**VEOLIA ES TECHNICAL SOLUTIONS, L.L.C.** Petition for Review to the Environmental Appeals Board of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

## Exhibit 1

Comparative CPT Emissions Results for HWCs: Mercury, SVMs, and LVMs

Note: While these specific charts were not included with Veolia's comments, the issues they address were raised by Veolia at VES 019535, VES 019546-47, and VES 019555-56. The charts have also been Bates labeled consistent with Veolia's comments for ease of reference.

The below data was colleaded using the serves actualed was provided a was colleaded using the serve actualed transmisser. All other serves actualed using the serves actualed of CPT mercury restrictures from comprised of CPT mercury set reaches throns compared to other HWCs, and Tang. This specific table shows the sorted results (novest to higher) for the Reletworks appropriate for this data set and fractive. Stand and the sorting by any of the three kunctions of Standard Deviation analysis of the data. Works compared to other HWCs, and thus, Veolia's HWCs are be seen in the rable. Veolia HWCs variabilities in test results are the function and sector by Relative Standard Deviation analysis of the data set and fractive. Standard Deviation     Relative Standard Deviation analysis of the data set and fractive. Standard Deviation analysis of the data set and fractive Standard Deviation       Mercury Results Sorted by Relative Standard Deviation     Relative Standard Deviation     Standard Deviation and set was a set and fraction and set was a set of the rable. Veolia HWCs variabilities in test results are found holds. J Ac and be seen in the rable. Veriability of the set (ST) Veriabil									
Facility Numbers 2, 5, and 7 are Veolia-Sauget HIThis data table is comprised of CPT mercury teststatistical functions of Standard Deviation, RelatiRelative Standard Deviation analysis of the data.deemed most appropriate for this data set and rmiddle of the pack" when compared to other HI"middle of the pack" compared to the compared to		te Incineration							
This data table is comprised of CPT mercury test statistical functions of Standard Deviation, Relati     Relative Standard Deviation analysis of the data.     deemed most appropriate for this data set and rulidle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     Tompretersive   Ferformance     Performance   Performance     17   2009     17   2009     13   2010     13   2011     13   2013     14   2011     15   2013     16   2013     1   2013     1   2013									
Statistical functions of Standard Deviation, Relative Standard Interctions of Standard Deviation analysis of the data.     deemed most appropriate for this data set and runiddle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     "middle of the pack" when compared to other H     Texported by Relative Standard Deviation     Performance     Performance     17   Comprehensive     17   Comprehensive     17   Comprehensive     17   2009     17   2009     17   2009     13   2010     13   2010     13   2010     13   2010     14   2011     15   2013     16   2013     17   2013     18   2013     19   2013     11   15     12   2013     13   2013     14   2013     11<		lerous HWCs. The variab	numerous HWCs. The variability of the 3 runs within each test was calculated using the	ach test was	calculated u	Ising the			
Kelative Standard Deviation analysis of the data.deemed most appropriate for this data set and riuldle of the pack" when compared to other H"middle of the pack" when compared to other HMercury Results Sorted by Relative StComprehensiveFacility Number1722132132132141320091422132222222221321421321421521621321421321421521617222182222222222222222222222222222222222 <t< td=""><td></td><td>ation, and Range. This sp</td><td>Deviation, and Range. This specific table shows the sorted results (lowest to highest) for the</td><td>ted results (</td><td>lowest to hig</td><td>ghest) for the</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></t<>		ation, and Range. This sp	Deviation, and Range. This specific table shows the sorted results (lowest to highest) for the	ted results (	lowest to hig	ghest) for the	0		
Thiddle of the pack" when compared to other H/ middle of the pack" when compared to other H/ All comprehensive   Mercury Results Sorted by Relative St   Comprehensive   Facility Number   Test (CPT) Year   17   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   2   17   2   2   17   2   17   2   2   17   2   17   2   17   2   17   2   17   2   17   2   13   2   14   2   13   2   14   15   2   16   2   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1 <t< td=""><td>lata. (Note: Sorting  </td><td>by any of the three function</td><td>ons shows comparable re</td><td>sults. Relati</td><td>ve Standard</td><td>Deviation w</td><td>as</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	lata. (Note: Sorting	by any of the three function	ons shows comparable re	sults. Relati	ve Standard	Deviation w	as		
Mercury Results Sorted by Relative St       Comprehensive     Performance       Facility Number     Test (CPT) Year     (ug/dst       17     2     2009     1       2     2009     1     1     2       17     2009     1     1     2     2       17     2     2009     1     1     2     1       17     2     2009     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     1     2     2     1     2     2     1     2     2     2     1     2     2     2     1     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2	nd results are shown	below.) As can be seen in	n the table, Veolia HWCs'	variabilities	in test result	s are			
Mercury Results Sorted by Relative St       Comprehensive     Comprehensive       Performance     Performance       17     Comprehensive       2     2009       17     2009       17     2009       17     2009       17     2009       17     2009       13     2010       13     2010       13     2010       13     2010       13     2010       13     2011       14     2011       15     2013       14     2011       15     2013       15     2013       15     2013       16     2013       13     2013       16     2013       17     2013	er HWCS, and thus, Ve	eolia's HWCs are not out	iers.						
Comprehensive     Comprehensive       Performance     1       Test (CPT) Year     2009       2009     2       2009     2       2009     2       2009     2       2005     2       2005     2       2005     2       2010     2013       2011     2       2012     2013       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2013     2       2010     2	e Standard Devia	eviation							
Performance       Test (CPT) Year       2009       2009       2009       2009       2009       2009       2009       2009       2009       2001       2005       2005       2005       2005       20010       2011       2011       2011       2011       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2013       2010       2013						Relative			
Test (CPT) Year 2009 1 2009 2009 2005 2005 2005 2005 2010 2010 2013 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013 201	Run 1	Run 2	Run 3		Standard	Standard			
2009 2009 2009 2005 2005 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2011 2013 2013	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	(ug/dscm @ 7% O2)	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	Average	Deviation	Deviation	Min.	Max.	Range
2009 2009 2009 2009 2005 2005 2005 2005	58.0	58.2	57.4	57.9	0.4	0.7	57.4	58.2	0.8
2009 2005 2005 2005 2013 2013 2010 2010 2011 2011 2013 2013	0.31	0.34	0.33	0.3	0.0	4.7	0.3	0.3	0.0
2009 2005 2005 2013 2013 2010 2010 2011 2011 2011 2013 2013	54.9	61.1	57.6	57.9	3.1	5.4	54.9	61.1	6.2
2005 2013 2013 2013 2010 2012 2011 2011 2013 2013	9.66	108	124	110.5	12.4	11.2	9.66	124.0	24.4
2005 2013 2010 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2013 2013	24	28	31	27.7	3.5	12.7	24.0	31.0	7.0
2013 2010 2009 2012 2012 2011 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013	6.125	7.243	7.917	7.1	0.9	12.8	6.1	7.9	1.8
2010 2009 2012 2009 2011 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013	06	120	95	101.7	16.1	15.8	90.06	120.0	30.0
2009 2012 2013 2011 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013	75.5	95.6	107	92.7	15.9	17.2	75.5	107.0	31.5
2012 2011 2011 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013	165.81	150.68	115.84	144.1	25.6	17.8	115.8	165.8	50.0
2009 2011 2010 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013	17.2	15.4	11.9	14.8	2.7	18.2	11.9	17.2	5.3
2011 2010 2013 2013 2011 2013 2013 2013	1.2	1.1	0.82	1.0	0.2	18.9	0.8	1.2	0.4
2010 2013 2011 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013	52	38	38	42.7	8.1	18.9	38.0	52.0	14.0
2013 2011 2013 2013 2009 2013 2013 2013 2013 2010 2010	23.408	15.79	22.917	20.7	4.3	20.6	15.8	23.4	7.6
2011 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013 2013	59	39	46	48.0	10.1	21.1	39.0	59.0	20.0
2013 2009 2013 2013 2013 2010 2010	2.34	1.55	1.76	1.9	0.4	21.7	1.6	2.3	0.8
2009 2013 2013 2010 2010	4.73	3.05	5.05	4.3	1.1	25.1	3.1	5.1	2.0
2013 2013 2010 2010	37.9	24.4	25.0	29.1	7.6	26.2	24.4	37.9	13.5
2013 2010 2010	7.1	8.1	15	10.1	4.3	42.7	7.1	15.0	7.9
2010	14.23	8.1	5.27	9.2	4.6	49.8	5.3	14.2	9.0
2010	60.5	30.8	22.7	38.0	19.9	52.4	22.7	60.5	37.8
0101	104.1	406.1	361.8	290.7	163.1	56.1	104.1	406.1	302.0
	31.5	11.7	11.6	18.3	11.5	62.7	11.6	31.5	19.9
11 2010	5.81	12.55	2.75	7.0	5.0	71.3	2.8	12.6	9.8

Semivolatile N	Aetals (SVM) CP	Semivolatile Metals (SVM) CPT Results for 17 Hazardous Waste Combustors (HWCs)	ardous Waste Combi	ustors (HWCs)						
The below data wa	as collated by the Co	The below data was collated by the Coalition for Responsible Wa	Waste Incineration							
Facility Numbers 2	Facility Numbers 2, 5, and 7 are Veolia-Sauget HWCs	-Sauget HWCs								
This data table is c	comprised of CPT SVI	This data table is comprised of CPT SVM test results from numerous HWCs. The variability of the 3 runs within each test was calculated using the statistical	ous HWCs. The variability	of the 3 runs within each	i test was cal	culated using	g the statistic	cal		
functions of Stand	lard Deviation, Relati	functions of Standard Deviation, Relative Standard Deviation, an	and Range. This specific table shows the sorted results (lowest to highest) for the Relative	le shows the sorted result	ts (lowest to	highest) for 1	the Relative			
Standard Deviatio	n analysis of the dat	Standard Deviation analysis of the data. (Note: Sorting by any of the three functions shows comparable results.	f the three functions shov	vs comparable results. Re	elative Stand	Relative Standard Deviation was deemed most	n was deeme	ed most		
appropriate for th	is data set and result	appropriate for this data set and results are shown below.) As can be seen in the table, Veolia HWCs' variabilities in test results are "middle of the pack" when	in be seen in the table, Ve	olia HWCs' variabilities in	test results	are "middle	of the pack"	when		
compared to othe	r HWCs, and thus, Ve	compared to other HWCs, and thus, Veolia's HWCs are not outliers.	rs.							
SVM Results S	orted by Relativ	SVM Results Sorted by Relative Standard Deviation								
	Comprehensive						Relative			
	Performance	Run 1	Run 2	Run 3		Standard	Standard			
Facility Number	Test (CPT) Year	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	Average	Deviation	Deviation	Min.	Max.	Range
17	2009	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	0.1	3.7	2.6	2.8	0.2
-14	2011	1.74	1.71	1.6	1.7	0.1	4.4	1.6	1.7	0.1
12	2005	2.927	3.481	3.118	3.2	0.3	8.9	2.9	3.5	0.6
гI	2001	53.2	57.5	65.7	58.8	6.4	10.8	53.2	65.7	12.5
1	2010	92.9	75	75.3	81.1	10.2	12.6	75.0	92.9	17.9
2	2013	1.1	0.78	7	1.0	0.2	17.1	0.8	1.1	0.3
7	2009	22.3	31.7	27.1	27.0	4.7	17.4	22.3	31.7	9.4
ъ	2009	58.6	67.1	46.2	57.3	10.5	18.3	46.2	67.1	20.9
17	2009	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.1	0.6	18.4	2.8	3.8	1.0
و	2009	1.22	1.24	1.67	1.4	0.3	18.5	1.2	1.7	0.5
4	2011	6.67	5.78	4.33	5.6	1.2	21.1	4.3	6.7	2.3
10	2005	25.118	26.054	17.058	22.7	4.9	21.7	17.1	26.1	9.0
<b>б</b>	2009	160.34	114.21	97.47	124.0	32.6	26.3	97.5	160.3	62.9
ø	2012	61.8	34.3	47.1	47.7	13.8	28.8	34.3	61.8	27.5
<u>S</u>	2013	20	13	12	15.0	4.4	29.1	12.0	20.0	8.0
13	2010	98.928	140.629	73.059	104.2	34.1	32.7	73.1	140.6	67.6
7	2013	8.6	4.5	10	7.7	2.9	37.1	4.5	10.0	5.5
13	2010	51.49	38.9	22.43	37.6	14.6	38.8	22.4	51.5	29.1
Ч	2013	51.75	49.68	97.97	66.5	27.3	41.1	49.7	98.0	48.3
15	2013	2.93	2.27	1.04	2.1	1.0	46.1	1.0	2.9	1.9
12	2010	3.71	11.2	8.011	7.6	3.8	49.2	3.7	11.2	7.5
2	2009	32.4	10.4	26.9	23.2	11.4	49.3	10.4	32.4	22.0
16	2013	2.57	1.48	4.8	3.0	1.7	57.4	1.5	4.8	3.3
11	2010	39.4	263.3	83.5	128.7	118.6	92.1	39.4	263.3	223.9
ñ	2012	1	14.5	37.9	17.8	18.7	104.9	1.0	37.9	36.9

**VES 019616** 

Low Volatile N	Aetals (LVM) CP	Low Volatile Metals (LVM) CPT Results for 17 Hazardous Waste Combustors (HWCs)	ardous Waste Combu	ustors (HWCs)						
The below data we	as collated by the Co	The below data was collated by the Coalition for Responsible Waste Incineration	ste Incineration							
Facility Numbers 2	Facility Numbers 2, 5, and 7 are Veolia-Sauget HWCs	I-Sauget HWCs								
This data table is c	comprised of CPT LVI	This data table is comprised of CPT LVM test results from numerous HWCs. The variability of the 3 runs within each test was calculated using the statistical	ous HWCs. The variability	of the 3 runs within each	test was cal	culated using	g the statistic	cal		
functions of Stand	ard Deviation, Relati	functions of Standard Deviation, Relative Standard Deviation, an	and Range. This specific tabl	This specific table shows the sorted results (lowest to highest) for the Relative	s (lowest to	highest) for .	the Relative			
Standard Deviatio	Standard Deviation analysis of the data. (Note:	a. (Note: Sorting by any c	y of the three functions shows comparable results.	vs comparable results. Re	lative Stand	ard Deviatio	Relative Standard Deviation was deemed most	ed most		
appropriate for th	is data set and result	appropriate for this data set and results are shown below.) As can be seen in the table, Veolia HWCs' variabilities in test results are "middle of the pack" when	an be seen in the table, Ve	olia HWCs' variabilities in	test results	are "middle	of the pack"	when		
compared to othe	r HWCs, and thus, Vi	compared to other HWCs, and thus, Veolia's HWCs are not outliers.	ers.							
LVM Results So	orted by Relativ	Sorted by Relative Standard Deviation								
	Comprehensive						Relative			
	Performance	Run 1	Run 2	Run 3		Standard	Standard			
Facility Number	Test (CPT) Year	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	(ug/dscm @ 7% 02)	Average	Deviation	Deviation	Min.	Max.	Range
12	2005	3.063	3.118	2.698	3.0	0.2	7.7	2.7	3.1	0.4
2	2013	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.6	0.2	8.1	2.4	2.8	0.4
14	2011	1.484	1.282	1.282	1.3	0.1	8.6	1.3	1.5	0.2
13	2009	2.252	1.946	1.9	2.0	0.2	9.4	1.9	2.3	0.4
5	2013	8.6	8.9	11	9.5	1.3	13.8	8.6	11.0	2.4
Ч	2001	12.5	16.6	13	14.0	2.2	15.9	12.5	16.6	4.1
17	2009	2.4	2.3	1.7	2.1	0.4	17.7	1.7	2.4	0.7
16	2013	3.21	2.98	2.08	2.8	0.6	21.7	2.1	3.2	1.1
7	2013	12	9.8	7.5	9.8	2.3	23.0	7.5	12.0	4.5
ч	2008	52.6	37.9	34.2	41.6	9.7	23.4	34.2	52.6	18.4
n	2012	7.6	12.7	10.5	10.3	2.6	24.9	7.6	12.7	5.1
თ	2009	20.6	11.4	18.3	16.8	4.8	28.6	11.4	20.6	9.2
15	2013	3.96	2.59	2.37	3.0	0.9	29.0	2.4	4.0	1.6
ø	2012	17.9	11.6	21.7	17.1	5.1	29.9	11.6	21.7	10.1
17	2009	3.3	1.8	2.4	2.5	0.8	30.2	1.8	3.3	1.5
12	2010	3.006	4.717	2.744	3.5	1.1	30.7	2.7	4.7	2.0
ъ	2009	28.6	20.1	15.6	21.4	6.6	30.8	15.6	28.6	13.0
9	2009	2.45	1.67	1.21	1.8	0.6	35.3	1.2	2.5	1.2
7	2009	. 5.2	10.3	13.5	9.7	4.2	43.3	5.2	13.5	8.3
13	2009	13.958	19.057	6.978	13.3	6.1	45.5	7.0	19.1	12.1
10	2005	2.64	1.93	4.94	3.2	1.6	49.6	1.9	4.9	3.0
2	2009	10.2	3.2	7.5	7.0	3.5	50.7	3.2	10.2	7.0
11	2010	11	30.9	12.6	18.2	11.1	60.9	11.0	30.9	19.9
Ч	2013	22.67	17.07	58.23	32.7	22.3	68.4	17.1	58.2	41.2
4	2011	20.02	5.69	7.29	11.0	7.9	71.4	5.7	20.0	14.3