, 490:8, 400:18, 402:11	continuously [1] - 485:9	458:1, 458:4, 468:1 correlate [2] - 339:14 340:11
518:21, 518:25, 519:1, 519:8, 519:9, 519:10, 519:17, 519:18, 519:19, 522:22, 523:10.	332:2 concept [1] - 552:2 concepts [1] - 358:14	372:24, 489:17, 490:1, 490:6, 490:8, 490:18, 492:11, 402:18, 492:12	continuously [1] - 485:9 contracted [1] -	458:1, 458:4, 468:1 correlate [2] - 339:14, 340:11

	1			5
correlation (1) -	423:13	313:7, 315:2,	373:4, 373:10,	438:1, 439:24,
339.19	court [2] - 290:25.	324:19, 325:15,	373:16, 373:19,	487:18
cost (11 - 302:10	291:15	326:8, 327:14.	373:21, 373:24,	decisions [1] - 487:14
council (4) - 514:4	COURT (4) - 294·4	331:25, 332:4,	374:1, 377:8,	declava [1] - 292:25
530.24 542.21	368.7 408.15 446.7	332:5, 332:10,	379:23, 382:9,	declined (1) - 496:15
542.22	COVER M1 - 332:22	333:25, 337:15,	388:4, 388:8,	decrease [10] -
042.22 count (41) 323:23	369.16 380.2	374:9. 374:11.	392:12, 392:14	326:13, 330:1,
244-1 245-2 245-8	517:10	374:16, 375:9,	397:6, 397:10,	330:4. 381:14.
404.7 412.14	covered (6) - 295.12	377:3. 377:18.	402:18, 402:20,	381:17, 381:18,
404.7, 415.14,	410.13 408.2	377:21. 392:10.	404:24, 405:9,	381:21, 382:1,
430.4, 440.23,	400.6 527.15 535.8	392:11, 392:24,	406:6, 406:9,	504:6, 504:7
acupted (7) - 300:14	COVERS (4) - 332:16	393:14, 399:3	406:14, 408:14,	decreased [8] -
407:23 408:1	308.24 517.7	399:7. 405:18.	408:16, 409:10,	369:12. 378:4.
407.23, 400.1,	517:10	410:22, 410:25,	410:8, 418:19,	381:2, 382:4,
451.17, 452.5,	cracke (2) - 329:4	411:17, 413:4,	418:25, 419:2,	389:14, 462:5,
400.1, 400.2	331.1	413:7, 415:2, 416:5,	443:17, 443:19,	462:24, 538:14
240·21	create (2) - 329:13	416:11, 416:12,	446:11, 451:5,	decreases [1] -
040.21 acustrics (4) 204:21	241.21	416:14, 416:25,	451:7, 462:10,	554:22
countries [1] - 234.21	created (12) - 301/22	417:23, 417:25,	470:5, 470:7, 474:3,	decreasing (3) -
205:12 A25:17	224.2 241.22	418:7, 426:25,	474:13, 478:10,	381:23, 494:17,
425-25	374.7 374.10	427:15, 427:19,	478:12, 517:22,	547:17
423.23	375.3 416.10	427:23, 432:7,	517:25, 520:16,	defer (1) - 533:16
497-2	A33-25 A30-20	432:9, 432:14,	520:24, 521:7,	define (5) - 500:23.
407.3	455.25, 455.20,	435:15, 435:22,	526:17, 542:1,	516:10, 516:14.
county [19] - 292: 19,	407.22, 403.20,	436:1, 436:3, 437:6,	552:12, 552:18,	516:24, 530:8
292:22, 304:10,	403.23, 300.2	437:21, 441:24,	552:22, 553:14,	defined [4] - 383:16.
312:5, 387:10,	503·14 503·16	442:9, 442:10,	553:17	485:21, 527:1, 527:6
420.12, 432.23,	areating 101 - 300-23	456:11, 456:12,	Dausch [4] - 291:10,	definitely [15] - 303:4.
433.5, 433.10,	200.24	456:14, 456:19,	340:1, 367:10,	326:15, 343:23.
434.2, 441.23,	critoria (1) - 504/3	456:21, 456:23,	418:23	363:21, 381:8,
445.16, 402.11,	critical (1) - 529:10	457:21, 462:13,	Davis [1] - 385:19	383:2, 384:13.
403.20, 502.0, 514.4 530.24	CPOSS (4) 410-1	473:20, 481:8,	daylight [2] - 395:24,	387:17, 387:22,
542:21 542:22	CR033[1]-419.1	492:16, 492:21,	396:8	401:7. 422:6.
County 1241 - 201:5		495:9, 495:20,	days [12] - 294:16,	426:15, 472:11,
201/9 202/4	EXAMINATION [1] -	495:22, 495:23,	305:6, 305:7, 305:8,	479:1, 496:11
291.0, 292.4,	419:1	496:8, 496:20,	305:17, 345:6,	definition [5] - 422:22.
292.11, 292.12,	CUFFERT [16] - 292.1,	499:8, 506:8,	345:10, 432:21,	423:7, 423:8,
209-2 305-21	290.9, 290.10,	506:11, 506:13,	432:23, 520:15	516:25, 527:4
305:22 311:9	290.12, 299.10,	506:16, 506:23,	dead [1] - 433:7	definitions [1] -
313:13 316:18	301.17, 301.10,	507:4, 507:8,	Dean [6] - 291:18,	415:12
343:8 432:20	311.17, 311.23,	507:12, 507:18,	291:25, 345:19,	definitively [2] -
434-21 435-4	311.20, 333.7,	508:13, 508:14,	346:1, 351:7, 488:21	326:5, 420:18
435.11 443.24	387.25 430.3 535.4	508:18, 508:23,	DEAN [1] - 291:19	degree [3] - 293:8,
444:5. 444:18	CUREORV 121 - 430-7	512:10, 512:19,	DECEMBER [1] -	293:19, 527:6
444:21 445:10	520·2	524:10, 535:20,	291:1	delay [1] - 364:2
446:16, 447:5.	curtain (1) - 320.23	535:23, 538:22,	December [14] -	delayed [2] - 364:10,
447:16, 475:5.	curtaine (1) - 552.20	540:23, 545:1,	291:3, 292:17,	364:11
484:11, 486:1.	ovele (0) 414:6	545:3, 545:13,	344:11, 395:8,	DeLuca [10] - 291:18,
486:15, 495:10.	Cycle [1] - 414.0	546:3, 546:6, 547:8,	395:22, 397:19,	291:23, 291:25,
495:24, 531:2	D	550:1	398:12, 406:12,	340.5, 358:7,
county's (3) - 437:4.	0	Data [1] - 290:14	406:14, 407:6,	443:23, 460:7,
437:9. 478:13	dampered [1] - 418:12	databases [1] - 536:2	511:18, 525:3,	521:8, 523:13,
County's (11 - 489:21	danger [1] - 542:6	DAUSCH [70] -	525:15, 525:16	526:22
couple [13] - 295:2.	data [115] - 290:11,	291:10, 338:12,	decide [3] - 442:1,	deLuca [5] - 418:24,
334:5, 334:8	290:12, 304:13,	339:21, 340:3,	442:11, 442:18	419:3, 420:22,
337:25. 341:24	304:16, 306:10,	340:7, 345:23,	decided [5] - 334:14,	474:14, 493:23
345:4, 453:3, 460:6.	307:16, 308:5,	350:11, 350:16,	335:10, 364:8,	DELUCA [17] - 291:19,
461:23. 462:2.	308:7, 308:11,	350:21, 357:24,	449:16, 549:8	338:20, 340:8,
462:7, 508:4, 548:22	309:15, 309:16,	358:4, 358:12,	decision [6] - 334:22,	351:13, 398:10,
course [2] - 396:1,	309:22, 309:23,	358:17, 364:23,	437:13, 437:21,	443:16, 446:9,
		367:11, 367:25,		

		-		
451:6, 461:22,	481:2, 482:1, 482:5,	487:3	360:10, 361:18,	discussed [3] -
470:6, 478:11,	482:14, 482:23,	detailed [1] - 427:17	361:19, 361:22,	331:18, 358:13,
517:24, 528:25,	483:17, 484:11,	details [5] - 308:3,	366:7, 371:6, 390:9,	430:1
536:6, 537:15,	486:15, 487:6,	330:7, 334:13,	391:13, 393:11,	discussing [1] -
542:9, 553:21	489:4, 489:21,	360:2, 530:13	393:18, 397:11,	527:20
demanded (1) -	495:10, 495:25,	Deteriorating [5] -	397:12, 419:22,	discussion [1] -
546:12	497:23, 498:18,	494:10, 495:19,	426:23, 430:18,	295:18
demarcation (3) -	502:14, 503:6,	496:9, 496:21,	430:19, 431:22,	discussions [1] -
352:9. 352:14.	504:9, 504:13,	496:23	435:8, 442:20,	366:15
352:21	505:13, 521:23,	deteriorating [3] -	445:17, 466:8,	distance [3] - 319:17,
demonstrate [2] -	524:17, 524:22,	495:25, 496:24,	484:24, 491:7,	445:23, 532:25
358:14, 538:18	525:20, 526:13,	497:6	491:16, 491:22,	distinction [4] -
demonstration [1] -	531:2, 540:18, 541:8	deterioration [1] -	494:21, 495:2,	352:25, 355:25,
493:16	Department's [5] -	538:11	496:10, 496:11,	543:20, 543:23
denominator (8) -	311:10, 436:10,	determinations [2] -	516:6, 517:8,	distinctions [1] -
447.4. 447.23	436:19, 452:8,	456:9, 456:10	519:13, 522:24,	317:18
449.9. 450:2.	468:14	determines [1] -	527:1, 544:8,	disulfide [1] - 505:9
471:20, 471:22.	Department-	486:22	544:11, 549:9	divert [1] - 413:24
472.8 472.24	observed [1] - 387:3	determining (6) -	differentials [1] -	divide [1] - 348:20
DEP (6) - 296:13	depicted [11 - 509:2	304:5, 364:4	424:6	divided [4] - 348:15.
335:10. 335:20	depiction (3) - 403:18.	389:17, 487:15.	differentiate [1] -	471:23, 473:2, 473:3
335.22 335.25	403:22, 403:24	521:15, 544:22	352:13	dividing [1] - 348:2
336.1	depicts [1] - 403:20	development (3) -	difficult [3] - 297:15,	division [1] - 292:3
department [1] -	deposition (6) -	321.16 337.9	297:24, 472:21	docket (1) - 394:11
383-6	507:24 508:12	412.12	difficulties [1] - 552:9	door (124) - 304:1
Department 1091 -	508:16 515:6	Development [1] -	difficulty [1] - 410:12	319.4 321.8 321.9
201.5 201.0 202.4	516:1 526:23	203-1	dip [1] - 378:22	321.11 321.12
291.0, 291.9, 292.4,	deputy [1] - 300:21	doviate (261 - 301:5	direct (81 - 434:4.	322.2 330.18
292.11, 292.12,	describe (171 - 200:22	317.4 A40.9	501:8, 501:10,	330.19 330.20
292.10, 294.1,	316:17 316:19	440.14 442.2	506:7. 517:4.	331.22 333.10
294.10, 290.0,	328.17 351.25	442.12 442.18	517:16, 540:2, 540:7	333.11 334.17
212.12, 230.2,	358:23, 359:5	487:6 487:15	DIRECT [1] - 291:21	334-18 338-3
343.0 361.8 360.8	365-2 368-12	487.22 487.25	directed (1) - 313:1	338.10 338.11
372.21 384.4	371.25 374.13	488-3 488-4 488-9	direction [4] - 312:20.	338-23 339-11
386.25 387.3	388-10 392-21	488:12 488:19	355:13, 383:7.	339.15 339.18
432.20, 434.11	398:21 403:18	488.22 489.1	383:21	339:20 340:10
434.15 434.22	410.21 411.24	489.5 489.12	directly (5) - 295:13.	342.6 342.7
435.4 435.11	described [3] -	deviates (1) - 442'4	317:12, 333:25.	342:17. 342:21.
436.11 440.9	407:21 440:19	deviation (3) - 301:12	355:5, 355:10	343:10, 343:18,
440.22 443.24	551:12	438.7 438.8	director [1] - 300:21	344:17, 344:18,
440:22, 440:21,	describes (1) - 441:16	device (5) - 328-2	dirty 121 - 328:19.	344:22, 345:17,
444.0, 444.22	describing (3) - 355:3	505:22 546:14	328:20	392:3, 399:12.
446.17 446.20	424.17 424.24	552.10 554.4	disagree (2) - 442:6.	400:14, 403:3.
447.6 447.17	description (6) -	devise (1) - 552-14	464:16	404:17, 405:24,
447.18 448.2	208:14 200:25	Dictionany (1) - 527:5	disagrees (1) - 525'2	406:5, 407:1.
448.8 448.20	200:14, 200:20,	difference (0) 208:8	discern (3) - 352.6	407:18.407:19.
AA8.24 AA9.15	201:6 424:10	0111erence [8] - 250.0,	552.7 552.9	410:3, 412:1, 419:5,
440.24, 449.15,	391.0, 424.19	313:10, 351.22,	discorned (1) - 337:11	419:16 419:17
450.10 451.8	000:15 247:12	351.25, 352.0,	discerned [1] - 577.11	419:21 419:22
451.21 453.13	299.15, 347.12	570.11, 590.0,	discipline [1] - 040.21	419:25, 420:3.
451.21, 456.10,	descriptor [1] - 299.2	032.10	260-12	420:20, 421:2.
456:15 458:2	design [2] - 330.0,	amerences [1] -	309.13 discover(1) 520.21	421:14, 421:18,
462.17 465.10	424.21 designated up 250.0	J00.12	discover [1] - 029.21	423:23. 428:10.
465:22 466:5	designated [1] - 358:9	UITHEFEITE [54] - 293:10,		445:20. 445:22.
466.10 467.7	designed [3] - 505:25,	298:15, 302:12,	discrepancies [1] -	445:24. 446:14.
468.24 472.24	544:16, 554:19	310:19, 330:15,	43/:Z	446:20, 447:24
475.6 A75.21	detached [2] - 352:16,	335:21, 339:2,	aiscrepancy [1] -	448:20, 449:7
478.01 470.21	352:19	345:4, 347:17,	334:11	449:8, 449:18.
470.21, 470.16	detail [6] - 315:7,	352:15, 352:17,	aiscretion [2] - 433:1,	449:21, 449:24.
479.74 480.12	359:6, 359:23,	354:15, 305:20,	521:9	450:4, 450:7.
710.27, 700.12,	375:13, 390:17,	359:10, 359:15,	discuss [1] - 366:8	

450:20, 451:10,	453:22, 455:14,	455:12, 457:6,	554:11, 554:20	employees [2] -
451:23, 454:2	455:25, 459:11.	457:7, 459:9,	emissions [109] -	306:2, 354:11
460:12 460:23	460:16, 464:17,	463:24, 467:19	303:3, 303:5,	employing [1] -
461.4 461.7 463.2	471:21, 471:22.	E-mail [1] - 290:15	303:10, 304:6,	371:21
464.17 465.15	472:16, 475:3.	e-mailed (1) - 432:9	304:7, 304:8,	employment [2] -
468:8 468:15	475:4 476:3 477:1	e-mails (3) - 394:17	304:10, 304:12,	292:18. 292:21
469.7 469.13	488.1 503.13	399.3 457.11	304:14, 304:15,	employs [1] - 304:21
403.1, 403.10, A60:17 A71:7	505:16 505:19	oarliget (1) - 309:17	306:2, 312:19.	enacted (3) - 431:5.
472.15 472.16	521.10 533.2	earliest [1] = 508.7	322:4, 325:1.	431.6 517:5
474.18 476.18	533-3 536-12		326:17, 327:21,	encansulated (1) -
474.10, 470.10,	553:10 553:13	201:10 201:15	328:3 328:15	376.12
470.24, 490.24,	Doors (4) 449:5	301.10, 301.15,	329.18 329.21	onclose 71, 329.7
497.1, 497.2, 497.3,	double (1) 454:4	301:19, 301.21,	330.1 330.4	220.0 423.25
497.0, 497.11,	double [1] - 404.4	301.25, 302.1,	330.22 330.24	424:10 425:1
503.5, 503.23,	down [18] - 320.20,	302:2, 302:3, 390:10	330.25 338.9	424.13,42J.1,
504.11, 504.16,	326:10, 329.17,	Ed [5] - 290:6, 300:17,	330.5 330.0	analagad (m. 220:1
500:0, 500:17,	345:1, 345:15,	300:18, 351:13,	330.17 340.11	enciosed [2] - 529.1,
509:6, 509:11,	374:21, 376:2,	353:21	340:14 340:18	329.5
512:7, 514:12,	378:8, 389:6,	education [2] -	340.20 340.23	
515:14, 515:21,	415:17, 417:8,	293:12, 293:23	340.20, 340.23,	329:22, 423:24
516:3, 516:12,	433:21, 440:17,	effected [2] - 312:3,	350.3, 350.4,	endanger [2] - 541:15,
516:19, 521:11,	440:18, 462:6,	502:2	351.19, 352.22,	541:24
534:8, 534:9,	464:24, 544:3,	effective [5] - 371:13,	303.2, 300.7, 404:14 406:25	Energy [1] - 295:4
534:13, 535:10,	545:20	490:22, 491:4,	404.14, 400.20,	enforce [14] - 324:6,
535:17, 538:24,	downward [1] -	492:2, 509:7	414.9, 414.10,	327:9, 327:16,
552:1	389:10	effectively [1] - 501:24	414:11, 420.10,	382:16, 400:9,
door-leak [19] -	dozen [1] - 309:9	efficiency [3] -	420:2, 420:0,	404:8, 435:20,
446:14, 451:23,	draft [7] - 363:1,	330:12, 330:13,	426:20, 426:22,	436:11, 437:6,
468:8, 469:7,	363:8, 363:15,	330:15	426:23, 427:1,	437:10, 442:14,
469:13, 469:17,	363:23, 373:14,	effort [2] - 343:13,	427:3, 427:4, 427:7,	450:16, 462:22,
471:7, 496:24,	452:20	518:25	427:18, 427:25	534:6
503:5, 503:23,	drafted [1] - 502:13	efforts [3] - 325:12,	428:5, 428:7, 430:1,	enforceable [1] -
504:11, 504:18,	draw [2] - 329:20,	518:14, 518:20	434:16, 444:2,	383:10
506:8, 506:17,	553:22	eighteen [1] - 359:13	445:17, 445:22,	enforced [8] - 368:15,
509:6, 512:7,	driven [1] - 553:1	eighty (3) - 403:15,	449:25, 481:17,	382:23, 386:7,
515:14, 515:21,	driver [1] - 501:22	409:21, 409:22	497:5, 497:11,	460:8, 462:4,
516:19	driver's (1) - 548:10	eighty-nine [1] -	498:21, 499:5,	463:13, 463:22,
door-leaking [2] -	driving (1) - 422:13	403.15	499:10, 499:16,	535:18
407:1, 407:19	drop [2] - 307:5, 414:8	eighty-one (2) -	503:9, 503:11,	enforcement [143] -
doors [75] - 303:14,	drove (1) - 552:18	409.21 409.22	503:12, 503:14,	292:2, 296:15,
314:13, 316:3,	DTE (11 - 295:4	either [14] - 296:8	504:6, 504:8,	300:15, 301:2,
318:12, 318:14,	due 111 - 438'9	307.20 386.12	504:10, 504:16,	308:19, 308:24,
318:16, 318:22,	duby (2) - 201:14	431.1 441.25	504:19, 504:20,	309:5, 310:2, 313:3,
320:12, 320:13,	410.1A	401.1, 441.20,	504:22, 504:24,	320:24, 320:25,
321:20, 321:23,	410.14 duration (5) 200:11	442.0, 433.13,	504:25, 505:3,	321:16, 323:24,
322:4, 324:10,	200:12 264:10	400.23, 470.2,	505:4, 505:23,	324:12, 324:16
329:4, 329:16,	410:6 495:11	519.10 510.2	506:1, 513:12,	325:17, 331:19,
332:19, 332:20,	410.0, 400.11 Deutieko (t) 202:19	551.21	513:15, 531:18,	336:11, 337:10,
333:5, 334:18,	DZURINKO [5] - 392.10,	001.21 electronic (0) 307:9	538:1, 538:5, 538:7,	342:1, 342:12,
338:9, 338:23,	393:23, 393:24,	420:42	541:14, 541:20,	342:13, 343:13,
343:3, 357:3, 357:7,	393:25, 394:1	432.13	541:23, 542:11,	346:19, 354:3,
357:10, 357:11,	E	016Ven [3] - 344.0,	548:17, 551:2,	354:13, 354:15,
360:22, 375:21,	E	344:7, 401:15	551:18, 552:11,	363:17, 363:19,
376:18, 407:1,	e-mail [24] - 365:6,	emission [18] -	553:23, 554:1, 554:7	363:24, 365:7.
411:17. 411:18.	365:15, 367:12.	313:18, 320:14,	emissions [1] -	366:4, 368:16.
411:23, 420:6.	367:23, 367:24,	320:19, 351:10,	352:24	368:21, 369:10.
424:5, 428:9.	367:25, 385:15.	393:17, 404:12,	emitted [2] - 330:10,	370:6. 375:4. 377:3
428:15, 429:16.	385:18, 385:19.	427:10, 430:15,	505:3	382:15, 382:22.
435:19.446:18	392:11. 392:17.	485:3, 522:24,	empirical [2] - 512:23,	383:1, 383:7, 394:4
447:4, 447:19	392:18, 393:22.	533:1, 542:19,	512:24	394:5, 416:23
447:20, 452:25	394:11, 394:18.	551:5, 551:6,	employed [1] - 313:12	419:8, 422:4
453.1 453.3	454.9 455.7 455.9	551:16, 551:17,		
1 100.1, 100.0,				

2	1			
427:22, 428:16,	456:21, 486:21,	equally [1] - 340:15	exactly [7] - 355:13,	516:19, 516:20,
428:23, 429:7,	487:3, 518:22,	equate [1] - 518:25	359:6, 369:17,	516:23, 516:25,
429:14, 434:13,	552:4, 552:7	equation [2] - 469:9,	454:14, 505:2,	517:1, 526:24, 527:5
435:1, 435:17,	engineer's [1] -	469:10	549:24, 551:12	exclude [1] - 333:11
435:20, 436:2,	325:14	equipment [4] - 302:8,	EXAMINATION [3] -	excludes [2] - 449:7,
437:20, 437:22,	engineering [2] -	302:9, 385:6, 426:6	291:21, 419:1,	472:15
438:2, 441:4,	293:9, 384:24	equivalence [2] -	526:20	excluding [1] - 454:19
442:17, 444:8,	engineers [6] -	321:8, 337:14	example [27] - 302:7,	excuse [2] - 349:6,
444:10, 444:15,	296:15, 366:4,	equivalencies [1] -	309:14, 345:5,	411:14
450:1, 451:23,	390:22, 442:9,	322:12	346:11, 359:16,	exeedance [1] -
452:3, 454:6,	452:5, 471:4	equivalency [10] -	371:10, 374:18,	491:23
454:13, 455:4,	ensure [7] - 325:12,	318:21, 320:5,	377:23, 383:25,	exercise [1] - 310:2
456:18, 456:20,	353:25, 366:1,	322:25, 332:7,	391:4, 395:20,	Exhibit [82] - 290:4,
457:1, 457:10,	395:13, 395:25,	338:3, 344:24,	396:2, 417:7,	290:6, 290:7, 290:9,
457:13, 457:19,	547:21, 552:10	345:17, 420:17,	417:11, 424:4,	290:10, 290:12,
458:3, 459:17,	entailed [1] - 384:11	421:10, 539:6	424:13, 428:9,	290:13, 290:15,
460:5, 461:5, 464:6,	enter [8] - 296:8,	equivalent [18] -	435:18, 436:4,	290:16, 290:18,
464:11, 466:12,	306:9, 374:9,	320:6, 331:23,	459:11, 462:25,	290:19, 290:21,
466:14, 468:9,	374:11, 374:15,	331:24, 342:9,	488:1, 496:13,	290:22, 290:24,
470:23, 475:18,	433:21, 433:24,	342:10, 342:18,	508:9, 516:3, 535:9,	346:2, 346:8,
477:10, 478:22,	551:17	342:22, 343:18,	040.20 execod (1) - 242:10	358:21, 300:1,
4/9:5, 4/9:10,	entered [7] - 375:9,	344:17, 421:9,	exceed [1] - 343.19	372:10, 374.0,
4/9:18, 481:3,	410:23, 413:5,	421:21, 421:25,	exceedance [10] -	302.12, 300.10,
481:7, 481:13,	416:12, 416:14,	509:12, 509:19,	350.10, 437.10, 456-22 496-14	407.9 408.10
402.3, 403.4,	417:18, 418:1	514:13, 519:5,	400.20, 400.14,	407.0, 400.13,
400.24, 409.20,	enters [1] - 333:24	521:12, 554:16	523.6 524.21	445.6 445.12
492.7, 493.24, AQA:A AQA:7 AQ5:8	entire [7] - 381:25,	error [20] - 304:14,	544:16 545:18	445:15 445:16
495.14 495.17	391:7, 424:2, 447:2,	304.10, 417.11,	exceedances [12] -	451:1, 453:18.
496:9, 496:19	401.23, 400.11,	441.10, 452.15,	323:11, 331:17,	454:24, 455:3,
498:12, 498:14.	001.1	454:17 455:14	348:15, 349:6,	455:6, 458:17,
500:5, 500:9,	entirely [1] - 525.2	455:18 455:21	412:1, 482:11,	458:22, 459:9,
500:14, 502:10,	298.23 383.12	456:1.457:22.	492:23, 547:3,	460:10, 469:23,
502:13, 503:5,	environmental [11] -	462:20, 498:9,	547:9, 547:24, 548:5	470:3, 470:8,
504:4, 507:13,	293:9. 295:15.	530:6, 536:21,	exceeded [6] - 344:2,	470:13, 472:4,
507:19, 514:9,	383:19, 390:13,	537:18, 537:20	344:4, 371:14,	474:14, 474:23,
521:8, 521:14,	394:3, 490:23,	errors [16] - 416:18,	510:4, 545:22,	475:1, 475:25,
521:20, 522:6,	491:5, 491:13,	454:19, 458:9,	545:23	476:8, 476:10,
525:17, 527:17,	492:3, 492:19, 552:6	458:14, 458:19,	exceeds [3] - 383:25,	476:23, 478:8,
537:9, 537:11,	Environmental [5] -	459:6, 459:8,	514:10, 514:11	479:13, 480:17,
538:3, 538:10,	296:12, 296:13,	472:15, 536:13,	Excel [10] - 299:24,	483:6, 483:11,
538:21, 538:25,	394:2, 444:3, 445:6	536:18, 536:22,	307:13, 307:15,	483:13, 483:17,
540:9, 541:6,	EPA [21] - 296:13,	549:15, 549:18,	367:22, 374:14,	493:20, 494.4,
541:18, 543:8,	301:10, 301:14,	550:5, 550:13,	374:21, 375:23,	497.20, 500.11,
544:15, 546:13,	301:22, 301:25,	550:21	411:16, 433:24,	517.17 510.23
548:2, 549:10,	302:15, 305:11,	escape [1] - 551:18	495:23	520.6 520.9
000.10 amformon (4) 446:20	316:4, 353:8,	escrow [3] - 459:22,	except [2] - 413:22,	520.14 523.11
enforces [1] - 440.20	353:13, 421:8,	461:15, 463:9	440.10	524.2 524.4 525.6
enforcing [14] -	434:9, 439:1, 439:2,	established [1] -	exception [3] -	525:9, 525:11.
334.7 435.24	439:3, 439:11,	334:15	oventions 121-	526:2, 526:6,
455.22 463.15	439:21, 444:19,	estimate [1] - 426:23	343.17 AA7.13	531:25, 537:13
464:1, 464:3, 466:9	444:23, 531:21	estimated (1) - 427:7	AYCORS [1] - 414-11	exhibit [10] - 346:5,
466:13, 466:18	EPA'S [1] - 484:8	estimating [1] - 3/9:/	AVC0000 [1] - 117.11	373:5, 373:12,
468:11, 478:6, 490:1	EPA-required [1] -	Evaluating [1] -	AVCASSIVA [1] - 001.0	376:13, 379:25,
Engineer (21 - 292:10.	305:11	352:24 evening (0) 204:46	330.19 330.25	389:20, 406:7,
292:14	907:11 207:16	A18-13	515:1, 515:3.	445:4, 453:20,
engineer [14] - 333:3.	297:11, 297:10,	+10.13 event (1) - 30/-15	515:14, 515:21.	460:18
338:5, 394:4,	201.20 ocual (2) - 340:23	evidence (2) - 358-3	516:4, 516:6, 516:9,	EXHIBITS [1] - 290:1
416:16, 416:23,	431-21	436:16	516:11, 516:14,	Exhibits [2] - 290:2,
442:3, 452:20,		100.10		
			and the second se	

		1	T	T
290:3	facility [16] - 323:13.	524:6, 524:8, 526:8,	501:20	434:8
exhibits (51 - 290.25	326:22, 357:21.	552:1	financially [1] -	format [1] - 374:21
341:13 373:7	361:11 362:16	familiarize [1] - 398:5	534:20	formula (10] - 449:6,
373.10 418.22	370:17, 381:25.	fan 111 - 553:22	finish [3] - 310:11,	455:14, 455:18,
evist (2) - 382:16	382:25, 383:12,	fanning (1) - 352:17	461:21, 520:18	456:1, 477:5,
A24.12	384.12 401.25	far (17) - 299.10	finishes (1) - 308:14	478:18, 478:21,
avietod (e) - 208.5	539 25 543 12	309:2 315:5 317:5	fire 121 - 553:9, 553:10	480:24, 481:2, 481:5
200-7 261-16	543:15 543:18	325:18 326:3	firsthand (11 - 386:25	formula., [2] - 478:18.
299.7, 301.10,	544.3	350:13 375:6	fite (1) - 484.21	480:24
300.20, 520.4, 540.7	facility-wide (1) -	390:18 396:18	five-minute [1] -	forth (1) - 306:17
existence [9] - 424.10,	370.17	A12:16 A22:9	A84-10	fortunately [1] -
440:3, 490:0, 501:3,	570.17 faction 221:18	412.10, 422.3,	404.13	383.22
517:19, 519:22,	244:10 275:2	434.17 444.21	fiano un 554.05	forth: (1) = 402:5
520:6, 520:10,	296.15 201.18	facibility (1) 431:4	flaps [1] - 001.20	forty-nine (1) - 402:5
520:13	500.15, 591.10,		mp [5] - 351.7, 370.12,	forward (1) 457:23
existing [1] - 501:15	534.11 feeters: 260:14	Pebruary [9] - 305.15,	379:13, 400:11,	547:15
exists [6] - 38/:4,	Tactor [5] - 300:14,	305:10, 305:17,	401:9	047.10
422:1, 440:12,	390:25, 392:2,	309:13, 374:24,	flow [1] - 414:8	100110ation [5] -
444:25, 487:20,	401:10, 518:10	461:12, 464:20,	focus [4] - 423:14,	330:12, 339.24,
509:23	factored [1] - 389:9	510:1, 511:10	490:17, 504:3,	552:12, 552:13,
expand [1] - 461:22	factors [12] - 298:15,	Federal [1] - 532:4	512:18	553:15
expect [4] - 330:8,	298:18, 298:19,	federal [14] - 316:12,	focused [2] - 324:17,	fourths [1] - 443:10
400:22, 421:1, 433:4	299:2, 300:5, 300:7,	316:13, 428:1,	508:6	Frequency [1] -
expecting [1] - 397:23	300:8, 301:17,	428:6, 428:13,	focusing [5] - 506:21,	518:11
experience [2] -	301:18, 302:12,	428:18, 429:1,	507:2, 508:8,	frequency [6] -
293:24, 423:16	303:4, 360:20	429:9, 430:15,	512:17, 514:22	399:12, 400:14,
expert [6] - 422:21,	factual [1] - 542:4	431:3, 431:8,	folder [1] - 394:16	405:24, 406:5,
422:23, 422:25,	fair [52] - 295:24,	431:25, 532:5,	folks [1] - 354:8	407:19, 410:3
423:2, 423:6, 423:10	326:18, 339:10,	554:15	follow [40] - 318:8,	frequent [1] - 303:5
expired [1] - 490:3	349:18, 369:19,	feet [14] - 318:12,	431:12, 434:2,	frequently [1] - 434:7
explain [29] - 296:3,	373:25, 375:24,	318:16, 318:22,	435:5, 436:20,	front [3] - 373:6,
298:8, 301:13,	376:20, 390:18,	318:23, 319:3,	437:10, 437:14,	388:19, 551:25
320:5, 331:9, 333:1,	404:11, 419:23,	319:5, 319:22,	437:22, 438:6,	fugitive [10] - 426:2,
333:7, 338:8,	420:12, 422:21,	421:22, 421:23,	438:12, 438:14,	426:5, 427:4, 427:7,
344:22, 346:17,	423:17, 425:18,	424:1, 445:23,	438:17, 438:25,	428:5, 428:7,
354:25, 356:1,	426:13, 427:5,	448:11, 554:25	439:9, 439:13,	434:16, 498:21,
356:18, 359:20,	427:23, 430:19,	fewer [6] - 336:25,	439:22, 440:16,	499:5, 499:16
359:24, 364:1,	441:15, 441:19,	337:12, 337:13,	440:23, 440:25,	fugitives [1] - 427:8
388:22, 389:1,	444:9, 444:12,	343:3, 527:25	442:5, 442:21,	full (15) - 291:23,
412:15, 412:19,	444:24, 447:14,	field [1] - 353:25	447:10, 448:8,	294:15, 305:2,
413:1, 413:8, 414:3,	450:21, 453:10,	fifteen [1] - 453:6	448:10, 448:21,	309:22, 310:9,
415:9, 434:5,	469:8, 473:25,	fifty [1] - 322:14	448:25, 449:15,	310:15, 315:11,
435:25, 452:8,	477:24, 478:23,	figure [4] - 331:8,	449:20, 450:12,	375:11, 386:24,
455:10, 471:10	479:5, 488:4,	337:8, 373:8, 554:6	450:16, 465:11,	391:3, 393:18,
explanation [2] -	492:13, 496:25,	figured [4] - 346:24,	469:10, 475:22,	425:20, 426:11,
338:13, 412:18	497:7, 502:1,	494:21, 549:1, 549:2	488:10, 536:23,	506:2, 545:24
explosive [2] - 414:15	502:20, 505:17,	figuring [1] - 390:25	536:24, 537:2,	full-time [3] - 305:2,
exposed (1) - 541:24	505:23, 506:5,	file [3] - 299:25,	537:3, 537:5	425:20, 426:11
extend (2) - 319:5	506:25, 513:2,	374:14, 433:24	foot [7] - 319:6, 424:2,	functioning [1] -
484.17	513:18, 515:20,	filing [1] - 297:12	448:1, 448:16,	384:12
avtondod (4) - 363:14	521:12, 526:25,	final (13) - 350:10.	532:25, 533:17,	furnaces [4] - 294:3,
extende (1) - 300.14	534:25, 538:1,	373.12 373.16	534:1	294:11, 294:19,
extends [1] - 515.7	538:9, 546:16, 551:2	452.21 460.4	footnote [1] - 472:14	295:15
extent [7] - 330.4,	fairly [3] - 330:16,	470.24 486.16	forget (5) - 295:4.	future (4) - 297:13.
423.12, 430.10,	378:10, 502:24	486.25 487.5	308:2, 355:13.	344:19. 347:8. 547:3
409:2, 534:10,	fairness [1] - 357:20	531.4 532.19	478:24 500:11	••••••••••••
542:1, 550:20	familiar (13) - 298:3.	532.22 546.10	formal (5) - 293:12	G
F	298:5, 302:24.	finalized (3) - 333-16	293.23 299.11	0
F	320:25, 330:5.	364.5 365.8	457.2 522.19	gained [1] - 530:16
facet [1] - 546:25	398:17. 409:14.	financial (4) - 501-5	formalized (3) -	gap [1] - 363:23
facilities [1] - 361:11	443:2, 489:17.	501.8 501.10	298.12 299.20	gaps [1] - 424:17
			200.12, 200.20,	

		-	r	r
garage (2) - 329:16.	437:1, 437:2.	339:7, 430:19,	405:24, 406:5,	414:7, 492:22
423.23	452:19.516:13.	430:21, 504:10.	407:19, 410:3	house [11] - 328:5,
120.20 (190 1171 - 328.20	516:20 516:23	504:16, 542:9	high-opacity (11) -	328:8, 330:2, 330:5,
328.22 330.11	quidance (18) - 290.5	head (4) - 295:22.	303:25, 314:13,	330:17, 424:25,
330.15 330.20	298.17 299.8	394.1 405:3 539:13	357:7. 357:10.	425:8, 425:13,
340.12 340.24	299.20 300.5	headers (1) - 532:16	357:11, 360:22.	504:25, 506:6, 554:4
340.72, 340.24,	301:12 301:16	headlight (3) - 549:3	392:3. 412:1.	huge [1] - 390:8
404-16 412-24	388-12 388-15	540.8 549.10	429:16 460:15	humans (2) - 441:18.
404.10, 413.24,	380.4 433.0	hoadlighte (2) -	497.2	441.22
504-22 505-4	436:17 439:1	548.20 548.23	higher (8) - 360:12	hundred (10) - 400.8
542.11	439.2 439.10	548:25	408:2 408:5	401.15 402.14
342.11 32800UE (12) - 328-3	485.18 489.3	Health (35) - 201.5	425:16, 425:24.	402:25, 403:9.
229-14 425-10	400.10, 400.0,	201.0 202.4	502.22 512.13	403:15 406:1
503.12 503.14	quidances (1) -	201.0, 202.4,	538:13	407:15, 423:24.
503.12, 503.14,	208.24	292.11, 292.12,	highest (2) - 528:8	503:2
504.10, 504.10,	quide (1) - 430:3	292.13, 294.1,	528.9	hundreds (1) - 551:5
504.19, 504.20,	guide[1] - 405.0	294.9, 290.0, 290.2,	highly (2) - 422.16	hydrogen [1] - 339:1
552.11	guideline (1) 388.7	316-10 343-8	422.18	hypothetical (4) -
JJZ.11	guidennes [1] - 300.7	A32:20 A3A:21	hillside (1) - 312:17	502.3 553.5
gamering [1] - 545.15	guys [3] - 350.7,	435.4 435.11	hindrance (1) - 544-14	553.16 553.18
geared [1] - 391.22	366:0, 507.24	433.4, 433.11,	Historical (4) - 200:12	hypothetically (1) -
gears [3] - 295:24,	11	445.24, 444.5,	historical m 313.7	3/0.21
295:25, 298:1	П	444.10, 444.22, AA6.17 AA7.5	222.10 277.18	545.21
generalized [1] -	H2S [2] - 327:24,	440.17, 447.3,	552.10, 577.10	
357:23	505:5	447.17, 475.5,	nistorically [6] -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
generally [8] - 306:11,	half [26] - 293:3,	404.11, 400.10,	321.24, 322.2,	I/we [1] - 366:16
308:7, 310:3,	309:18, 320:13,	405.21, 430.10,	226.10 272.17	I3 [1] - 540:13
359:24, 419:13,	320:19, 333:9,	530.22 531.2	530.19, 572.17	idea [3] - 356:4,
420:7, 553:2, 554:5	345:8, 345:9,	542.23	hit or 244:12 520:25	395:25, 424:11
generate [4] - 306:19,	349:19, 363:25,	health (0) - 388-24	helee w 401:10	identical [1] - 367:1
310:14, 3/4:0	415:16, 453:2,	130.0 486.8	holideve (1) - 491.19	identified [14] -
generated [1] - 3/5:3	455:23, 468:21,	505:16 513:6	homostu: 450:40	456:17, 457:6,
generating [1] -	495:15, 498:24,	513.12 541.15	nonest [1] - 408:10	458:9, 458:13,
433:16	508:3, 508:9, 510:8,	541.24 542.6	nonestly [1] - 454:21	459:9, 461:13,
glance [1] - 529:2	510:9, 510:19,	health-based (2) -	noperuly [1] - 350:10	473:23, 494:16,
goal [2] - 395:13,	510:25, 511:14,	A30.9 513.12	not [41] - 319:7,	494:24, 495:2,
504:3	511:18, 511:20,	hear (1) - 485'23	319:14, 329:10,	504:4, 520:9, 522:3,
gotcha [1] - 443:18	511:25, 523:22	heated 111 - 544:6	331:2, 346:14,	523:25
governed [3] - 499:2,	handing [1] - 408:19	heavily (1) - 404:4	415:10, 415:17,	identifies [1] - 498:6
499:11, 499:17	handwritten [6] -	hollo (4) 201:23	500:4, 500:9,	idle [26] - 500:4,
graded [1] - 389:10	433:13, 433:23,	helped (2) - 321:16	500:13, 500:21,	500:9, 500:13,
gradient [1] - 351:19	470:16, 476:10,	221.10 A0A.1A	501:3, 501:0,	500:22, 501:3,
graduate [2] - 293:7,	476:14, 476:15	551.19, 454.14	501.11, 501.19,	509:12, 509:19,
293:10	HAPs [3] - 339:6,	high ran - 202:25	501.23, 509.12,	510:6, 510:14,
graduated [2] - 293:6,	339:7, 339:8	214-12 220-12	509.19, 510.0,	510:20, 510:22,
293:20	hard [4] - 314:2,	314.13, 330.12,	510:14, 510:20,	511:5, 511:12,
Graham [3] - 383:5,	433:16, 433:19,	330.14, 330.17,	510.22, 511.0,	511:19, 511:24,
383:13, 548:11	476:22	352.19, 352.1,	511.12, 511.19,	512:2, 512:6,
granted [1] - 552:8	harder [6] - 386:21,	357.11 360.22	511.24, 512.2,	514:13, 516:5,
graph [1] - 368:14	420:23, 420:25,	357.11, 300.22,	512.0, 514.15,	521:18, 543:19,
graphically [1] -	421:3, 426:9, 456:11	371.19, 370.10,	514.23, 510.3,	543:24, 544:6,
403:19	hardest [1] - 352:5	379.10, 392.3,	521.10, 543.19,	545:11, 546:8
gravity [2] - 529:9,	harm [3] - 360:14,	405-24 406-5	544-6 EAE-11 EAE-0	idled [1] - 514:24
529:16	360:15, 544:5	403.24, 400.3,	044.0, 040.11, 040.0	idling [6] - 346:15,
gravity-based [2] -	Harrington [1] -	407.18,410.3,	100r [3] - 308:8,	501:6, 501:11,
529:9, 529:16	455:11	412.1, 424.2,	308:15, 356:8	501:19, 501:23,
gray [1] - 383:16	hashtag [2] - 412:18.	429.10, 400.10,	nourly [1] - 349:6	543:21
group [3] - 309:5,	412:23	493.9, 493.11,	nours [9] - 305:4,	ignore [2] - 482:21,
389:7	hashtags [1] - 412:22	497.2, 002.24	305:5, 348:8,	488:14
guess [9] - 312:18,	hazardous 181 -	300-12 400-14	340:10, 348:11,	ignoring [1] - 449:23
318:10, 413:24,	338:25, 339:5,	J35.12, 400.14,	340:14, 340:15,	II [1] - 292:14

			1	
III (11 - 292:10	incorporates [3] -	540:24, 540:25,	495:3, 495:9,	442:4, 442:16,
images [1] - 356:2	390:11, 391:11,	541:2, 541:7, 541:8,	495:15, 496:3,	452:2, 455:20,
imagine (1) - 329:6	499:8	541:10, 550:4	497:1, 499:8,	476:16, 479:11,
immediate (6) - 543:6.	incorporating [1] -	informed [3] - 453:25,	524:10, 525:13,	486:17, 495:25,
543.11 543.14	376:25	454:1, 454:14	526:9, 526:10,	536:2, 536:11,
544.4 544.9 544.13	incorrect (6) - 334:1.	initial [5] - 302:19,	540:1, 540:5,	539:20, 539:24,
immodiately (2)	359.10 460.5	334:22, 363:15,	548:15, 548:17,	546:22, 554:11
207.10 207.20	462.15 467.2 467.6	442:3. 500:11	548:21, 549:5, 549:7	inspector [8] - 416:22,
297.19, 297.20,	increase [14] - 313:18	initiated [1] - 335:2	inspections [126] -	441:14, 475:6,
1944.19	313.23 322.12	inner (1) - 295:14	304:17, 304:25,	485:12, 485:15,
542:0 550:14	330-3 330-17	input (4) - 296:14	305:11, 305:16,	486:8, 496:4, 540:3
513.6, 550.14	330:10 340:10	301.23 302.9 514.6	307:12, 308:11,	inspectors [79] -
Impacted [1] - 455.16	340.11 350.1	insertion (2) - 537:23	312:6. 312:10.	296:15, 296:19,
Impacts [1] - 388:24	424.8 424.20	inepoct (e), 414:1	312:14, 313:2,	296:21, 297:18,
implies [4] - 420:18,	424.0, 424.20,	A21.10 A22.21	313:21, 314:24,	304:18, 304:19,
491:9, 507:1, 527:6	424.22, 347.1,	431.10, 432.21,	315:7. 315:8.	304:25, 305:3.
important [1] - 366:16	505.21	432.23, 433.1, 440.3	315:11, 315:12,	307:5, 307:20,
impose [1] - 362:13	Increased [8] - 515.0,		315:23, 316:7.	307:22, 308:10,
imposed [3] - 324:15,	322.5, 322.6,	305:13, 420.0, 540.5	316.9 316.20	312:7. 314:18.
527:10, 528:6	326:16, 337:2,		316:25 317:23	315:10, 316:5.
imposing [1] - 513:9	369:23, 380:12,	314:21, 433:11,	318-2 319-18	317:15, 317:16
improve [5] - 349:24,	380:13	435:8, 478:14	323-5 323-15	317.19 317.22
546:18, 546:21,	increases [1] - 360:13	inspection [97] -	325.25 327.10	319.10 319.23
546:24, 547:13	increasing [4] -	304:16, 306:10,	327.11 331.12	319.24 353.1
improved [2] - 499:23,	329:25, 368:25,	306:18, 306:19,	331.13 331.14	374.9 374.15
504:21	553:22, 554:2	307:16, 312:6,	347:16 347:17	396.23 410.23
improvement [9] -	increment [1] - 485:1	312:22, 312:24,	347.10, 347.17,	413:11 416:11
326:10, 326:11,	increments [1] - 417:9	312:25, 314:3,	347:23 348:1	418-1 425-21
349:22, 349:23,	independently [2] -	314:9, 314:10,	348.2 348.3 349.7	426.12 431.12
492:12, 492:17,	366:14, 366:21	314:15, 315:19,	340.0 340.14	431.18 431.23
492:24, 492:25,	INDEX [1] - 290:1	320:19, 324:19,	350.2 371.22	432.4 432.20
493:1	indicates [1] - 372:20	326:1, 327:9,	372.2 374.19	432.25 433.1
improving [1] - 502:16	INDIPAY [2] - 302:18,	331:10, 332:17,	374.25 375.22	433.5 433.11
in-house [1] - 424:25	302:22	348:4, 348:18,	378.15 378.16	433-13 434-2
inaccurate [3] - 371:3,	Indirectly [2] - 516:20,	349:16, 349:23,	378.19 379.2	434:22, 435:4
371:5, 371:6	516:22	349:25, 360:10,	379.5 379.9	436:1, 436:7, 437:5.
inches [1] - 319:6	indirectly [2] - 489:14,	372:4, 372:5, 372:6,	379.10 380.7	438:5, 440:25,
include [5] - 354:5,	516:13	375:25, 376:16,	380.9 380.10	441.25, 442:1
393:18, 450:5,	individual [6] - 302:5,	376:22, 378:18,	380:12 380:16	443:24, 444:18,
497:13, 525:16	411:1, 417:20,	386:3, 392:24,	380.19 380.24	444:22, 445:18,
included [5] - 475:8,	482:12, 492:5, 528:9	393:14, 393:17,	393.2 393.8	446:13, 446:17,
519:13, 524:15,	individually [2] -	393:19, 393:20,	395:11 395:13	446.21 447.1
525:17, 537:22	365:11, 495:4	396:21, 400:13,	395-23 396-1	447.2 447.6
includes [10] - 390:21,	individuals [2] -	405:18, 410:22,	396.4 396.6 396.9	447:17, 448:3.
458:18, 498:14,	302:18, 489:25	411:5, 411:6,	396:14 396:16	450:9, 455:19,
498:21, 498:24,	industries [1] - 430:20	413:10, 415:25,	396.17 396.20	470:19, 484:1.
499:5, 499:10,	industry [3] - 294:22,	416:17, 417:3,	398.24 399.4	484:12, 485:19,
499:13, 499:15,	430:18, 430:23	417:10, 432:14,	399.15 411.9	486:16, 495:10,
524:10	industry-specific [1] -	432:18, 433:14,	411.11 414.2	495:11, 539:24.
including (1) - 385:5	430:23	433:20, 433:24,	417.18 417.20	540:3
inclusion [1] - 537:17	information [27] -	435:15, 435:17,	419:19 425:17	install [2] - 302:7.
incomplete (1) - 377:3	296:17, 301:23,	437:6, 437:16,	425.22 425.24	302.8
incorporate (5) -	307:12, 307:21,	437:21, 441:6,	431.15 431.21	installed (1) - 538:3
298.22 300.10	308:9, 337:22,	441:11, 441:24,	432.5 433.5	instantaneous (1) -
300:11 393:20	357:23, 364:7,	442:9, 442:10,	433:14. 433:17	485:7
504.22	366:19, 374:15,	443:14, 446:14,	434.3 434.25	instead (4) - 308-8
incorporated Int -	387:21, 391:11,	447:2, 470:16,	435.11 435.20	391.2 473.2 477.23
298.19 300.12	393:5, 414:24,	471:7, 475:2, 475:4,	435.23 435.24	instituted 111 - 212.0
389.7 390.12	427:2, 454:15,	475:8, 475:11,	436:3 436:8	institution (1) - 512.5
390.13 411.5	456:6, 473:21,	475:18, 476:11,	436.12 438.9	instruction [1] - 040.1
453:24 453:25	519:25, 540:18,	476:13, 483:13,	438:12. 438:13.	
			,	

384:11	issued [17] - 308:21,	325:2, 369:2, 369:7,	426:11, 431:12,	397:18, 397:22,
instructions [1] -	308:25, 310:17,	369:9, 369:18,	431:18, 431:22,	397:23, 406:7,
485:18	342:4, 370:8, 375:7,	490:16, 493:2	432:4, 432:25,	406:11, 417:13,
instructs (1) - 486:1	393:1, 444:15,	Judgment [37] -	435:10, 436:1,	417:15, 422:8,
intent (2) - 327.17	454:10, 454:11,	304:22, 310:18,	436:7, 438:5,	449:3, 449:4, 449:7,
503:22	457:11, 457:14,	310:20, 310:22,	440:25, 441:25,	449:17, 450:5,
intentionally (1) -	459:19, 475:22,	311:4, 315:4,	447:1, 453:14,	458:22, 462:22,
488·3	502:11, 502:13	324:11, 324:17,	453:16, 453:20,	465:21, 478:16,
interesting (3) - 369:5	issues [7] - 335:7.	325:11, 325:20,	455:7, 455:12,	481:15, 494:20
A00.10 A00.25	447:18, 468:2.	325:23, 326:17,	455:18, 456:4,	lasts [1] - 509:16
internal (1) - 452'7	496:1, 496:25.	327:13, 336:24,	456:25, 457:11,	latest [2] - 308:16,
internet [1] 402.7	497:7. 548:22	337:4, 370:3, 370:9,	457:19, 457:20,	309:15
366-8 461-25	Issues (3) - 494:10.	372:24, 489:17,	458:8, 459:8,	law [2] - 531:1, 548:14
A63.21 465.9	496:21, 496:23	490:1, 490:6, 490:8,	462:12, 463:18,	lead [11] - 323:15,
466.4 514.25	issuing (6) - 363:11.	490:18, 492:11,	463:24, 465:3,	323:21, 383:11,
536.15	383:21, 444:8.	492:18, 493:13,	465:6, 465:15,	383:12, 456:14,
interpreting (2)	468:15, 507:13,	493:21, 498:3,	465:25, 468:3,	479:1, 485:8,
	507.19	499:3, 499:6,	469:21, 469:22,	518:16, 519:6,
400.3, 400.3, 400.10	Italy 121 - 326-24	499:11, 499:18,	470:17, 472:23,	534:23
Intervals [1] - 404.20	327.7	500:8, 500:16,	473:22, 476:11,	leads [3] - 425:21,
Introduce [1] - 307.3	item [1] - 532.7	500:21, 501:24	495:10, 496:4,	518:20, 519:2
Introduced [1] -	iteolf [13] - 339.5	July [6] - 342:24,	524:7, 525:13,	leak [42] - 303:15,
413:19	374.10 303.15	398:15, 398:16,	527:20, 535:19,	303:17, 338:10,
Introducing [1] -	416:18 417:4	510:12, 511:3,	536:9, 547:7	338:23, 339:12,
357:19	470.10, 417.4,	511:17	keramida [1] - 398:7	339:15, 339:20,
introduction [2] -	458.2 491.10	jump [1] - 417:22	KERAMIDA [1] - 398:8	340:17, 340:19,
357:22, 358:3	493.21 501.5	jumped [2] - 417:17,	Keramida's [13] -	343:10, 345:17,
Inventories [1] -	544.14 554.3	418:2	307:24, 395:7,	404:17, 420:19,
427:10	044.14, 001.0	iumps [1] - 345:16	396:16, 398:11,	421:4, 421:14,
Inventory [4] - 426:20,		June (12) - 342:2.	432:14, 452:7,	446:14, 446:21,
426:22, 427:1,	5	342:3, 342:15,	452:23, 456:16,	448:21, 450:21,
427:18	January [34] - 309:24,	342:24, 344:14,	458:13, 462:21,	451:23, 463:2,
investigation [1] -	310:1, 310:15,	363:19, 363:21,	467:19, 469:1, 536:4	465:15, 468:8,
386:15	343:22, 343:25,	375:7, 392:19,	kicking [1] - 326:6	469:7, 469:13,
involve [1] - 431:4	344:7, 344:13,	510:2. 511:11.	knocks [1] - 464:24	469:17, 471:7,
involved [5] - 294:22,	369:13, 374:24,	538:18	knowing [1] - 472:22	496:24, 503:5,
295:22, 391:15,	375:21, 407:16,		knowledge [8] -	503:23, 504:11,
412:12, 441:15	407:17, 483:7,	K	307:19, 311:3,	504:18, 506:8,
IP [1] - 412:8	483:12, 483:14,		356:25, 386:7,	506:17, 508:9,
iPad [1] - 432:5	506:13, 508:25,	Keramida [91] -	532:18, 535:19,	509:6, 512:7,
irrespective [2] -	509:5, 509:7,	290:17, 290:18,	542:8, 553:20	515:14, 515:21,
361:10, 362:16	509:13, 509:23,	290:20, 290:21,	known [1] - 454:11	516:19, 545:19,
issuance [11] - 332:1,	510:1, 510:3,	290:23, 290:24,	knows [2] - 423:3,	554:25
337:21, 341:7,	510:16, 510:19,	304:19, 305:10,	440:12	leaked [1] - 527:10
341:25, 346:20,	510:20, 511:7,	305:15, 305:19,		leaking [14] - 303:13,
346:21, 363:24,	511:10, 517:20,	305:22, 305:24,	L	318:17, 399:13,
364:20, 365:19,	538:17	307:11, 307:12,		400:14, 406:5,
365:23, 375:4	jason [2] - 291:8,	307:13, 307:18,	label [1] - 470:13	407:1, 407:19,
Issue [2] - 495:19,	406:6	307:20, 308:4,	labeled [4] - 474:16,	410:4, 413:13,
496:10	Jayme [3] - 383:5,	308:5, 308:14,	483:6, 518:7, 529:3	413:14, 413:16,
issue [20] - 297:5,	383:13, 548:11	316:5, 317:13,	labeling [1] - 377:11	414:24, 461:7,
331:16, 333:5,	jim [1] - 300:19	317:14, 317:19,	lack [1] - 394:16	464:21
334:21, 342:4,	Jim [2] - 300:20,	317:22, 318:3,	large [3] - 327:6,	leaks [147] - 303:9,
350:9, 358:15,	300:23	319:23, 333:5,	329:16, 421:4	304:1, 320:9,
363:9, 363:10,	job [1] - 292:9	333:24, 334:20,	larger [1] - 326:22	320:13, 320:14,
373:13, 382:24,	Jonelle [5] - 385:20,	376:25, 395:15,	last [30] - 297:20,	320:20, 320:21,
383:7, 383:13,	392:19, 393:23,	396:4, 396:5,	313:21, 333:11,	321:8, 321:10,
384:4, 393:13,	393:24, 394:2	398:22, 399:14,	333:17, 333:19,	321:11, 321:12,
394:21, 419:7,	judgment [12] - 311:1,	405:19, 406:20,	333:21, 335:23,	321:23, 322:2,
431:10, 519:23,	315:1, 324:15,	408:20, 409:16,	336:17, 336:23,	322:5, 322:7,
527:17	324:21, 324:25,	419:4, 419:19,	342:14, 366:10,	

322.19 322.20	544.16.548:4.548:5	542:16, 543:4, 544:9	maintenance [7] -	449:1, 449:11,
322.21 323.3	leave (3) - 396:23	lines (11 - 515:16	295:10, 382:25,	449:13, 449:14,
323:14 323:18	546.25 551.17	liquid (1) - 328:18	383:4. 384:2. 384:5.	449:21, 450:17,
323.20 323.23	led (2) - 456:23	list /11 - 436:4	546:19, 548:19	450:19, 451:9,
327:23 330:18	494.22	listed (24) - 318:5	maior (10) - 330:14.	451:12, 451:22,
330:19 330:20	loft (101 - 374.16	342:3 347:13	359:18, 359:20,	453:1, 453:4,
331.22 333.10	378.5 300.21	357.9 360.8	360:11, 462:24,	455:19, 455:24,
333-18 334-17	403:16 410:24	360.23 369.6	490:17, 492:12,	463:15, 464:14,
334.18 338.3	403.10, 410.24,	371:15 374:16	492:17, 492:25,	464:16, 464:18,
339:18 340:10	416:5 445:5 529:18	376.1 458.6	493:1	465:23, 469:8,
340:13 340:15	loft band 11 403:16	461:11 461:23	majority [4] - 300:12.	469:9, 471:10,
340.10, 340.22	longth (5) 200:2	462:7 467:4	343:23, 496:6.	471:13, 471:14,
340:23 340:25	200.6 402.21	467.14 467.22	501:13	475:14, 475:23,
342.7 342.17	554:14	472.4 480.8 497.2	malfunctions [1] -	477:5, 478:7,
342.21 343.3	1004.14 Ionionov (4) 448:16	497.3 498.7 535.10	521:10	478:22, 479:4,
343:15 343:19	lenienty [1] - 440.10	liste 111 - 347.17	management [1] -	479:9, 479:17,
344.17 344.18	letter(1) - 324.3	load (1) - 420:17	292:23	479:25, 480:12,
344.23 344.25	letter [1] - 304.21	locate (1) - 355:17	manager (6) - 292:2.	480:16, 481:6,
345.2 345.3 345.7	10V01 [4] - 303.4,	locate [1] = 000.17	301.2 307:1 307:8	481:16, 481:21,
345.8 345.9	425:10, 505:14,	116·6	383:6, 394:11	481:23, 482:2,
345.10 345.11	540:3	410.0	manager's [1] -	482:6, 482:15,
345:16 400:4	levels [1] - 300:0	A66:25	383.20	482:24, 487:7,
400.9 400.18	lid [3] - 413:15,	400.20	manner (5) - 315.7	487:15, 487:19,
400.20 400.22	413:17, 413:18	locations [1] - 421.5	318.1 329.6	487:23, 488:9,
401:4 401:11	lids [23] - 303:14,	long-duration [1] -	320.22 385.6	488:13, 488:16,
402.2 402.4 402.8	304:1, 314:14,	299:11	manual (1691 - 316:15	488:17, 488:20,
402:22 403:3	316:2, 332:20,	IOW [5] - 330.2, 330.3,	316.18 316.24	489:6, 489:8,
403.22 404.8	413:1, 413:4, 413:6,	359:19, 359.20,	317:3 317:7	489:13, 523:14,
404.9 404.11	413:7, 413:9,	300:12	317.13 317.16	524:18, 524:23,
405:23 407:7	413:10, 413:13,	IOWEF[10] - 309.14,	317.22 318.2	525:1, 525:2,
407:12, 407:18.	413:14, 414:7,	401.20, 494.22,	318.5. 318.8. 318.9.	525:21, 526:1,
407:20, 407:21.	414:20, 414:24,	490.4, 490.7,	318:15, 324:1.	526:14, 530:18,
407:23, 408:1.	414.20, 410.2,	505.5 534.23	333:15, 333:16.	531:5, 531:6, 531:8,
409:3, 409:5.	420.10, 420.24,	505.5, 554.25	333:20, 334:4.	531:12, 531:16,
409:19, 410:1,	479.22, 400.10,	Tunch [1] - 400.4	334:8, 334:12,	532:24, 533:16,
414:1, 414:23,	029.17 Biologia 264:19	M	334:15, 334:23,	533:21, 534:3,
419:5, 419:16,	light[1] - 304.10	IVI	335:9, 335:16,	534:7, 534:14,
419:17, 419:21,	NKEIY [6] - 323.21,	machine [1] - 450:8	335:19, 335:22,	534:19, 535:1,
419:22, 419:25,	400.10, 404.17,	mail [25] - 290:15,	335:24, 336:2,	535:2, 535:4, 535:8,
420:3, 421:2,	420.20, 422.7, 401.0	365:6, 365:15,	435:5, 435:6, 436:8,	535:11, 535:15,
421:18, 421:20,	257.21 262.0	367:12, 367:23,	436:12, 436:16,	536:14, 536:18,
428:10, 436:4,	392.25 527.10	367:24, 367:25,	436:20, 436:25,	536:25, 548:7,
436:5, 436:23,	limitation (2) - 319:20	385:15, 385:18,	437:5, 437:10,	548:9, 548:11,
437:16, 445:20,	310.21 542.19	385:19, 392:11,	437:14, 437:22,	548:18, 548:24,
448:5, 449:18,	limitatione (2) -	392:17, 392:18,	438:18, 438:21,	549:9, 549:12
449:21, 450:23,	211.10 217.21	393:22, 394:11,	438:25, 439:2,	manual's [2] - 319:16,
454:2, 464:24,	218.1	394:18, 454:9,	439:5, 439:9,	435:7
465:21, 465:23,	10.1 limited (0) 225:4	455:7, 455:9,	439:10, 439:13,	manually [1] - 296:14
465:24, 470:21,	E52:11	455:12, 457:6,	439:16, 439:19,	manufactured [1] -
471:8, 471:18,	002.11 limite (4) 216:4	457:7, 459:9,	439:22, 440:4,	425:13
471:19, 472:17,	1 HIMLS [11] - 310.4,	463:24, 467:19	440:21, 442:2,	manufacturers [1] -
476:18, 476:24,	A20:6 A20:15	mailed [1] - 432:9	442:5, 442:6, 442:7,	424:9
477:7, 479:1,	420.0, 430.10,	mails [3] - 394:17,	442:12, 442:19,	March [20] - 309:14,
491:19, 504:21,	430.10, 431.0,	399:3, 457:11	442:21, 443:4,	365:21, 369:14,
509:11, 509:18,	522.24 523.2	main [2] - 414:8,	443:7, 445:2,	374:24, 408:21,
513:20, 514:12,	line (12) 252-10	489:25	445:10, 445:11,	410:4, 461:20,
E16-2 E16-12		maintain (2) - 3/3.9	446.13 447.9	463:5, 464:21,
510.5, 510.12,	355-6 368-22	mannan [5] - 040.0,	440.10, 447.0,	
521:11, 534:8,	355:6, 368:23, 485:8, 516:2, 522:3	385:4, 546:21	447:11, 447:14,	465:13, 466:20,
521:11, 534:8, 534:9, 534:13,	355:6, 368:23, 485:8, 516:2, 532:3, 540:14, 540:20	385:4, 546:21 maintained [1] -	447:11, 447:14, 448:9, 448:11,	465:13, 466:20, 466:22, 466:23,
516.3, 516.12, 521:11, 534:8, 534:9, 534:13, 534:22, 534:23,	355:6, 368:23, 485:8, 516:2, 532:3, 540:14, 540:20, 541:13, 542:14	385:4, 546:21 maintained [1] - 384:23	447:11, 447:14, 448:9, 448:11, 448:15, 448:22,	465:13, 466:20, 466:22, 466:23, 466:24, 466:25,
516.3, 510.12, 521:11, 534:8, 534:9, 534:13, 534:22, 534:23, 535:10, 535:17,	355:6, 368:23, 485:8, 516:2, 532:3, 540:14, 540:20, 541:13, 542:14,	385:4, 546:21 maintained [1] - 384:23	447:11, 447:14, 448:9, 448:11, 448:15, 448:22,	465:13, 466:20, 466:22, 466:23, 466:24, 466:25,

(__)

467:2, 489:21,	296:19, 299:8,	methods [2] - 435:5,	453:21, 454:4,	411:8, 419:4,
508:8, 510:1, 511:11	314:8, 314:17,	436:13	454:6, 454:13,	432:10, 456:12,
mark (3) - 291:10.	314:20, 315:6,	metric [7] - 304:4,	456:16, 456:25,	456:13, 524:7
408:22, 427:13	320:4, 327:8,	344:19, 346:13,	457:6, 457:8,	months [46] - 310:7,
marked [1] - 407:8	336:21, 384:6,	499:19, 500:25,	457:12, 462:12,	322:6, 337:16,
market (1) - 424:23	393:4, 399:1,	519:13, 544:21	467:24, 468:23,	337:19, 341:24,
marking (1) - 351:10	404:14, 414:4,	metrics [2] - 346:16,	468:25, 473:24,	342:25, 343:5,
match [1] - 378:6	423:19, 434:4,	346:17	549:20	344:3, 353:24,
matches (2) - 361-21	451:25, 537:8,	mid [2] - 309:15, 310:1	mix [1] - 339:9	354:17, 363:25,
473.1	539:22, 547:7,	mid-April [1] - 309:15	model [8] - 301:10,	370:23, 374:18,
material (1) - 425:5	551:1, 551:20,	middle [4] - 333:8,	301:11, 301:13,	376:1, 398:11,
math [1] - 473:1	554:24	333:23, 455:23,	301:14, 301:21,	398:15, 419:12,
matter (12) - 204-18	mentions [1] - 537:9	496:14	302:13, 302:19	419:15, 507:25,
328.0 328.10	merely [2] - 391:2,	midniaht (3) - 395:24,	models [1] - 302:23	508:4, 508:21,
320.24 330.9	391:14	396:6. 396:11	moderate [4] - 359:18,	509:16, 509:19,
347.5 355.16	Merriam [1] - 527:5	might (6) - 297:6.	359:20, 360:12,	509:24, 509:25,
503:10 503:16	Merriam-Webster [1] -	376:5, 398:14.	462:25	510:5, 510:10,
540.11 553.8	527:5	438:7, 447:21, 516:6	modification [1] -	510:17, 510:21,
553:12	Method (68) - 303:7.	Mike [5] - 392:18.	457:3	511:8, 511:21,
may 111 - 528.7	303:8, 303:9.	393:23, 393:24.	modified [1] - 444:5	512:3, 512:15,
max[1] - 020.7	304:19, 305:11.	393:25, 394.1	moment [1] - 451:25	512:25, 538:15,
110X111011 [13] - 321.7,	305:14, 316:10,	million (1) - 460'4	Mon [1] - 394:1	538:20, 539:8,
301.3, 302.2,	318:18, 319:23.	minimize [1] - 343'15	Monday [1] - 366:15	539:11, 544:25,
362.11, 302.13,	331:13, 331:14.	minimizing (1) - 385.7	monetary [2] - 530:6.	545:3, 545:8,
302.19, 309.9,	332.6. 334:12.	minimum (2) - 319:17	550:7	545:13, 545:15,
509.12, 509.15, 505.14 529.1	342.7 347:20	A45.23	money [1] - 549:2	545:20, 546:4
505.14, 526.1,	347:22, 348:1.	minue (40) - 333:16	monitor (2) - 348:10.	morning [7] - 297:1,
526.5, 529.20	348:3, 353:13.	225.11 235.13	348.22	297:7, 308:16,
1110XIIIIUIII/IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	353:23, 353:25,	335:16 335:22	monitoring (1) - 385:5	341:18, 350:20,
[1] - 300.10	354:20, 355:7.	348.14 412.21	Monitors (1) - 314:16	386:13, 386:16
may[1] - 342.13	355:14, 355:22,	456.3 462.1	monitors (2) - 348:7.	mornings [1] - 387:8
MBA [1] - 293.10	413:11, 425:19,	462.23 464.17	356.12	mostly [1] - 328:19
WCWaster [1] - 294.10	426:11, 431:12,	465.1 465.23	month (44) - 306-22	moved [2] - 462:6,
means [2] - 352.19,	432:1, 434:2, 434:4,	477.7 478.5 534.8	309.18 310.3	465:3
395:21	434:8, 434:9,	534.9 535.16	312.23 312.24	movement [3] -
meant [1] - 526:25	434:11, 434:12,	Minus (11 - 447:23	322:15 323:19	319:14, 329:10,
measurable [4] -	434:15, 434:17,	minute (2) - 373-14	332.13, 337:12,	485:23
490:23, 491:5,	434:18, 434:19,	484.19	337:23, 342:20,	moves [1] - 465:24
491:14, 492:2	434:24, 435:1,	minutos (4) - 297.21	344:13, 345:1.	moving [3] - 381:9,
measure [2] - 340:13,	435:8, 435:10,	356.8 484.16	345:11, 363:23.	381:20
420.9	438:6, 438:13,	484.17	363:25, 395:22.	multiple [3] - 297:4,
measured [1] - 420.5	440:25, 441:6,	misreading [1] -	396:22, 398:24,	410:24, 437:15
mechanic [1] - 549.0	441:8, 441:11,	355.19	399:6, 404:3, 408:8,	multiplying [1] - 348:8
11991 [13] - 319:11,	444:4, 444:9,	missed (7) - 332-24	419:7, 432:12,	must [1] - 346:14
330:11, 330:13,	444:12, 444:13,	333:1, 333:3	506:18, 506:22,	
348:12, 398:25,	444:14, 444:19,	372:18, 452:14	507:4, 507:5, 511:1,	N
438:11, 499:22,	444:23, 484:3,	452.21, 459.6	511:15, 514:12,	nomo (0) 001-24
001:10, 002:9,	484:6, 484:7, 484:8,	missing (2) - 376-5	516:12, 521:11,	112me [2] - 291:24
033:0, 038:24,	484:12, 485:1,	397.19	524:11, 538:17,	320.7
04/118 	530:12, 530:16,	mistake (13) - 451-25	539:4, 540:6,	names [1] - 295:2
meeting [13] - 333:13,	531:23, 554:13	452.5 452.7 452.8	545:22, 545:23,	
335:1, 335:2, 335:5,	method [12] - 303:11,	452.23 462.14	545:24, 547:11,	339.2, 504.23, E05:10
335:0, 335:8,	303:15, 353:8,	463.19 465.3	547:16, 547:21	505:10
335:10, 335:12,	386:24, 420:17,	465:6 465:15	monthly [20] - 307:17.	nature [3] - 294:17,
449:17, 536:16,	434:9, 435:7, 436:8,	472.18 473.18	322:8, 322:11.	393:10, 394:7
539:12, 549:9	438:12, 438:14,	478.4	323:20, 332:7.	nearly [1] - 316:14
member [1] - 496:18	441:16, 554:10	mietakon (4) 465-6	338:2, 338:3, 342:8.	negotiated [1] -
memories [1] - 385:16	methodology [4] -	mietakos (01 453-9	395:7, 396:20.	489:20
mention [3] - 542:22,	353:8, 521:15,	A53-0 A53-12	398:22, 398:23,	NESHAP [17] - 331:10,
542:23, 542:25	522:5, 523:9	453-12 453-16	399:8, 399:19,	428:13, 428:18,
mentioned [23] -		400.10, 400.10,	And Annual and a start proper starts a	429:1, 429:9,
	1	a second s	and the second sec	

-				
429.19 429.23	note (6) - 364:16.	471:20, 472:16,	306:1, 313:19,	403:2, 405:20,
430:15 430:22	374.3 392.1 469.4	492:22, 512:20,	319:9, 326:14,	406:2, 476:1, 476:7,
431.3 431.8	538-23	514.11 527:21	331:16. 386:17.	476:11, 476:21
431:15 431:17	noted (s) - 326:1	528:4 528:8 529:5	399:17, 399:23.	476:25, 510:13,
431.13, 431.17,	240:1 242:14	547.2 548.5	400.2 415.19	511:17, 523:18.
441.2, 441.9,	340.1, 342.14,	540.24 554.22	443:25 484:20	523 20 524 11
441:10, 539:19	364:13, 410:14,	549.24, 554.22	443.23, 404.20,	524.13 524.24
NESHAPS [1] - 316:4	527:17	Number [9] - 340.2,	404.24, 400.2, 554.01	526.4 526.12
net[1] - 302:14	notes [1] - 412:6	358:5, 362:24,	004.21	920.4, 920.12
network [2] - 394:14,	nothing [4] - 417:2,	384:15, 392:16,		oda (1) - 400.0
394:18	418:16, 521:13,	395:21, 529:5,	445:22	000F [13] - 297.5,
newer [6] - 298:22,	550:10	532:5, 540:7	observe [5] - 386:25,	385:20, 385:24,
440:14, 440:15,	Notice [1] - 393:6	numbering [1] -	387:3, 446:2, 447:6,	386:2, 386:14,
440:16, 450:14,	notice [1] - 387:20	388:22	448:12	386:19, 386:20,
481:25	noticeable [1] -	numbers [29] - 313:9,	observed [21] -	386:22, 386:25,
newest [3] - 379:14,	326:11	322:17, 323:4,	311:18, 320:9,	387:5, 387:6, 387:7
379:15, 522:13	noticed [5] - 313:18,	323:18, 346:6,	320:13, 350:4,	odors [1] - 386:12
nilly [1] - 488:14	313:23, 326:9,	346:11, 346:24,	351:19, 386:12,	OF [1] - 291:1
no-more-than [1] -	326:13, 538:13	348:19, 349:25,	387:3, 393:1,	off-shift [2] - 297:2,
395:13	Notices (1) - 394.6	356:4, 357:4, 361:1,	399:19, 400:5,	297:16
non-1 (11 - 332:20	notwithstanding (1) -	365:11, 370:17,	445:18, 446:24,	Offered [1] - 290:2
non-attainment //1.	534·11	371:9, 376:12,	447:3, 465:21,	offering [1] - 358:13
504:1	November 1491	378:14, 379:16	471:21, 472:16,	officially [1] - 520:18
504.1	244:10 402:5	379:18, 389:9,	476:24, 477:2,	offsite [1] - 386:17
HOH-COKE [1] - 369.19	344.10, 403.5,	420:11, 420:13,	481:17	offtake (9) - 332:20.
non-compliance [2] -	400.0, 400.10,	420:23, 473:2.	observer [2] - 446:2,	413.20 413.21
473:10, 547:20	409:17, 470.2,	495:7, 496:10.	446:6	413.22 413.23
non-compliant [12] -	470:22, 471:0,	496.16 512.13	observers [1] - 486:1	414.23 429.16
461:24, 463:14,	471:21, 474:19,	numerator (2) - 449:8.	observing [4] - 352:2.	480:18 480:20
463:21, 464:2,	4/5:3, 4/5:16,	472.23	448.14 483.18	offtakes (17) - 303:14
464:22, 468:9,	511:18	numerically (1) -	486.9	304.2 314.14
477:23, 485:8,	number [78] - 309:8,	380.15	obstructed (5) -	316:3 407:4
486:17, 487:1,	313:21, 315:6,	303.13	447.20 447.24	400:22 400:24
492:22	320:8, 320:13,	0	447:25 450:4 450:7	413-4 413-5 413-8
non-inspection [1] -	320:16, 321:23,	0	obstructing [1] -	410.4, 410.0, 410.0,
314:15	322:1, 322:5, 322:7,	oath [3] - 467:22,	222-12	413.10, 414.9,
non-observed [1] -	322:18, 322:19,	502:18, 515:8	333.12	414.10, 414.21,
471:21	322:20, 322:21,	object [5] - 338:12,		415.1,429.1,429.0
non-operating [1] -	326:16, 332:7,	339:23, 542:1,	ODVIOUS [2] - 318:13,	010[7] - 366.7, 366.15,
450:3	332:8, 340:21,	552:12, 553:14	416:18	388:16, 390:10,
non-quality [1] - 308:6	341:11, 342:11,	objection (31) -	obviously [3] -	391:5, 391:10,
non-stipulated [5] -	342:17, 345:20,	302:22, 338:19.	354:14, 418:13,	451:20
314:4, 314:5,	348:8, 348:10,	339.21 339.24	453:1	older [3] - 298:17,
336:22, 368:16	348:11, 348:17,	340.1 345.21	occasion [1] - 344:11	450:13, 481:24
369:3	349:2, 349:5,	345.23 358.17	occasionally [1] -	oldest [1] - 401:24
non-violations [1] -	350:12, 357:24,	367.9 367.25	435:18	one-week [1] - 423:13
462:3	359:10, 360:15,	373.2 377.7 377.8	occasions [1] - 301:8	onerous [1] - 536:1
non-visible (11 -	361:5, 368:14,	270.21 370.23	occupation [1] - 292:1	Ongoing [5] - 494:10,
304:12	368:20, 368:22,	282.7 282.0 388.2	occur [3] - 345:3,	495:19, 496:9,
noncompliance [1] -	368:25, 369:12,	382.7, 382.9, 380.2,	395:11, 414:9	496:21, 496:23
302:11	369:22, 371:19,	404:22 404:24	occurred [11] - 297:2,	ongoing [3] - 495:25,
502.11 nono (c) 230:7	374:19, 388:25,	404.22, 404.24,	311:19, 371:22,	496:24, 497:6
	389:2, 390:15,	408:13, 408.16,	438:2, 452:18,	online [1] - 527:5
441.3, 497.0,	393:19, 403:20,	409:9, 409:10,	453:8, 520:3, 520:5,	onward [1] - 352:12
505:16, 550.17,	408:7, 408:14,	410:7, 410:8,	520:8. 536:19.	opacity (52) - 303:15.
535:11	413:13, 413:14,	418:18, 418:19	536:22	303:19, 303:25,
	421:12, 425:24.	obligation [1] - 538:24	occurring [3] - 297:9.	304:1, 304:2, 304:3.
551:15	431.21 433.5	observance [1] -	297.25 485.11	304.4 314.13
normal [3] - 305:5,	436.4.436.5	434:10	occurs (2) - 352-21	332.20. 348.7
330:8, 432:24	447.23 449.24	observation [4] -	414.5	348.9 348.22
notable [1] - 343:17	456.24 465.20	324:4, 353:9, 418:9,	October (201 - 345:15	352.7 353.4
notate [1] - 532:14	470.21 471.17	486:25	402·15 403·1	355:11 356:2
notations [1] - 373:15		observations [15] -	TUL. 10, TUU. 1,	000.11,000.2,

	1		1	
356-3 356-12	533:23 536:17	295:15, 298:25,	446:4, 449:3,	324:15, 324:20,
356.20 356.22	opposing (2) - 341.17	302:25, 303:5.	497:17, 497:19,	325:9, 325:13,
256:22 256:24	538-16	303:21 304:25	497:22, 498:5.	326:5, 327:13,
350.25, 350.24,	opted (1) 524:12	312:11 312:12	537.8 537.11	336:22, 370:5,
350.25, 357.7,	opted [1] - 534.13	315:13 333:11	paragraphe [1] -	372.16 390.24
357:10, 357:11,	or [2] - 346:3, 371:5	315.13, 355.11,		303.1 468.15
358:14, 360:22,	Oracle [1] - 296:7	361:10, 361:14,	445:10	400:12 400:15
392:3, 412:1, 416:7,	orders [7] - 314:5,	384:7, 384:18,	PARKER [4] - 367:21,	490:12, 490:15,
417:7, 417:8,	371:1, 372:18,	388:13, 389:18,	397:13, 531:14,	493:15, 495:16,
418:14, 429:16,	394:5, 501:5, 502:2,	389:19, 391:15,	537:14	497:14, 500:21,
441:14, 441:19,	549:16	391:23, 392:8,	part [32] - 292:5,	534:24, 550:13
441:22, 460:15,	organic [3] - 295:21,	393:11, 404:3,	295:12, 303:6,	penalty [129] - 298:3,
484:6, 484:7, 484:8,	338:8. 338:14	414:12, 424:10,	314:12, 314:25,	298:16, 298:18,
485:3, 485:10,	organizations [1] -	438:23, 450:3,	325:22, 356:10,	300:24, 301:3,
485:13, 485:19,	205-1	477:2, 491:19,	358:6, 364:17,	302:20, 303:2,
490:25, 492:4, 497:2	original (4) 454:5	517:10, 518:2,	372:13, 374:14,	303:3, 304:15,
Onacity (1) - 314:15		541:17	382:19, 382:21.	309:6, 309:23,
oparity (1) - 014.10	originally [1] - 459.6	overall (2) - 492-19	384:13 392:7	310:14, 310:17,
Opaque [1] - 556.14	originating [1] -	500:19	395.7 415.10	311:11, 311:14.
open [10] - 331.1,	387:12	overeset 101 - 355:16	435-1 438-1	311.20, 311:22,
361:13, 391:19,	origination [1] -	0vercast [2] - 355.10,	453.1, 450.1,	311.24 311.25
414:9, 414:11,	386:18	355:23	455.25, 457.25,	312-3 313-14
424:1, 424:2,	otherwise [1] - 541:14	overlap [1] - 325:12	498:15, 500:11,	312.3, 313.14,
503:12, 551:17,	outage [1] - 438:10	overlooked [2] -	521:23, 522:12,	314.0, 314.10,
553:6	output [1] - 301:24	452:15, 452:17	540:9, 543:7,	332:16, 356:25,
opening [2] - 304:10,	outside (6) - 355:18.	overnight [5] - 296:20,	543:14, 543:18,	359:2, 359:3, 359:8,
551:22	413.21 414.1	386:13, 386:16,	546:12, 546:18,	359:22, 359:25,
openings [3] - 329:2.	424:6 553:10	387:6, 387:8	546:19	360:3, 360:7,
329:3. 331:2	552:24	overrides [3] - 439:2,	Part [2] - 385:8, 445:7	360:12, 360:13,
operate 171 - 295:12	555.24 	442:5, 488:15	participation [1] -	360:16, 360:23,
334.14 384.8	outsides [2] - 329:13,	overrule (2) - 338:18.	337:10	361:2, 361:3, 361:8,
394:12 385:4	331:1	340.4	particulate (8) - 328:9.	361:16, 361:20,
422:20 401:22	outstanding [1] -	overview (1) - 360:4	328:10, 329:24.	361:21, 362:1,
422.20, 491.22	488:23		330.9 503.10	362:2, 362:13,
operated [4] - 299:22,	oven [53] - 293:25,		503:16 553:8	362:19, 363:12,
300:23, 384:23,	295:11, 304:19,	331:3	552:12	364:15, 365:7.
491:2	305:2, 305:12,	oxide [1] - 327:18	000.12	365:19 365:23
operating [5] - 422:15,	316:23, 325:24,	oxides [1] - 327:22	parties [1] - 440.2	366.2 366.3
450:2, 450:3, 477:1,	326:22, 333:11,		раптя [2] - 369:14	366:17 369:15
491:16	333:17, 333:19,	P	party [1] - 440:12	370.8 370.15
operation [14] -	333:21, 335:23,	m m m 206:24	pass [4] - 548:15,	370.0, 370.13,
293:25, 295:10,	339:5, 339:10.	p.m [9] - 290.24,	548:21, 549:4, 549:6	370.10, 371.2,
330:5, 343:12,	339.11 339.15	297:1, 308:15,	passes [1] - 545:25	371.7, 371.9,
343:14, 383:4,	339.19 340.11	405:12, 405:13,	past [17] - 301:6,	371:13, 371:15,
384:2, 384:5.	340:24 340:25	474:8, 474:9, 521:3,	313:16, 322:8,	372:13, 388:13,
415:11, 415:16,	251:16 274.8	521:4	332:9, 343:4, 343:6,	389:10, 389:13,
502:17 539:16	331.10, 374.0,	PA [3] - 296:13,	354:8, 383:2,	389:17, 389:23,
543:24 544:3	3/4.15, 3/5.22,	335:25, 336:1	502:16. 507:4.	390:2, 390:5,
operational (2) -	384:22, 404:15,	Packet [1] - 290:9	507:7. 516:13.	390:23, 408:2,
101-25 546-16	404:16, 410:23,	packet [1] - 368:4	527:13 538:22	419:13, 422:4,
491.25, 540.10	413:19, 413:22,	pages [11] - 290:9,	547:4 548:7 549:16	422:6, 431:10,
operationally (2) -	414:1, 414:6,	299:14, 367:11.	Dacto (1) - 412:6	441:6, 441:12,
547:14, 547:20	416:11, 418:1,	374:1.374:3.	paste [1] - 413.0	441:21, 459:19,
operations [5] - 330:9,	421:2, 424:18,	389:24 390:2	pay [5] - 302:17,	461:15, 462:6,
382:25, 383:14,	425:20, 430:12,	300.5 398.4	302:21, 305:19,	463:9.463:17.
423:1, 491:24	443:14, 444:3,	410.24 524.2	382:19, 547:22	480:5, 489:14.
opinion [5] - 464:8,	449:7, 456:2,	naid (1) 461-15	payday [1] - 306:9	498:11. 500:8
464:11, 464:19,	462:22, 465:21,	yaiu [2] - 401.10,	pays [2] - 305:22	500.15 500.23
515:18, 515:20	504:23, 505:4,	403.9	penalized [3] - 325:18,	500.24 501.4
opportunity [3] -	531:18, 532:25.	paper [1] - 433:19	368:21, 501:25	501.5 501.7 501.9
404:12, 527:4.	540:3, 541:21.	papers [1] - 540:8	penalizing [1] - 467:1	501.0, 501.7, 501.0,
551:16	542:11	paradigm [1] - 334:15	penalties [25] -	514:20 514:25
opposed (5) - 318:23.	ovens (35) - 294:3.	paragraph [10] -	308:22, 308:25,	514.20, 514.20, 516.4 516.7 517.4
334:16, 412:11	294.12 294.20	366:10, 386:9,	314:4, 314:5, 315:3.	510.4, 510.7, 517.4,
				517.7, 517.13,

518:1. 518:6. 519:12, 519:21, 520:6, 520:9, 520:13, 527:25, 528:1, 528:6, 528:14, 529:9, 529:11, 530:4, 530:10, 534:21, 550:3, 550:7, 550:17, 550:18, 550:21.550:24 Penalty [1] - 290:8 Pennsylvania [5] -296:11, 335:10, 335:20, 335:22, 548:16 people [6] - 294:20, 295:16, 296:8, 423:3, 423:4, 527:2 per [34] - 304:22, 333:9. 334:3. 334:4. 336:22, 336:23, 347:22, 361:4, 361:5, 361:6, 362:9, 362:10, 370:15, 370:20, 370:21, 370:22, 376:21, 379:2, 380:6, 407:23, 407:25, 453:3. 455:22. 456:3, 463:15, 464:22, 469:7, 521:11, 528:3, 529:13, 540:1 percent [71] - 303:13, 320:8, 320:12, 349:19, 349:20, 352:8, 356:8, 356:9, 356:15, 356:22, 356:23, 356:24, 356:25, 357:8, 357:12, 357:13, 371:12, 371:18, 371:19. 378:7. 378:11, 378:13, 379:19, 395:12, 395:22, 412:6, 412:7, 412:8, 412:10, 412:11, 413:13, 413:15, 417:8, 417:9, 423:3, 423:4, 423:24, 431:7, 449:22, 450:10, 451:11, 451:13, 451:15, 451:17, 464:21, 469:21, 476:5, 477:8, 477:9, 477:12.478:25. 479:12, 479:15,

479:23. 480:9. 493:7, 493:11, 493:17, 496:15, 496:16, 501:11, 502:19, 502:25, 518:15, 519:1, 519:9, 519:17, 519:20, 530:8. 535:11 percentage [29] -330:3, 347:3, 347:4, 348:4, 348:5, 348:16, 348:18, 348:23, 349:8, 349:17, 349:18, 374:20, 378:11, 381:14, 381:21, 381:23, 382:2, 461:7, 468:14, 468:18, 493:4, 493:9, 498:19, 503:1, 547:1, 547:18, 550:10, 550:11, 551:8 percentages [10] -322:9, 371:4, 375:25, 378:4, 378:9, 381:11, 381:17, 495:5, 496:3, 496:5 Peresie [4] - 290:6, 300:17, 300:18, 351:13 performance [11] -295:16, 313:17, 326:19. 326:20. 490:24, 491:6, 492:3, 492:19, 501:1, 545:14, 550:12 performed [2] -396:19, 475:5 performing [9] -347:2, 521:15, 521:19, 522:7, 523:9, 544:22, 545:6, 545:17, 546:2 period [32] - 326:9, 326:12, 337:12, 343:7, 343:21, 343:25, 356:7, 364:2, 379:7, 419:13, 422:4, 422:7, 431:10, 441:7, 441:12, 468:1, 468:7, 480:5, 484:20, 506:22, 507:4, 507:5, 511:1, 511:15. 519:12. 520:3, 522:8, 539:3,

539:5, 545:4, 545:8, 545:25 periods [1] - 538:19 permanent [1] - 544:1 permanently [1] -544:4 permit [8] - 382:14, 382:16, 382:17, 384:14, 412:9, 412:12, 412:13, 537:6 permittee [1] - 385:4 permitting [3] - 354:5, 354:6, 354:9 person [6] - 299:3, 306:15, 394:3, 422:12, 487:14, 542:17 persons [1] - 542:12 pertain [1] - 357:21 phone [3] - 296:8, 455:13, 457:20 phonetic [2] - 292:25, 432:15 physical [1] - 319:20 physically [1] - 552:15 pick [7] - 433:6, 439:6, 439:15, 439:17, 465:10, 496:18, 501.2 picking [2] - 328:8, 401:19 picture [1] - 355:1 pictures [1] - 356:20 picturing [1] - 329:15 piece [1] - 450:5 pieces [1] - 433:19 pile [1] - 540:8 piping [2] - 480:18, 480:20 pivot [1] - 296:1 places [1] - 396:24 plan [2] - 373:9, 519:20 planning [3] - 354:5, 354:6, 354:9 plant [33] - 312:17, 312:19, 319:21, 348:7, 348:21, 358:15, 368:17, 371:14, 374:21, 376:9, 376:12, 376:15, 377:19, 382:2, 393:18, 411:1, 416:3, 422:3, 422:16, 422:20, 422:21, 422:24, 423:1, 423:6, 423:10, 423:12, 424:21, 425:17,

425:24, 426:12, 426:17, 426:24, 501:12 plant-wide [3] - 348:7, 348:21, 411:1 plants [4] - 327:4, 423:17, 425:20, 552:14 plastic [3] - 329:16, 424:4, 551:25 plume [7] - 352:10, 352:15, 352:19, 355:21, 356:3 plumes [2] - 352:16, 352:17 plus [3] - 348:1, 348:3, 348.19 PM [4] - 339:1, 503:20, 504:2, 506:3 PM2.5 [4] - 504:5, 505:1, 505:23, 506:1 policies [2] - 390:9, 390:24 policy [86] - 298:3, 298:5, 298:9, 298:12, 298:17, 299:1, 299:4, 299:7, 299:11, 299:12, 299:14, 299:15, 299:16, 299:17, 299:19, 300:2, 300:3. 300:24. 301:6, 301:9, 301:12, 301:18, 311:23, 311:24, 311:25, 312:3, 359:3, 359:22. 359:25, 360:4, 360:21, 360:23, 361:16, 361:20, 361:22, 361:23, 365:7, 365:10, 366:2, 366:3, 370:15, 370:18, 370:20, 370:21, 370:22, 370:24, 371:2, 371:7, 371:10, 371:13, 371:15, 371:21, 371:23, 388:14, 389:23, 389:24, 390:2, 390:5, 390:10, 390:19, 391:5, 391:6, 391:10, 436:25, 440:19, 489:3, 489:14, 517:4, 517:7, 517:13, 517:17, 517:19, 518:1, 518:7, 519:4,

519:16, 519:22, 520:3, 520:6, 520:9, 520:13 pollutant [2] - 339:6, 430:24 pollutants [14] -339:1, 339:7, 430:19, 430:21, 503:6, 503:19, 503:23, 504:4, 504:8, 504:10, 504:17, 505:2, 505:15, 542:10 pollution [4] - 292:2, 384:24, 385:5, 385:7 pop [1] - 414:7 port [2] - 413:18, 553:7 portion [17] - 348:5, 348:6, 348:16, 374:17, 376:23, 376:24, 389:4, 390:16, 416:5, 426:14, 426:15, 449:23, 501:2, 509:8. 529:16. 530:9, 533:21 portions [4] - 325:6, 412:17, 438:22, 449:22 ports [5] - 478:14, 479:4, 479:8, 479:17, 479:25 position [11] - 292:7, 292:13, 293:2, 295:13, 308:18, 419:22, 436:10, 436:19, 437:4, 437:9, 437:25 positive [8] - 345:13, 372:19, 414:16, 430:25, 472:9, 477:13, 483:22, 531:11 possibilities [1] -340:16 possibility [1] -501:15 possible [3] - 527:15, 533:3, 547:2 post [1] - 380:2 potential [10] - 291:14, 301:19, 360:14, 360:15, 389:9, 484:15, 499:21, 499:25, 500:1, 501:3 potentialities [1] -434:17 potentially [5] -323:14, 473:19,

			1	T
487:24, 505:5	430:10, 433:23,	403:6, 403:12,	292:10, 298:23,	Questions [1] - 358:1
practical (1) - 551:10	460:3, 485:22,	403:25, 405:23,	299:4, 391:16, 444:6	questions [10] -
pre-pushing (1) -	486:4. 512:7.	405:24, 407:7,	quantify [1] - 313:25	339:22, 350:14,
486·4	513:18, 530:21,	407:9, 407:12,	quantity [1] - 393:12	418:22, 418:24,
-100.4	542.25, 544:10	409:3, 409:4,	quarter (85) - 309:7.	418:25, 515:11,
	processed [1] - 544:9	409:20, 410:1,	309:13, 309:18,	515:15, 520:19,
preceding [2] -	producing (1) - 327:3	410:4.414:12.	309:22 310:3	523:12, 527:14
380:14, 380:22		419.17 419.22	310:4 310:9	quick (3) - 365:4.
predated [2] - 361:23,	product [1] - 424.23	410.25 421.20	310:13 310:15	398.10 531.17
533:18	production [3] -	475:11 485:14	313.12 332.23	quickly (3) - 356:14
predecessor [1] -	501:14, 501:15,	475.11, 405.14,	222:24 222:2	208.4 527.15
300:16	501:17	403.23	332.24, 333.2,	390.4, 327.13
prefer [1] - 339:22	project [1] - 326:4	pusn-side [3] -	330.12, 330.13,	quite [3] - 295.25,
prepare [1] - 494:14	projects [1] - 390:13	419:17, 419:22,	336:22, 336:23,	341:14, 345:20
prepared [4] - 296:1,	promulgated [2] -	419:25	337:1, 341:4,	-
427:22, 470:17,	532:21, 532:22	pusher [2] - 342:7,	346:10, 349:8,	R
549:21	promulgation [1] -	447:4	363:1, 363:5, 364:6,	raise (1) - 201-12
presentation (2) -	530:20	pusher-side [2] -	364:8, 364:9,	Fam (4) 495-23
350.6 351:13	properly [2] - 384:12,	342:7, 447:4	364:12, 364:15,	random (1) - 400.20
Presentation (1) -	384:22	pushes [1] - 315:13	364:19, 365:19,	random [1] - 421.12
200.6	proposed (71 - 532:6	pushing [47] - 303:24,	365:20, 365:24,	randomly [3] - 401:19
	532.8 532.12	304:22, 314:12,	368:17, 368:18,	496:14, 539:24
250.14	532:15 532:16	314:22, 315:12.	369:5, 369:21,	range [9] - 309:20,
300:14	532.10, 532.10,	316:1, 324:22.	370:1, 370:16,	313:9, 322:6,
presents [1] - 3/5:24	532.19, 532.22	325:5 325:16	371:11, 372:3,	322:13, 336:18,
press [1] - 369:19	protect [1] - 513:6	327.12 377.19	392:22, 392:23,	336:21, 337:2,
pretend [1] - 509:22	Protection [4] -	377.21 378.7	393:12 406:10	360:16, 408:9
pretty [7] - 349:2,	296:12, 296:13,	279.10 279.22	419:10 419:11	rare [3] - 426:11,
371:16, 379:16,	444:4, 445:6	3/0.19, 3/0.22,	451.12 451.14	426:15, 426:16
404:4, 493:11,	protective [1] - 505:16	414.0, 415.7, 415.0,	451:16 452:1	rate (6) - 330:15,
512:8, 547:12	provided [4] - 290:25,	415:10, 415:11,	451.10, 452.1,	330:16, 389:12,
prevents [1] - 319:21	347:5, 399:14, 548:7	415:14, 415:21,	452.5, 455.9,	502.24, 518:15
previous (9) - 299:15.	provides [1] - 478:13	448:5, 450:8, 486:4,	453:24, 454:3,	518:21
301.16 332:13	providing [2] - 308:10,	486:5, 490:9,	459:1, 460:13,	rathor (2) - 383-20
361.22 370.23	387:20	490:13, 491:24,	460:24, 461:5,	167.21
300.10 412.24	provisions [1] - 479:4	497:14, 497:24,	463:2, 467:11,	407.21
447.22 548.21	public (111 - 298:13	499:10, 499:13,	467:14, 480:2,	raw (8) - 339.10,
447.22, J40.21	388:24 406:18	499:15, 499:21,	480:7, 480:9,	340:24, 399:3,
previously [/] -	505:16 513:6	500:2, 500:4,	480:10, 493:3,	404:16, 432:9,
291:20, 296:25,	503.10, 515.0,	500:12, 500:15,	498:17, 514:10,	505:4, 542:11
300:2, 350:11,	513.25, 514.2,	500:17, 500:22,	514:11, 518:14,	RDC [1] - 292:25
462:20, 494:22,	517:14, 541:15,	500:24, 501:22,	518:20, 518:25,	reach [2] - 335:4,
554:1	541:24, 542:0	501:25	519:25, 520:5,	386:21
primarily [1] - 336:12	pull [2] - 454:24,	puts (2) - 387:19.	520:8, 520:12,	reached [1] - 337:23
print [1] - 411:14	553:23	433:10	521:24, 529:8,	read [33] - 303:15,
printing [1] - 394:22	purpose [5] - 305:10,	100.10	539:2, 547:13	318:16, 318:19,
privy [1] - 312:6	327:15, 366:1,	0	quarterly [15] -	319:11, 347:15,
procedure [10] -	366:20, 394:15	Q	308:22, 308:25	353:6, 356:15,
367:2, 390:21,	purposes [10] -	Q1 [3] - 369:3, 369:5,	309:6 314:3	366:10, 384:21,
393:7, 414:5,	309:22, 357:18,	371:17	325:15 325:17	385:2, 385:16.
436:25, 475:15,	358:2, 358:13,	QAQC [6] - 456:8,	368:15 368:21	412:21, 412:23.
478:13, 478:16,	377:2, 435:17,	457:18, 470:25,	360:10, 370:5	417.8 418.14
479.8 490.12	435:18, 493:4, 552:8	536 3 536 4 536 5	309.10, 370.3,	410.21 410.25
nrocedures 131 -	pursuant (3) - 451:9.	OC (1) - 476-17	370.14, 302.21,	A20.3 A41.22
AA2.15 A5A.16	500:16. 521:20	OC'd 111 - 308:6	383:22, 383:23,	420.0, 441.22, AA6-8 AA6-0 AA0-2
440.10,404.10,	nush (36) - 315-13		416:23	440.0, 440.9, 449.2
047:23	222-18 222-10	quaimcation [1] -	quarters [6] - 332:22,	4/6:22, 484:6,
1 001 1	322.10, 323.19,	541:6	336:11, 336:17,	485:2, 496:19,
proceed [1] - 291:17	000.00 000.00		490.4 400.23	524:8. 532:3. 533:7
proceed [1] - 291:17 PROCEEDINGS [1] -	399:22, 399:23,	quality [10] - 301:1,	400.4, 499.20,	
proceed [1] - 291:17 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 291:1	399:22, 399:23, 400:5, 400:18,	quality [10] - 301:1, 308:6, 308:8, 399:7,	519:22	540:14, 540:20,
proceed [1] - 291:17 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 291:1 process [18] - 295:19,	399:22, 399:23, 400:5, 400:18, 400:23, 401:1,	quality [10] - 301:1, 308:6, 308:8, 399:7, 513:9, 535:20,	400.4, 495.23, 519:22 guench [4] - 415:11,	540:14, 540:20, 541:13, 543:5
proceed [1] - 291:17 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 291:1 process [18] - 295:19, 299:22, 325:7,	399:22, 399:23, 400:5, 400:18, 400:23, 401:1, 401:11, 401:12,	quality [10] - 301:1, 308:6, 308:8, 399:7, 513:9, 535:20, 535:22, 536:6,	400.4, 499.23, 519:22 quench [4] - 415:11, 415:15, 415:18.	540:14, 540:20, 541:13, 543:5 reading [10] - 318:21,
proceed [1] - 291:17 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 291:1 process [18] - 295:19, 299:22, 325:7, 422:16, 422:18,	399:22, 399:23, 400:5, 400:18, 400:23, 401:1, 401:11, 401:12, 402:2, 402:9,	quality [10] - 301:1, 308:6, 308:8, 399:7, 513:9, 535:20, 535:22, 536:6, 536:10	400.4, 495.23, 519:22 quench [4] - 415:11, 415:15, 415:18, 425:2	540:14, 540:20, 541:13, 543:5 reading [10] - 318:21, 323:11, 366:6,

			T	1
484:7, 484:8,	redid [1] - 466:21	440:5, 440:10,	529:23	317:6, 317:8,
485:19, 533:1,	redirect [1] - 520:21	440:22, 440:23,	remind [1] - 493:18	319:12, 319:17,
542:14	REDIRECT [1] -	442:5, 442:6, 442:7,	removed [1] - 462:2	337:23, 396:21,
readings [10] - 304:22,	526:20	442:20, 442:22,	repair [1] - 325:25	396:25, 446:2,
319:24, 412:2,	reduce [2] - 361:5,	453:2, 453:4,	repairs [1] - 325:23	446:12, 486:10,
418:6, 420:9,	508:7	455:22, 464:16,	repeat [1] - 294:7	509:10, 540:21,
420:10, 484:4,	reduced [3] - 320:16,	464:20, 464:22,	repeatable [2] -	540:23, 546:13,
484:15, 533:11,	320:22, 552:11	480:7, 487:18,	512:11, 512:21	549:13
534:12	reduction [6] - 320:8,	487:21, 488:10,	repeated [1] - 516:13	requirements [13] -
reads [2] - 441:14,	320:12, 503:25,	488:15, 488:16,	repercussions [1] -	316:12, 316:13,
554:13	504:1, 504:21,	488:18, 488:21,	545:19	317:1, 354:7,
reality [5] - 324:7,	504:25	488:22, 489:7,	replace [1] - 548:24	425:19, 431:25,
340:17, 427:7,	refer [3] - 383:5,	489:9, 489:10,	replacing [1] - 549:10	438:11, 438:20,
464:1, 465:1	474:14, 487:18	525:2, 530:18,	Report [1] - 394:13	439:11, 501:16,
realized [3] - 367:16,	reference [6] - 347:13,	530:21, 531:4,	report [9] - 306:4,	501:18, 546:17
508:12, 508:18	382:1, 445:9,	533:15, 533:23,	307:17, 320:2,	requires [4] - 355:14,
reasonable [10] -	531:17, 531:21,	535:2, 535:16,	395:8, 398:23,	484:9, 532:24,
518:13, 518:19,	531:22	535:18, 536:14,	399:9, 406:20,	504:10
518:22, 518:24,	referenced [2] - 392:4,	536:17, 536:22,	456:13, 525:13	Regulting [1] - 506.10
519:8, 519:9,	531:24	535.23, 537.3,	reporter [2] - 290:25,	Residential [1] ~
519:18, 519:19,	references [3] - 440:4,	542.3, 540.14,	291:15	292.20
527:7, 527:11	440:21, 531:6	049.14, 004.10	REPORTER [4] -	resolve [1] - 330.10
reasonably [1] -	referred [1] - 299:12	202-25 216-12	294:4, 368:7,	205:0 205:10
541:14	referring [7] - 353:14,	324.3 351.16	408:15, 446:7	295.9, 295.10,
recalculated [1] -	363:17, 466:1,	429.25 430.3	Reports [2] - 393:24,	300.24 302.25
460:2	492:21, 507:14,	430.4 430.11	394:10	303.2 303.21
recalculation [1] -	509:9, 513:19	430:22, 430:23.	reports [17] - 306:18,	304:13, 305:10.
454:18	refers [5] - 391:19,	431:3, 436:21.	306:19, 306:21,	306:1, 306:18.
recent [7] - 439:9,	392:1, 439:1, 466:2,	446:21, 486:18,	306:23, 306:24,	307:11. 308:11.
439.10, 439.21,	4/2:19	488:11, 508:11,	300:25, 307:0,	311:10, 312:12,
439.23, 440.2,	reflecting [1] - 413:2	531:3, 531:7,	332.0, 342.0,	316:21, 322:3,
440.24, 443.0	reflects [1] - 4/0:15	534:11, 535:7,	394.12, 394.19,	322:22, 323:5,
reception[1] - 250.5	retractory [1] - 544.7	536:20, 551:11,	300.2 410.4	324:9, 324:14,
353-23	reg [1] - 450.5	551:12	456:12 524.7	326:13, 328:3,
recertified [1] - 354:21	207-12 357-23	regulatory [4] - 317:5,	represent (4) - 362:8.	328:25, 338:17,
recessed (4) - 351:2	381.10 383.13	317:7, 362:12, 430:2	368:19, 395:10.	341:3, 342:11,
405.12 474.8 521.3	rogardlees 11 - 347.7	reimbursed [1] -	395:18	349:7, 360:3,
rechecked [2] -	regime (1) - 312.6	305:23	representation (3) -	361:16, 364:14,
458:13. 458:15	region (1) - 387:9	reissue [1] - 550:2	371:3, 376:21, 411:4	364:19, 369:3,
recipients (1) - 393:22	regions (1) - 425:21	reiterate [1] - 548:12	representing [2] -	372:21, 382:2,
recognize (6) -	Register (2) - 532:4	related [8] - 295:13,	335:22, 449:7	382:24, 383:1,
341:19, 353:12,	532.5	296:15, 358:15,	represents [5] -	384:7, 388:11,
385:15, 395:6,	regs (3) - 316:9	428:24, 429:6,	346:13, 359:13,	388:23, 391:14,
398:20, 410:19	316:10. 471:12	445:17, 447:19,	377:25, 395:11,	390:14, 400:9,
recollection [2] -	regulate (6) - 503:7.	490:12	404:12	403.24, 413.20,
300:20, 434:6	503:22, 504:11,	relates [6] - 350:14,	request [3] - 346:25,	417.17,417.21,
reconvened [4] -	504:17, 551:6,	384:18, 392:25,	347:6, 534:16	417.23, 410.0,
351:3, 405:13,	551:13	399:23, 400:1,	requested [2] -	497.23 514.9
474:8, 521:3	regulated [8] - 438:20,	445:20 relating (4) 201:22	533:22, 546:12	522.22 527.9
record [11] - 291:2,	503:20, 503:21,	relating [1] - 301.23	requests [1] - 534:5	534:3. 534:6. 535:7.
291:6, 291:24,	531:1, 538:2, 538:5,	relevance (4) 553-15	require [4] - 324:3,	536:10, 537:8.
311:8, 351:1, 351:5,	538:7, 551:16	reliable (1) - 555.15	343:9, 507:5, 516:5	537:18, 537:24.
351:18, 405:15,	regulation [59] -	A27.15 A27.10	required [13] - 305:11,	539:20, 545:11,
419:16, 474:7, 521:6	317:3, 317:10,	+21.10, 421.10	330:11, 354:12,	545:13, 546:11,
recorded [3] - 312:15,	333:20, 333:22,	535-22 536-3	385:3, 385:8,	547:9, 548:8,
413:15, 485:4	335:25, 336:1,	remainder (1) - 360'24	447:10, 490:21,	549:15, 549:21,
recording [1] - 485:13	362:20, 436:17,	remedy (1) - 547:14	53/:2, 53/:5, 540:4,	550:13
recordings [1] - 418:5	436:22, 436:24,	remembered [1] -	043:1, 044:10	respond [6] - 296:17,
recoras [1] - 309:3	437:17, 437:19,		admiainaint [10] -	

			T	T
297:9, 297:15,	rulemaking [2] -	366:23, 382:18,	397:12, 416:25,	397:23, 400:4,
297:20, 386:1	513:17. 542:25	384:15, 430:12,	495:20	408:11, 414:25,
response (2) - 296:20.	rules (3) - 430:11.	437:20, 445:20,	sets [1] - 415:4	416:15, 417:10,
547:5	531:2, 532:6	449:5, 481:15,	seventeen [1] -	420:22, 447:20,
responsible (2) -	ruling (11 - 340:2	484:3, 494:9,	402:23	452:20, 452:21,
400.1 542.17	run 121 - 422.24	494:13, 495:20,	severe [1] - 462:18	470:16, 475:2,
restarted (4) - 543.25	527:14	496:10, 496:21,	severities (1) - 360:11	476:11, 476:13,
restanted [1] - 040.20	527.14	496:23, 497:5.	severity (18) - 359:15	476:14, 476:15,
210.4 422.10	6	518:10, 518:13.	360.11 360.12	476:21, 479:22,
310.4, 433.10	3	523:15	360:13 360:15	483:13, 484:21,
result [6] - 509.24,	saddle [1] - 424:22	Section (1) - 449.4	388:25 301:4	507:14, 526:9,
510.10, 510.10,	safe [2] - 336:10,	sections (2) - 354-4	301.14 301.24	526:11, 528:1,
511.Z, 511.9, 512.4	339:14	439.5	301:25 461:25	528:14, 540:10
resulted [3] - 300.24,	safely [2] - 533:4,	seem (1) - 514:18	462.5 462.9	sheets [17] - 307:13,
492:12, 510:6	533:9	aclosted (4) 356:5	462:11 462:23	307:15, 307:23.
results [5] - 411:5,	safety [2] - 505:17.		462.11, 402.20,	307:24, 315:11.
432:18, 433:20,	541:15	Selective [1] - 490.20	400.4	375:23, 393:20.
442:8, 500:15	sarcastic [1] - 468:16	Self [1] - 313.1	205:4 A45:22	398.22 415.3
resume [2] - 405:10,	scale (3) - 313:5	seif-directed [1] -	303.4, 445.23,	415:4 416:17
521:1	323.14 462.6	313:1	440.0, 449.5,	417.24 433.14
retract [1] - 508:15	Scan (1) - 375-14	send [6] - 366:14,	449:12, 451:9,	433.24 456.12
retroactively [1] -	acanpad (2) 207:3	385:25, 393:3,	4/8:17, 480:23,	456.10 482.12
506:20	304-12 204-18	393:5, 393:7, 394:13	481:16, 523:15	Shanango (4) - 424:25
reverse [1] - 404:6	394.13, 394.10	sending [1] - 387:24	shed [53] - 319:1,	shiftion 207:2
review [15] - 296:16,	scanning [1] - 343.16	sense [7] - 313:5,	319:3, 319:6, 320:9,	Sint [9] - 297.2,
326:8, 375:11,	scans [1] - 307:1	353:21, 438:19,	322:24, 323:9,	297.10, 297.23,
416:14, 416:21,	scenario [3] - 500:14,	448:13, 454:25,	323:10, 323:24,	308:7, 308:8,
418:8, 427:11,	507:9, 510:23	514:19, 519:6	328:25, 329:8,	308:14, 395:12,
441:24, 442:3,	schedule [1] - 501:18	sent [11] - 307:25,	330:21, 330:22,	432:10
462:8, 472:20,	schedules [1] -	365:6, 365:15,	330:23, 330:24,	snitting [1] - 298:1
486:23, 530:22,	501:14	371:2, 372:18,	331:3, 331:4,	shifts [3] - 396:10,
531:8, 538:9	Scheetz [5] - 385:20,	385:19, 385:22,	400:16, 409:6,	396:11, 396:13
reviewed (11) -	392:19, 393:23,	392:18, 394:16,	409:7, 422:12,	short [5] - 297:11,
310:22, 324:11,	393:24, 394:2	455:5, 455:12	423:19, 424:1,	297:16, 298:17,
324:12, 325:14,	School [7] - 353:13,	sentence [5] - 449:3,	424:18, 425:1,	520:17, 520:24
416:8, 416:12,	353:21, 353:22,	449:4, 478:16,	425:8, 425:14,	short-term [2] -
416:13, 442:9,	353:23, 354:2,	480:22, 481:15	435:19, 447:25,	297:11, 297:16
444:9. 513:23. 546:6	354:9, 356:21	separate [13] - 299:24,	448:1, 448:12,	shorter [1] - 403:21
reviewing (3) -	scientific [1] - 426:6	299:25, 353:17,	448:17, 449:2,	show [7] - 342:19,
313.17 314.21	scratch [1] - 380:23	360:9, 360:22,	504:21, 505:20,	346:25, 347:3,
442.10	scroll [3] - 375:15,	360:24, 388:20,	505:22, 505:25,	471:6, 507:4, 507:9,
roviews (2) - 416:16	375:16, 398:10	389:6. 389:18.	506:2, 508:6,	521:24
486.22	scrub [1] - 328:16	415:4, 458:14,	527:10, 533:3,	showed [6] - 371:13,
rovice (1) - 540-18	scrubber [4] - 328:17,	550:23	551:20, 551:22,	508:13, 508:23,
revise [1] = 043.10	425:7, 425:11,	separately [2] -	552:22, 552:24,	517:4, 522:9, 522:18
1841380 (1) - 440.13	425:12	327:16.455:1	552:25, 553:3,	showing [4] - 332:10,
right-hand [4] - 411.7,	scrubs (1) - 328:21	Sentember [11] -	553:5, 553:6, 553:9,	343:5, 351:17,
411:20, 443:13,	second-level (1) -	342.24 385.21	553:11, 554:3,	356:22
443:21	540:3	402.8 454.9 457.6	554:10	shows [8] - 343:6,
risk [3] - 505:13,	secondary [1] -	457:14 459:12	shedded [2] - 318:20,	376:18, 392:20,
513:5, 513:12	486:23	510:12 511:17	424:22	403:19, 437:16,
roadway [1] - 434:16	accordband (4)	520:4 520:7	sheet [46] - 315:12.	506:17, 506:24.
roof[1] - 329:4	400:24	539.4, 539.7	315:14, 315:24.	508:19
roughly [1] - 309:7	400.24	sequential [1] - 397.9	333:3, 342:19.	shut [1] - 544:3
row [7] - 391:19,	A04:04 400:40	sequentially [1] -	343:16, 347:14.	shutdown [13] -
392:1, 392:5, 392:6,	481:24, 482:10,	396:15	362:3, 362:4, 362:6	438.10 543.6
395:20, 485:4, 485:5	405:3, 523:22,	series [1] - 538:17	370:25 371:1	543.11 543.14
rule [9] - 532:8,	523:25, 525:8, 526:5	set [12] - 309:22,	376.6 376.7	543.17 543.19
532:12, 532:15,	secretaries [1] -	315:11, 315:12,	388.10 380.4	543.17, 543.18,
532:19, 532:21,	483:22	315:19, 335:5,	380.6 303.10	543.21, 343.20,
532:22, 532:23,	section [23] - 316:23,	352:9, 352:10,	307.20 307.22	544.0, 044.12,
549:6	348:22, 365:10,	376:8, 397:11,	351.20, 351.22,	044.13, 044.18,

-		T	r	
545.10	475:11 475:12	402:14, 403:9,	smoke [12] - 351:22,	311:6, 314:9,
sic 131 - 331-13 493-3	491:25, 504:21,	407:15, 468:21,	352:1, 352:2, 352:5,	315:18, 315:25,
523.20	505:16 505:19	523:22	352:12, 353:17,	317:24, 334:25,
sida (464) 315:14	506:3 506:6 506:9	sixty-nine [1] - 402:14	353:18, 353:23,	339:7. 340:8.
3108 [181] - 313.14,	506:17 508:7	sixty-one (1) - 523:22	434.7 434.10	344:11, 345:6.
318:19, 318:20,	500:6 500:11		553.12	348.25 354:22
319:1, 319:4,	509.0, 509.11,	Sixty-Seven [2] -	smokostack (1)	357:11 358:8
319:18, 319:24,	514.12, 515.14,	403:9, 408:21	352:10	360.14 370.7
320:5, 320:6,	516:4, 521:10,	sixty-six [1] - 407:15	353:12	387.11 307.0
320:12, 321:8,	527:9, 533:6, 538:2,	size [1] - 327:7	SO [3] - 397:12,	367.11, 397.9,
321:20, 321:23,	538:4, 539:6,	skewed [1] - 554:21	432:3, 434:13	397.21, 402.11,
321:25, 322:1,	544:17, 551:21,	slater [4] - 351:18,	SO2 [10] - 327:25,	406:11, 407:20,
322:4, 322:12,	554:12, 554:14,	410:11, 410:21,	328:12, 328:14,	409:24, 409:25,
322:17, 322:18,	554:18	520:16	339:1, 503:15,	412:16, 414:17,
322:20, 322:21,	sided [2] - 350:9,	SLATER [74] - 291:2,	503:20, 504:2,	416:13, 428:3,
322:25, 323:3,	394:22	291:11, 291:16,	504:5, 504:23, 505:5	437:2, 445:11,
323:5, 323:13,	sides [16] - 323:11,	338:18, 339:25,	sO2 [1] - 328:10	446:7, 446:9, 460:8,
323:18, 323:19,	329:7, 347:14,	340:4, 341:15.	soaking [53] - 304:2,	460:19, 464:21,
323:24, 324:9.	410:12, 413:22,	345:21 345:24	304:7, 304:23,	470:8, 472:19,
329:11. 330:10	426:18. 446:2.	350:19 350:24	314:14. 314:22.	476:20, 497:19,
331:1, 331:22	446:13, 446:17.	351.1 351.4	315:11, 315:13.	509:25, 528:5,
331.24 337.14	447:6. 448:4	351.10 358.6	316:2. 324:23	528:13, 529:23,
338-3 342-6 342-7	448.14 533.12	259.10 259.19	325.5 325.16	529:24, 537:11,
2420 242:40	551.22 553.6	300.10, 300.10,	327.12 332.20	538:4, 550:15
342.9, 342.10,	551.22, 333.0,	367:7, 367:9, 368:2,	372.22 380.15	sought (1) - 538:6
342.21, 343.1,	555.15	3/3:2, 3/4:2, 3/7:7,	372.22, 360.15,	sound (11 - 439.7
343:3, 343:18,	significant [2] - 530.0,	377:9, 377:13,	381:10, 381:10,	sounded (11 - 539:23
344:17, 344:24,	530:9	379:21, 379:24,	381:17, 381:22,	sounds (5) 215:9
345:16, 362:23,	significantly [3] -	382:7, 382:10,	382:2, 413:24,	420:49 472:25
374:16, 374:17,	450:20, 450:24,	388:2, 388:5,	414:3, 414:4, 414:5,	439:16, 472:25,
399:15, 399:18,	502:22	394:25, 395:4,	414:9, 415:25,	493:8, 493:18
399:22, 399:24,	similar [2] - 386:11,	397:4, 397:7,	429:21, 483:3,	source [141] - 304:7,
400:1, 400:2, 400:5,	432:5	397:25, 398:7,	483:7, 483:14,	316:15, 316:23,
400:7, 400:18,	similarly [2] - 378:21,	404:22, 404:25,	483:18, 484:1,	317:7, 317:13,
400:20, 400:23,	380:14	405:4, 405:7,	485:20, 485:21,	317:16, 317:21,
401:1, 401:4,	simple [1] - 512:8	405:10, 405:14,	486:2, 486:3, 486:4,	318:2, 318:5,
401:11, 401:13,	simply [3] - 368:22,	406:21, 406:23,	486:9, 490:9,	318:15, 319:16,
401:14, 401:18,	374:16, 452:10	408:17, 408:22,	490:13, 497:15,	324:1, 330:14,
402:2, 402:4, 402:9,	single [2] - 313:12,	409:11, 410:9,	497:24, 498:6,	333:14, 333:15,
402:12, 402:13,	417:3	410:14, 418:18,	498:8, 498:11,	333:16, 334:4,
402:22, 402:24,	SIP (11 - 331:10	418:20, 418:23,	499:14, 499:16,	334:8, 334:12,
403:6, 403:8,	site-wide [1] - 427:4	443:14, 443:18,	500:25, 502:4,	334:15, 334:23,
403:12, 403:14,	situation (121 - 360-19	451:4, 470:4, 474:5.	522:20, 537:9,	335:9, 335:15,
403:17, 403:25,	434.14 440.12	474:10. 478:9.	537:18, 537:22	335:18, 335:21,
404:4, 405:23.	450.15 475.21	517:21, 517:23.	sole [1] - 484:22	335:24, 336:2,
405:24, 405:25.	400.10, 470.21,	520:21, 520:23	solely [5] - 350:2.	360:19, 393:9,
407:1, 407:7, 407:9.	500.12 500.20	521:1. 521:5.	357:22. 375:3.	427:10, 435:5,
407:12, 407:14.	501.12, 500.20,	526:18, 528:15	399:23, 411:22	435:7, 436:8,
409:3, 409:4, 409:7	547:15	528.17 528.23	someone [1] - 366.7	436:12, 436:20,
409:20 410:2	04/.10	536.5 536.7 542.7	sometime 121 -	437:5, 437:10.
410.4 410.5	situations [5] - 439:4,	553.10	300.21 365.21	437:14, 437:22.
411.20 419.16	440:8, 448:3, 448:7,	elightly (4) 220-7	somotimos (5)	438:17. 438:21
419.17 410.21	448:24	3191119 [4] - 320.7,	252.16 497.00	439:8, 439:10
410.22 410.25	six-month [12] -		407:25 AP0:2 400.4	439:13, 439:16
A20.3 A21.10	337:12, 337:23,	slowly [1] - 547:23	407.20, 400.3, 400.4	439.19 440.4
421.0, 421.13,	342:20, 506:18,	small [5] - 340:19,	somewnat [1] - 315:9	440.21 442.2
421.20, 423.18,	506:22, 507:4,	420:19, 530:9,	somewhere [4] -	AA2.4 AA2.12
424.22, 420.0,	507:5, 511:1,	554:25	350:13, 408:9,	442.12, 442.4
435:19, 443:13,	511:15, 538:17,	smelling [1] - 387:5	455:23, 466:22	442.10, 440.4,
443:21, 446:22,	539:4, 545:24	smells [1] - 387:1	soon [1] - 474:11	440.0, 440.2,
446:23, 447:2,	six-percent [1] - 320:8	Smoke [6] - 353:13,	sooner [1] - 308:9	445:10, 445:11,
44/:4, 44/:1/,	sixteen [1] - 400:6	353:20, 353:22,	sorry [51] - 298:11,	440:13,447:9,
448:1, 448:6, 452:7,	sixty [6] - 400:8,	354:1, 354:9, 356:21	301:14, 310:12,	447:10, 447:13,
452:9, 475:8,				
		the second se	and the second se	the second se

448.8. 448:11.	361:22, 367:22,	507:9, 507:10,	356:10, 357:20,	414:8, 414:15,
448:15, 448:21.	374:7, 374:9,	508:14, 508:19,	358:15, 363:2,	485:19, 486:1,
448:25, 449:11.	374:10, 391:1,	509:6, 509:8,	372:11, 377:19,	486:9, 486:10,
449:13, 449:14,	411:16, 413:16,	509:23, 510:4,	377:21, 382:14,	486:14, 543:24,
449:20, 450:17,	416:17, 417:4.	510:11, 510:17,	386:1, 394:2, 394:6,	544:3
450.19 451.9	442:13, 462:21	511:1, 511:8,	399:5, 405:8,	stops [2] - 352:11,
451:11 451:21	Spreadsheet [1] -	511:15. 511:22.	425:16, 425:23,	544:11
452.25 453.4	290.11	512:1, 512:4, 512:8.	426:19, 431:7,	story [1] - 354:15
455:10 455:24	eproadeboote 131 -	513:1 513:6.	438:17, 439:5,	straight [1] - 405:3
455.15, 455.24,	361.25 373.13	513:10, 513:13,	439:12, 439:24,	stresses (1) - 400:25
469:9 471:10	416:10	513:17 514:19	440:9, 440:22,	stretch (1) - 342:20
405.5, 471.10,	410.10	515:14 515:21	448:15, 449:17,	strictly (4) - 321.9
471.13, 471.14,	252-20 256-21	516:19 533:9	451:4, 453:10.	321.11 324.20
475.14, 475.22,	352.20, 350.21,	535.13 538.2	453:11, 454:22,	325.4
477.0, 470.7,	405.1 426.9	538.20 538.25	459:22, 461:15,	strike (2) - 406:16
470.22, 475.4,	400.1, 420.0,	539.6 543.2 545.19	463:9, 463:16.	418.8
479.0, 479.17,	430.22, 490.23,	standards [18] -	464:13, 467:7.	etringent (101 - 316:8
4/9.24, 400.12,	491.9, 492.3, 492.0,	303:14 303:19	471:15 474:15	316-13 333-22
401.0, 401.10,	497.14, 490.22,	303.23 303.25	475:25. 488:8	450.14 470.2
401.20, 401.23,	430.24, 433.2,	331:15 356:6	488:11, 488:19	523-2 535-15
402.1, 402.0,	002.0, 022.22	384:16 415:5	488:25, 489:20	535-17 542-10
402.10, 402.24,	Stacked [1] - 502:7	131-0 135-16	493:25 499:22	543-2
487:0, 487:15,	stacks [11] - 353:17,	434.9, 435.10,	500.7 501.7	043.2 string (0) 42415
407.19,407.23,	355:25, 356:12,	430.0, 430.11,	501.20 501.24	anipa [2] - 424:0,
488:9, 488:12,	356:13, 490:18,	437.7, 437.11,	502.9 506.11	424.10
488:20, 489:5,	491:7, 491:8,	437.23, 430.14,	506:18 506:24	strong [3] - 514:20,
489:12, 523:14,	491:21, 492:12,	472.12, 470.24	508:6 508:13	510:7
524:18, 524:23,	493:4, 497:24	stanus [1] - 410.10	509.10 509.18	stronger [1] - 300:12
525:21, 520:13,	staff [3] - 354:3,	star [1] - 392.1	510:14 512:19	studies [2] - 421:0,
530.10, 531.12,	365:7, 387:25	546:01 546:00	514.6 514.8 516:3	540:21
531.10, 532.24,	stages [1] - 430:7	510.21, 510.22	517:21 518:1	study [1] - 421:8
533(10, 533)21,	stagnant [2] - 500:17,	statute [1] - 311.10	519.9 519.18	subject [11] - 294:18,
534:3, 534:0,	546:25	statutory [1] - 302:9	520:10 520:13	318:3, 336:11,
534:13, 534:19,	stand [1] - 516:21	stays [2] - 349:24,	528.15 528.23	356:11, 380:23,
535:1, 535:2, 535:4,	standard [88] -	500:17	533.14 534.3	425:16, 425:23,
555.6, 555.11,	303:25, 321:9,	steam [8] - 351:22,	534 16 534:20	438:3, 454:7,
535.14, 536.14,	321:19, 343:10,	352:1, 352:6, 352:7,	535:3 536:16	493:24, 494:5
540:10, 530.24,	343:20, 344:12,	352:11, 352:21,	536:24 537:2	Subjectivity [5] -
542:10, 543.7,	344:18, 345:17,	353:3, 353:6	547.8 549.12 550.8	366:18, 366:25,
548.0, 548.9, 549.12	348:13, 356:9,	steel [1] - 327:3	Steel's 131 - 498:18	383:3, 383:5, 441:15
sources [/] - 296.25,	356:11, 357:12,	Steel [124] - 291:4,	501.17 548.4	submit [4] - 394:12,
391:13, 420:23,	357:13, 359:18,	291:10, 304:21,	steelmaking (1) -	394:19, 395:8,
438:20, 517:8,	393:7, 408:4, 412:7,	305:1, 305:20,	203·24	427:10
517:11, 518:4	426:15, 428:11,	305:22, 305:23,	Stop (2) - 347-21	submits [1] - 307:13
spans [1] - 538:17	428:13, 428:19,	307:15, 307:21,	347.24	submitted [1] - 459:22
sparse [1] - 404:1	428:21, 429:2,	307:22, 307:25,	eton (4) - 302.20	Subpart [1] - 385:8
speaking [1] - 306:11	429:4, 429:9,	308:3, 308:4,	318.24 300.24	subsequently [3] -
spectrum [1] - 345:14	429:11, 429:17,	308:11, 308:22,	300.24, 330.24,	321:12, 322:17,
speculating [1] -	429:19, 429:21,	309:1, 309:6,	etone (1) - 347-13	322:21
327:5	429:23, 436:23,	310:18, 310:25,	etipulated (491 - 214-4	substantially [2] -
spent [1] - 419:3	448:21, 450:12,	311:3, 313:14,	311/5 315-3	362:19, 369:23
split [1] - 376:16	450:22, 451:20,	314:17, 325:23,	324-20 326-6	subtotal [1] - 360:17
spoken [1] - 548:6	464:25, 477:20,	332:2, 332:9,	227.13 336.22	subtotals [1] - 361:1
spot [1] - 445:2	477:22, 478:3,	333:13, 334:25,	368-16 260-2	subtract [3] - 450:3,
spots [1] - 423:20	481:24, 483:1,	335:1, 335:4, 335:6,	360.0 370.5	450:4, 471:18
spreadsheet [23] -	483:25, 485:7,	335:8, 335:14,	400.15 402.15	subtracted [1] - 450:8
299:21, 299:24,	503:5, 503:7,	335:25, 336:4,	450.10, 450.10	subtracting [14] -
300:3, 300:5, 301:4,	503:24, 504:11,	336:7, 336:16,	atood (2) 404-17	320:18, 334:3,
360:7, 361:7,	504:14, 504:18,	337:12, 342:20,	A04-24 407-40	449:18, 449:25,
361:15, 361:17,	506:9, 506:17,	346:14, 346:24,	494.24, 497.10	453:1, 455:25,
361:19, 361:21,	506:24, 507:8,	347:5, 348:12,	stop [10] - 319.15,	456:2, 462:21,

	-	1	1	
464:23, 465:21,	surrounding [1] -	424:5	524:18, 524:23,	this [1] - 446:6
465:24, 467:25,	387:13	temporary [1] -	525:21	Thompson [3] -
472:23, 534:22	switch [2] - 295:24,	543:24	testified [5] - 291:20,	300:19, 300:20,
successive [1] -	489:16	tenure [1] - 312:5	337:6, 502:18,	300:23
499:23	switching [1] - 295:25	term [5] - 297:11,	516:18, 554:9	thorough [1] - 323:1
sufficient [1] - 546:23	sworn [3] - 291:13,	297:16, 331:24,	testifying [3] - 291:12,	thousands [2] - 426:2,
suggest [3] - 337:22,	291:14, 291:20	394:16, 526:24	506:7, 515:5	551:1
520:16, 539:15	System [1] - 432:15	termed [1] - 457:3	testimony [9] - 296:1,	threat [1] - 541:24
suggestion [1] - 373:4	system [18] - 296:4,	terminology [1] -	434:4, 449:19,	three-fourths [1] -
suggests [1] - 539:17	296:10, 296:14,	299:13	485:25, 491:12,	443:10
sulfide [2] - 339:1,	296:16, 301:23,	terms [31] - 299:20,	501:6, 516:16,	threshold [2] - 371:14,
505:10	301:24, 302:10,	306:3, 313:5,	518:24, 526:23	386:21
sulfur [5] - 327:17,	306:10, 307:1,	313:17, 316:8,	testing [64] - 316:15,	throughout [5] -
327:18, 327:21,	307:3, 307:10,	316:11, 317:23,	316:24, 317:7,	329:3, 387:16,
327:23, 503:15	329:6, 334:1,	330:6, 330:22,	317:13, 317:16,	395:14, 396:1,
sum [2] - 347:18,	334:12, 388:22,	349:3, 353:1, 370:7,	317:22, 318:2,	539:25
348:2	389:2, 394:13,	378:4, 383:11,	318:5, 318:15,	Thursday [1] - 532:6
summaries [1] -	432:13	389:16, 416:25,	319:16, 324:1,	timeframe [2] -
325:15		447:10, 448:8,	333:14, 333:15,	375:18, 431:9
summarize [2] -	Г	451:10, 465:7,	333:10, 334:4,	timeline [1] - 334:10
338:25, 393:21	Tab [1] - 406:19	481:20, 494:17,	334.0, 334.13,	timing [1] - 418:3
summarized [1] -	tab (61 - 388:20, 389:5.	524:17, 524:23,	334.23, 333.9,	titles [1] - 393:25
332:6	406:21, 411:17.	525:20, 525:13,	335.15, 335.24	TO [1] - 290:1
summary [17] -	413:5. 413:6	533:20, 534:20,	335.21, 335.24,	today [9] - 291:12,
290:14, 307:17,	table (15) - 360:25.	538:11, 548:2,	A30.8 A30.10	291:17, 386:10,
398:22, 398:23,	368:14, 378:1.	500:12 test 70 - 220:14	439.0, 435.10,	386:12, 419:12,
399:13, 399:19,	391:7, 391:19,	10SL[/1] - 330.14,	448:11, 448:15,	400:0, 400:11,
405:18, 406:5,	391:24, 391:25,	A35.7 A36.8	449:14, 451:11,	523.17, 527.10
407:1, 407:19,	392:4, 393:16,	436:12 436:20	453:1, 453:4,	224.0 456.10 527.4
410:25, 411:8,	399:23, 400:1,	437.5 437.10	455:24, 469:9,	534.9, 450.19, 527.4
411:10, 419:4,	403:16, 410:24,	437:14 437:22	471:13, 481:23,	228.22 320.21
432:10, 470:18	416:9, 529:18	438:18, 438:21.	482:6, 489:13,	342.23 372.10
summation [4] -	tables [8] - 360:19,	439:13, 439:16,	526:13, 530:18,	410:16 412:25
314:3, 342:0,	378:5, 393:21,	440:4, 440:21,	531:12, 531:16,	413:11 445:5
347.10, 402.22	410:25, 411:7,	442:2, 442:4,	532:24, 533:16,	532:3. 532:12.
347.23 347.25	411:18, 414:22,	442:12, 442:18,	533:21, 534:3,	553:7. 553:22. 554:2
348.8 481.17	416:2	443:4, 443:7, 445:2,	534:6, 534:13,	topic [2] - 338:15,
523.16	tablet [2] - 333:25,	445:10, 446:13,	534:19, 535:1,	339:22
sun (7) - 355'3 355'5	432:4	447:9, 447:10,	535:2, 535:4, 535:8,	topics [1] - 489:16
355.9 355.10	tabs [2] - 299:25,	447:13, 448:9,	535:11, 535:15,	topside [6] - 413:1,
355:12 355:16	346:5	448:22, 449:1,	536:14, 536:18,	413:7, 414:2,
SunCoke [1] - 295:2	takeaway [1] - 395:19	449:11, 449:13,	536:24, 548:6,	414:18, 414:20,
supervisor [1] - 540:2	talking [1] - 322:10	449:21, 450:17,	548:9, 549:12	414:21
supplemental [1] -	target [2] - 493:12,	450:19, 451:9,	testings [1] - 330:11	topsides [3] - 316:2,
390:12	493:14	451:22, 455:19,	tests [1] - 316:20	413:3, 414:25
suppose [2] - 367:15,	Task [1] - 536:1	464:14, 469:8,	tneirs [1] - 316:8	total [30] - 293:3,
487:10	tecnnical [3] - 422:18,	471:10, 471:14,	tnemselves [4] -	322:11, 348:3,
supposed [8] - 302:7,	422.19, 002.9	4/5:14, 4/5:22,	291.0, 300.22,	348:5, 348:14,
315:22, 400:25,	technologiaal //	4//:0, 4/0:/,	theony (4) 496-14	348:17, 361:2,
437:1, 481:21,		4/0.22, 4/9.4,	thereof (4) = 542.7	361:3, 374:22,
497:13, 498:7, 514:8	technologically M	4/ 9.0, 4/ 9.1/,	thereto (1) - 550.6	376:9, 376:12,
surprised [1] - 522:9	513·2	4/9.20, 400.12,	thermal (1) - 500.0	376:15, 379:4,
surrogate [12] - 304:6,	technologies #1-	401.0, 401.10,	they've (2) - 200-10	411:9, 413:13,
304:9, 304:11,	205:16	482.15 482.24	547-4	416:3, 426:23,
490:23, 491:5,	technology 121 -	487.7 487.15	thinking (2) - 300-21	427:3, 451:19,
491:8, 491:13,	424.15 430.18	487:23 488:9	548·8	4/2:10, 4//:1,
491:18, 492:2,	522:15	488:13. 488:20.	third-quarter #1 -	400:1, 400:3,
492:5, 492:19,	temperature [1] -	489:6, 523:14.	365.19	402.22, 404.14,
503:10		2 515116 F 0000 5 2 2 1 K	000.10	+04.10, 404.10,

		T		
519:20, 523:25,	400:21	453:11, 454:22,	394:11, 430:18,	459:12, 459:16,
530:10	twice [2] - 354:18,	459:22, 461:15,	434:15, 451:8	459:20, 459:23,
touched [1] - 331:9	501:25	463:9, 463:16,	USS [2] - 346:8,	459:25, 461:13,
towards [4] - 342:23,	two-month [1] -	464:13, 467:7,	373:12	461:16, 461:18,
391:23, 414:6,	363:23	471:15, 474:15,		463:7, 463:10,
547:19	two-sided [2] - 350:9,	475:25, 488:8,	V	463:12, 463:13,
tower [4] - 415:11,	394:22	488:11, 488:18,	vegetion (1) 354:14	463:16, 463:19,
415:15, 415:18,	types [17] - 305:17,	488:25, 489:20,	vacations (1, 422:24	464:4, 464:5,
425:2	312:24, 314:3,	493:25, 498:18,	Valiav (1) 204:1	464:20, 465:1,
toxic [1] - 339:9	314:8, 314:9,	499:22, 500:7,	value (1) - 394.1	465:20, 465:22,
track [1] - 553:17	314:10, 332:17,	501:7, 501:17,	Value [2] - 412.10,	466:6, 466:7, 466:9,
traditionally [1] -	347:17, 352:16,	501:20, 501:24,	412.24	466:18, 466:24,
522:21	359:11, 360:10,	502:9, 506:11,	427·8	467:1, 468:5,
trailer [1] - 470:19	375:25, 391:13,	506:17, 506:24,	varied (1) - 322.13	469:17, 473:8,
trained [1] - 295:9	413:10, 541:20	508:6, 508:13,	varios (1) - 322:15	4/4:10, 4/0:1/,
trainee [2] - 292:14,	typical [5] - 336:16,	509:10, 509:18,	varies [1] = 517.7	4/5.22, 4/0.5,
301:1	336:18, 343:14,	510:14, 512:19,	various (1) - 204:21	403.10, 490.0,
training [11] - 293:24,	383:22	514:6, 514:8, 516:3,	Vacco (4) - 205'2	490.0, 020.19,
294:2, 294:8,	typo [4] - 417:9,	517:21, 518:1,	vehicle 121 - 548-15	525.4 525.17
294:10, 294:17,	418:11, 498:8,	519:9, 519:16,	548.19	525.22 528.1
294:23, 338:17,	498:10	520:9, 520:13,	Veolia (2) - 327.8	526:4 526:12
384:7, 423:12,	typographical [1] -	528:15, 526:23,	327.0	528.2 528.3 528.7
444:17, 444:23	537:20	524.16 524.20	veolia (1) - 327:11	528.10 529.9
trainings [4] - 294:14,	typos [1] - 416:18	535-2 536-16	verify [2] - 467:13	529.11 529.13
295:7, 295:8, 295:9		536.24 537.2	467.17	529:21, 537:10
transcription [1] -	U	547.7 547.8 548.4	version [7] - 372:8.	550:3
452:19	U.S [127] - 291:10,	549:11, 550:8	373:17, 439:9.	Violation [3] - 393:6,
transfer [2] - 435:22,	304:21, 304:25,	unable (11 - 438:9	440:14, 440:15,	394:6, 529:5
435:25	305:20, 305:21,	unaccounted [1] -	440:16, 443:6	violations [133] -
	305:23, 307:15,	324:8	versions [1] - 373:12	302:1, 303:8, 309:8,
3/4./, 415.1, 454.15	307:21, 307:22,	unconsciously [1] -	versus [12] - 291:4,	309:9, 313:20,
540.7	307:25, 308:3,	487:22	313:6, 316:9,	313:23, 314:6,
tranevoreae (1) -	308:4, 308:11,	uneven [1] - 433:4	316:12, 323:13,	323:15, 323:21,
551.11	308:22, 309:1,	unfortunately [8] -	324:16, 331:10,	324:6, 324:9,
travel (101 - 303.24	309:6, 310:18,	295:20, 334:12,	334:12, 334:23,	325:19, 326:16,
314.12 377.19	310:25, 311:3,	336:17, 347:14,	403:21, 424:6,	331:16, 331:17,
377.21 415.8	313:14, 314:17,	452:6, 453:23,	456:21	332:17, 334:5,
415:9, 415:10,	325:23, 332:2,	454:2, 549:17	vicinity [1] - 297:25	334:6, 334:9,
415:15, 415:18,	332:9, 333:13,	unhealthy [1] - 542:12	view [6] - 333:12,	336:14, 336:25,
415:21	334.25, 335.1, 225.4, 225.6, 225.9	unintentionally [2] -	417:21, 447:21,	337:2, 337:4,
travels [1] - 415:17	335.4, 335.0, 335.0,	488:4, 488:6	447:24, 450:4, 450:7	337.13, 330.2,
treating [1] - 340:15	336:4 336:7	United [2] - 291:4,	Violated [1] - 536:20	357.14 359.7
trend [3] - 338:1,	336.16 337.12	444:3	violation [90] - 301:24,	360.6 360.8
368:23, 368:24	342.20 346:14	University [2] -	302:5, 311:10,	362.10 362.11
trending [1] - 547:19	346:24, 347:5.	293:18, 294:11	311.19, 311.20,	363:2, 368:15.
trends [6] - 494:16,	348:12, 356:10.	unlike [1] - 432:25	359.11, 359.14,	368:16, 368:20,
494:24, 495:2,	357:20, 358:15,		361:4 361:5	368:23, 368:25,
495:6, 497:9, 497:10	363:2, 372:11,	334:19	361:12 362:10	369:4, 369:12,
tried [1] - 347:12	377:18, 377:21,	unsale [2] - 519.12,	366:18, 380:6,	369:25, 370:8,
trigger [1] - 501:3	382:14, 385:25,	319.13 upuquation 418:2	380:17, 383:4.	370:25, 372:3,
triggered [3] - 500:5,	394:2, 394:3, 394:6,	410.2,	383:8, 383:24,	372:7, 379:8,
500:13, 521:18	399:4, 405:8,	+ 10.0	386:20, 386:22,	379:12, 380:11,
true [1] - 4 85:7	425:16, 425:23,	updated (1) = 306-11	391:4, 391:5,	380:13, 380:20,
Tuesday [1] - 291:3	426:19, 431:7,	upper [1] - 412.20	391:24, 391:25,	380:25, 383:23,
twelve [3] - 337:16,	438:17, 439:5,	upper [1] - + 12.20	393:5, 408:5,	390:14, 390:15,
480:14, 480:15	439:12, 439:24,	377.12	436:16, 437:17,	391:19, 392:3,
twenty [2] - 400:21,	440:9, 440:22,	urgency [1] - 297:3	448:20, 449:1,	392:25, 393:10,
477:3	448:15, 449:17,	uses (5) - 301:25.	451:19, 451:23,	393:12, 393:14,
twenty-five [1] -	451:4, 453:10,			393:15, 394:7,
	-			-

			1	1
403:20, 407:21,	w	358:5, 358:8,	546:8, 552:20,	z
408:3, 408:7,	walk m 347:10	358:11, 358:16,	002:21 	zero [15] - 320:16.
417:24, 428:15,	470.11	358:19, 358:20,	WORKS [2] - 490.17,	320:20, 320:22,
428:24, 429:6,	walking (1) - 318:12	364:22, 364:24,	021.20 	333:20, 343:24,
429:13, 436:21,	walking[1] - 510.12	304:25, 307:3,	world [2] - 295.17,	345:1, 345:2,
441:3, 441:21,	401.10 401.10	307:0, 307:13,	320.23	351:19, 389:8,
447:18, 448:2,	491.10, 491.10	307.14, 300.3,	WOISE [3] - 301.0,	451:15, 471:21,
450:21, 451:10,	wants [1] - 405.11	300.0, 300.0, 300.9,	301:7, 512.10	518:17, 518:20,
452:10, 453:11,	water [1] - 320.19	3/3:1, 3/3.0,	WOrst [7] - 521:15,	519:3, 519:7
455:3, 458:3,	ways [7] - 510.19,	373.14, 373.10,	521:19, 522:7,	
458:18, 458:19,	329.9, 345.5,	373:20, 373:22,	523:8, 544:22,	
458:25, 460:6,	352.13, 454.3,	373:25, 374:4,	545:6, 546:2	
460:9, 460:13,	555.25, 554.0	377.0, 377.10,	Worth [1] - 302:14	
460:23, 461:4,	Website [1] - 290.9	377.14, 377.10,	V	-
461:9, 462:3, 462:4,	webster [1] - 527.5	379.20, 379.20,	Y	
462:8, 462:9,	WOOK [14] - 294.2,	300.3, 302.0,	yard [34] - 318:20,	
462:12, 462:18,	294:10, 294:15,	302.11, 300.1,	320:5, 320:6, 321:8,	
462:23, 463:2,	305.6, 305.7, 305.0,	202.10 202.13	322:12, 322:25,	
465:11, 466:11,	305:17, 354.14,	392.10, 392.13,	331:22, 331:24,	
468:5, 468:8,	384:10, 423.13,	392.13, 394.21,	332:7, 337:14,	
469:13, 479:9,	432:21, 432:23,	395.2, 395.5, 397.2,	338:3, 342:9,	
4/9:18, 480:1,	547:11, 547.10	207.14 208.1	342:10, 342:18,	
480:11, 480:15,	Week-long [3] - 294.2,	208.2 208.0	342:22, 343:1,	
481:6, 481:12,	294:10, 364:10	390.2, 390.3,	343:18, 344:17,	
482:2, 482:0,	Weekly [1] - 300.0	402.21 404.20	344:24, 345:17,	
482:14, 483:3,	Weeks [7] - 306:11,	402.21, 404.20,	420:1, 420:7, 420:9,	
463.7, 492.0,	306:12, 300:14,	405:16 406:8	420:20, 421:8,	
493.10, 497.14,	500.25, 507.5,	406:11 406:16	421:10, 421:16,	
520.20 530.2	310.0, 009.0	406:18, 406:22,	421:25, 509:11,	
533.6 534.24	340.5	406:24, 408:13,	509:19, 514:13,	
535.18 537.24	340.3 wolfare (2) - 505:17	408:18, 408:23,	521:12, 539:6,	
539.19 547.24	541·16	409:9, 409:13,	554:18	
550.6	woll (1) - 532:11	410:7, 410:11,	year [19] - 293:22,	
violator [1] - 302:14	whatnot (1) - 329.5	410:16, 410:18,	294:3, 294:11,	
virtue (1) - 533:5	white (2) - 352'3	418:17, 418:21,	294:12, 313:22,	
visible (31) - 303:3.	352.5 353.17	461:21, 520:19,	336:23, 354:18,	
303:5, 303:10.	whole (16) - 339.2	520:22, 526:19,	374:8, 378:20,	
304:11, 304:12.	381.24 387.16	526:21, 528:16,	380:22, 381:18,	
304:14, 304:15,	395.14 396:1	528:19, 528:21,	416:19, 417:4,	
306:2. 313:18.	404:2, 405:1	528:24, 529:1,	426:19, 449:17,	
325:1, 326:14,	412:22, 491:7.	531:15, 536:8,	510:8, 510:9,	1.
326:17, 326:19,	491:13, 504:12,	537:16, 542:4,	517:20, 539:20	
327:21, 350:2,	505:7. 516:22.	542:13, 552:16,	years [27] - 292:0,	
351:18, 352:24,	532:10, 532:13,	552:19, 552:23,	293:3, 296:20,	
353:1, 393:17,	549:1	553:16, 553:18,	308:20, 308:21,	
444:2, 449:24,	wide (7) - 309:13,	554:8	311:12, 311.13,	
485:3, 503:8, 503:9,	348:7, 348:21,	Willis [3] - 291:8,	311:10, 313:10,	
503:11, 531:18,	370:17, 382:3,	291:16, 526:18	314:0, 322.0,	
532:25, 538:1,	411:1, 427:4	willy [1] - 488:14	332:13 336:20	
538:5, 538:7	WILLIS [114] - 291:8,	willy-nilly [1] - 488:14	337.25 371.7	
visual [3] - 312:14,	291:18, 291:22,	WINEK [1] - 406:13	378.20, 379.1	
554:11, 554:20	294:6, 338:16,	witness [5] - 291:11,	417:14 417:15	
Volume [6] - 358:22,	338:21, 340:9,	291:17, 291:19,	494.20 508.1	
382:13, 442:24,	341:16, 345:25,	520:18, 520:25	508:22. 508:24	
469:25, 470:1, 532:5	350:9, 350:12,	witnesses [1] - 291:14	538:15. 541:18	
volume [4] - 346:3,	350:18, 350:23,	workings [1] - 295:14	vellow [1] - 362:1	
346:4, 358:23, 390:8	350:25, 351:6,	Works [8] - 316:22,	yourself [5] - 398:5.	
	351:12, 351:14,	356:10, 357:1,	422:25, 423:5,	
	357:19, 357:25,	387:10, 387:13,	423:9, 442:10	