22988 DHAWKINS

RECEIVED ENVIRONMENTAL APPEALS BOARDS. E.P.A. 1 UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROMECUMON APPENCY 2 WASHINGTON, D.CENVIR. APPEALS BOARD 3 4 5 In the Matter of: 6 7 Tri-County Public Airport Site, : CERCLA Section 8 : 106(b) Raytheon Aircraft Company, : Petition No. 06-01 9 Petitioner 10 11 12 13 Washington, D.C. January 17, 2007 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

	Ine above-entitled matter came on for hearing at the
2	Administrative Courtroom, U.S. Environmental
3	Protection Agency, EPA East Building, 1201
4	Constitution Avenue, NW, Room 1152, Washington, D.C.
. 5	on Wednesday, January 17, 2007, at 10:30 a.m.
6	
7	Before: HON. SCOTT T. FULTON,
8	Environmental Appeals Judge
9	
10	Also present: Eurika Durr, Clerk
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

Appearances:

2	J. SCOTT PEMBERTON, Esq.
3	Senior Assistant Regional Counsel
4	Office of Regional Counsel
. 5	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
6	Region 7
7	901 North 5th Street
8	Kansas City, Kansas 66101-2907
9	T 913.551.7276
10	F 913.551.7925
11	E-mail: pemberton.scott@epa.gov
12	
13	
14	BEVERLEE J. ROPER, Esq.
15	Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin, LLE
16	4801 Main Street
17	Suite 1000
18	Kansas City, Missouri 64112
۱ _. 9	T 816.983.8143
20	F 816.983.8080
21	E-mail: broper@blackwellsanders.com
22	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	
3	MOLLY M.A. BROWN, Esq.
4	Senior Counsel
. 5	Raytheon Company
6	870 Winter Street
7	Waltham, Massachusetts 02451-1449
8	T 781.522.3061
9	F 781.522.6465
10	E-mail: molly_brown@raytheon.com
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
L 9	
20	
21	

PROCEEDINGS

(Announcement by the Clerk.)

JUDGE FULTON: Good morning. This morning we will be hearing argument on Region 7's motion to stay in this matter. The argument will proceed in accordance with the Board's order of November 30, 2006. Each side will have 20 minutes for argument. The Region is the moving party, will proceed first, and may reserve time for rebuttal if you wish.

Now before we proceed, could each party state for the record their name and the party that they represent?

MR. PEMBERTON: My name is Scott

Pemberton. I'm in the Office of Regional Counsel
with EPA, Region 7, representing EPA's interest.

JUDGE FULTON: Will anyone else be presenting for the Region this morning? Or just you.

MR. PEMBERTON: Just me.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay, thank you.

MS. ROPER: Good morning. Beverlee Roper for Raytheon Aircraft Company, along with Molly Brown from Raytheon Company.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

JUDGE FULTON: Very well. Welcome. 1 Did you bring the cold weather with you? 2 MS. ROPER: We did. (Laughing) 3 JUDGE FULTON: I was out in Southeast 4 5 Missouri, which is where my parents live, around the 6 holiday time; and it seemed to be pretty balmy there 7 then. MS. ROPER: It was like Florida during the 8 holiday. Not last night and not the night before. 9 JUDGE FULTON: Well, welcome to Washington 10 11 to both of you. So I guess without further ado, we'll 12 start with the Region. I of course have a number of 13 questions for each of you; I think my inclination is 14 15 to hold my questions except for clarifying questions during the course of your arguments; but you should 16 expect that I'll probably have a little litany of 17 things to work through with you when you're finished 18 with your affirmative presentation. 19 2.0 And Mr. Pemberton, will you be asking for time for rebuttal? 21 22 Of our allotted MR. PEMBERTON: Yes.

Please

time, we'd like to reserve five minutes, if rebuttal 1 2 is necessary, and I don't know if it would be. 3 JUDGE FULTON: Okay, very good. 4 proceed. MR. PEMBERTON: May it please the Board. 5 In July 2005, Raytheon filed a lawsuit in Federal 6 7 District Court seeking cost recovery or contribution from the United States Army as a liable party. 8 9 Raytheon also sought a declaratory judgment that the provisions of CERCLA governing the Unilateral 10 11 Administrative Order regime are unconstitutional under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment. 12 On November 17, 2005, the United States 13 filed a motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, for 14 summary judgement in that case. In response to the 15 United States' motion, the District Court issued a 16 memorandum and order on May 26, 2006. 17 As a result of the Court's memorandum and 18 19 order, Raytheon only has contribution claims 20 remaining against the United States; an implied Section 107(a) claim for its UAO cost, and a Section 21

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

113(h) contribution claim for the cost Raytheon has

22

-	Inculted under two Aces.
2	JUDGE FULTON: Were there originally
3	contribution claims running against other parties?
4	MR. PEMBERTON: I do not believe so. It
. 5	is only
6	JUDGE FULTON: The litigation has always
7	been limited to
8	MR. PEMBERTON: The United States.
9	Particularly the Department of Defense, the Army,
10	Army Corps of Engineers.
11	JUDGE FULTON: Why the Corps of Engineers?
12	MR. PEMBERTON: They have been designated
13	to represent the Army in litigation matters.
14	JUDGE FULTON: Okay.
15	MR. PEMBERTON: In January 2006, Raytheon
16	filed a reimbursement petition with the Board to
17	recover the cost it incurred in complying with the
18	UAO. In the reimbursement petition proceeding,
19	Raytheon must show that it is not liable. Because
20	Beech Aircraft, which was purchased by Raytheon in
21	1980, operated a TCE degreaser near the UAO removal
22	area, Raytheon seeks to prove its nonliability by

circumstantially establishing the Army used and disposed of the TCE in the UAO removal area.

The EPA does not have direct evidence that the Army used TCE in degreasers at the site during World War II, and the Army is not part of this proceeding.

Because of the unique fact pattern of this case, and Raytheon's attempt to prove its nonliability by proving the Army is the liable party for the UAO cost, it is our view that the District Court is a better venue for deciding liability issues.

Raytheon is seeking to recover its cost of complying with the UAO before both the Board and the District Court. The issue of Raytheon's liability is a common issue before each forum.

In the District Court, the United States expects to prove Raytheon liable, that Raytheon's share of liability is very large, if not 100 percent; and that Raytheon should get little or no contribution from the United States.

The District Court will need to resolve

the issue of Raytheon's liability in addressing the contribution plans. The EPA has approximately \$2.4 million in unreimbursed response costs, and intends to ask DOJ to file a counterclaim in the District Court action to recover those costs.

The concept of judicial economy applies in this matter.

JUDGE FULTON: Excuse me, can you repeat that about the counterclaim? What's the value of the counterclaim.

MR. PEMBERTON: We have estimated we have approximately \$2.4 million in unreimbursed response costs that are outstanding, and these costs cover all the work that EPA has done at the site from somewhere around 1997 to the present. But that excludes the cost we've incurred in the reimbursement petition, and it also excludes the cost we've incurred in the current litigation in District Court. So there may be other costs.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay. Actually, Mr.

Pemberton, it would be useful for me if you could
talk a little bit about the history of response at

the site. It would be helpful for me to understand better how the Unilateral Administrative Order that's at issue here relates to the broader remedial action at the site.

Could you just review briefly kind of the sequencing of response at the site?

MR. PEMBERTON: I can. Probably early on

-- I was assigned to this site about two or three

years ago -- but early on, EPA -- and I'm not sure

exactly through which avenue, found that there was

contamination in the ground water at the site. This

might have been a result of the Army doing some work

at the site; I'm not real clear on that.

We became aware that there was TCE contamination in the groundwater at the site, and that it covered approximately seven square miles; it's my understanding that it's that large.

and did some more investigations of the site, and discovered that a number of the rural residents that lived in the area -- this is in a rural area -- had contaminated groundwater. At that time I think EPA

. 5

decided to supply bottled water to these individuals.

After that, EPA entered into negotiations with Raytheon, in one of the AOCs that I mentioned, to provide a water treatment system for their houses to treat the water; and Raytheon did those, did enter into that AOC, and did provide that filtration system to those parties.

Subsequent to that, the City of

Harrington, which actually owns the site, the airport

site, applied for and received -- well, they applied

and received a grant to build a water system, piping;

water system to these residents that live in that

rural area. And that recently, within the last six

months I believe, has been completed, and I think

Raytheon is getting ready to remove the treatment

systems from those houses, and they will have

completed work under that particular order.

Also around that time, Raytheon entered into an order, administrative order with the Kansas Department of Natural Resources to conduct an RIFS, with the aim of it eventually that we were going to have to select a remedial action to address the

contaminated groundwater.

By the way, the site was proposed for the NPL, and it has not been finalized on the NPL; it is currently still proposed in the proposed status for the NPL.

Currently Raytheon is conducting the RIFS, although I am not quite certain where in the process the company is with the RIFS; because this again is under state oversight.

JUDGE FULTON: Again, the focus of the RIFS is groundwater remediation?

MR. PEMBERTON: It would focus on groundwater remediation, it would focus on determining source areas of contamination, so if there are source areas, that they can be removed. They would probably focus also on any institutional controls that may be necessary for the site in the future, if that is part of the decision.

JUDGE FULTON: The Kansas administrative order on consent, that was premised on state law?

MR. PEMBERTON: Yes.

JUDGE FULTON: So those are the two pieces

. 5

that precede the one that is before us?

MR. PEMBERTON: That is correct.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay.

MR. PEMBERTON: The Unilateral Order; early on the State of Kansas requested that EPA conduct a removal at a known source area at the site; and that is the area near Hangar One. That was contributing to the contamination of the groundwater. This happens a lot of time where EPA, before remedial actions are selected, that if there are known source areas, that we seek to remove those areas to keep from contributing to the contamination in the groundwater.

originally, Kansas discussed with Raytheon about implementing a removal in that area. They were not able to reach an agreement with Raytheon; and then the State requested that EPA do the EECA, which is the Environmental Engineering Cost Analysis, which is similar to an RIFS in the remedial realm; but that's for the removal part; that we do that and either request Raytheon to implement the action selected in the EECA or conduct the action ourselves.

. 5

And I'm not sure of the timing; the United States did the EECA, and then we requested Raytheon to implement the decision under an order. Raytheon originally responded favorably to consider negotiating with this on the order, but subsequently said that they could not enter into an order as long as the Department of Defense was not part of that

order and doing the work along with Raytheon.

So Raytheon declined to enter into the consent agreement. Thereafter the United States, EPA, issued the UAO to Raytheon in September of 2004. And Raytheon complied with the order, and all the work currently is completed under that particular order.

In the decision regarding whether the stay should be issued in this particular matter, we feel that the concept of judicial economy applies here.

Extensive discovery is currently ongoing in the District Court litigation. In fact, the trial for the District Court is currently scheduled for October 2nd of this year.

JUDGE FULTON: What's the discovery

2.0

schedule?

MR. PEMBERTON: I would like to answer that, my best guess, I think the original discovery schedule was that discovery was supposed to be completed by the end of November of 2006; but there are still depositions going on, I think. I'm not real familiar with what the current status is, but I believe the parties were exchanging, very soon if not already, their privileged logs for privileged information. I don't know if there are outstanding issues yet to be resolved concerning the discovery, though.

JUDGE FULTON: The Justice Department is handling that litigation?

MR. PEMBERTON: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE FULTON: I'll check in with Ms.

Roper about that. She may have some thoughts about where that stands.

MR. PEMBERTON: Thank you.

Currently in the discovery, the United

States is conducting discovery of Raytheon concerning

Raytheon's liability, and Raytheon is currently

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

conducting discovery in an attempt to prove that the Army is liable for the site contamination.

It would be duplicative and wasteful to litigate Raytheon's liability simultaneously in both forums. We therefore before that the Board should stay the reimbursement proceeding until the Court's address Raytheon's liability.

If the Courts do not resolve Raytheon's liability, the stay can be lifted and the petition for reimbursement can proceed. Granting the stay does not prejudice Raytheon's ability recover its UAO cost on the ground that either Raytheon is not liable, or the U.S. is liable, or both. In the Board proceeding, Raytheon is earning interest on its legitimate UAO cost, if it's ultimately determined Raytheon is not liable.

If the court proceeding determines

Raytheon is not liable, the stay can be lifted and a hearing can be held solely on the legitimacy of Raytheon's cost and the amount of interest due. If the court proceeding determines Raytheon is liable to any degree for the contamination address by the UAO,

the reimbursement petition will become moot.

JUDGE FULTON: Let me stop you there. If the Court determines that Raytheon is not liable with respect to this area in Hangar One, will the Court then not award to Raytheon contribution from the Army at that point? Or is it the United States' view that a nonliable party is not eligible for contribution recovery under this implied theory of contribution under Section 107(a)?

MR. PEMBERTON: I believe -- it is EPA's position -- I'm not sure about the United States -- but it is EPA's position that this implied liability decision that was reached by the Court is not correct. However, that is the law in this particular case.

We believe -- we don't know if the Court would award Raytheon its cost if it's determined that Raytheon is not liable. Assuming that they do, we're not sure if the Court would also award the interest that Raytheon would be due under the reimbursement petition.

But in either case, if the Court fails to

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

410-684-2550

. 5

do either one or both of those, they could bring back and we could lift the stay on the reimbursement petition to settle those issues.

JUDGE FULTON: It's theoretically possible if the Court sort of follows through its implied contribution view that if Raytheon establishes that the contamination in this area was entirely the Army's doing, they may get their award from the District Court, which would obviate this proceeding.

MR. PEMBERTON: That would make the most sense.

JUDGE FULTON: As a matter of policy, if you have a party that is not a liable party, is it not more appropriate in some ways that they work their way through the reimbursement process rather than having to maintain an action in District Court as though they were a liable party?

MR. PEMBERTON: Generally speaking, yes.

However, Raytheon initiated the District Court action
to recover its cost; initiated in July 2005, six

months; well before they filed their reimbursement
petition.

Since they just started that process, and they do have the claims -- we feel, and because the issues of liability are central to each proceeding, and because the discovery has gone on so far in that proceeding, we feel that the District Court is a better venue to decide the liability issues.

JUDGE FULTON: Will the Region be prejudiced in any way, apart from litigation expenses, if the Board were to deny the stay request here, and proceed to have this litigation go forward?

MR. PEMBERTON: I do not -- I really don't have an answer as to whether we'd be prejudiced or not. If the Board were to reach a decision that Raytheon was not liable, we're not sure of the effect that would have on the District Court action.

Because liability is still an issue in that particular action, we're not sure what would happen in that particular case; whether the Department of Justice would give full faith and credit to the Board decision, where they have to -- we're not sure.

These are issues that have not come up before. So my answer is we're not sure if we would be prejudiced or

not.

1.5

JUDGE FULTON: Okay.

Did you have anything you wanted to share as part of your affirmative statement?

MR. PEMBERTON: I would like to address the as-applied constitutional challenge, if I may.

In its response to EPA's motion to stay,

Raytheon seems to argue that the District Court will

have jurisdiction to hear its as-applied

constitutional challenge when and only when the Board

denies its reimbursement petition.

Raytheon apparently bases this argument on the District Court's finding in its memorandum and order, dismissing Count 5 of the Complaint, where the Court stated: Because cleanup at the Tri-County Public Airport is not complete, there is no basis for jurisdiction for Count 5 under Section 113(h)(1).

However, the Court also noted that
Raytheon admits that there may be other UAOs
forthcoming. There's no indication the Court would
consider the as-applied constitutional challenge
regardless of what the Board decides with respect to

Raytheon's liability for the subject UAO.

Raytheon's argument is based on the assumption that the District Court will have jurisdiction to decide whether EPA's issuance of the UAO violated due process -- the as-applied challenge -- when and only when the Board denies its petition and Raytheon seeks reimbursement from the District Court.

Raytheon has not supported this jurisdictional argument, and the United States may not concede that it is correct.

JUDGE FULTON: But if, in the wake of -assuming for purposes of argument -- if the Board
ruled adversely to Raytheon on their petition, that
would then open the door for Raytheon to file an
action in District Court under 106(b), right? And
would that then not serve as a possible vehicle for
raising their constitutional concern?

MR. PEMBERTON: They may well attempt to try to raise that concern; I can't say that the United States would not oppose that --

JUDGE FULTON: Well, I'm sure the United

States would oppose it. But what I hear Raytheon
saying is that the only sure path to getting a
constitutional issue ventilated in the courts is
through 106(b), in the wake of the Court's decision
here; and viewed from that vantage point, they would
need to get through this process in order to be able
to pursue that.

MR. PEMBERTON: The Court's decision did not say that they have to complete the reimbursement petition procedure, I don't believe.

JUDGE FULTON: I don't think the Court addressed it.

MR. PEMBERTON: They did not address it, that is correct. They only referenced the fact that the work was not done, which soon after that we issued the notice of completion, we accepted the report, they made some changes, and the work was then complete.

JUDGE FULTON: It's just that they, in the Court's view, the action that's currently pending does not serve as an adequate predicate for the raising of the constitutional and as-applied

1	challenge.
2	Okay. Anything further.
3	MR. PEMBERTON: No, Your Honor, that is
4	all.
. 5	JUDGE FULTON: Okay, I've got a few things
6	for you.
7	The contamination of concern here is at
8	least in Hangar One, and this northwest corner of the
9	Hanger, TCE is the only contaminant of concern?
10	MR. PEMBERTON: That was the contaminant
11	that was driving everything else. There were other
12	contaminants that were there, but they were at a lot
13	lower levels, and it really did not drive the
14	response action.
15	JUDGE FULTON: I notice there is a
16	reference in the materials to these degradation
L 7	byproducts, DCE and vinyl chloride. Is it the case
L 8	that neither of those themselves were at the action
19	level?
20	MR. PEMBERTON: I cannot be sure of
21	exactly what levels we had detected there of those
, ,	narticular constituents. I believe they were

detected, and they may well have been above the 1 levels we selected for the cleanup, which were the 2 3 Kansas soil to the groundwater levels. JUDGE FULTON: But whether they by 4 themselves would have driven the response is less 5 6 clear, I gather. Well, I would not be able 7 MR. PEMBERTON: 8 to answer that. 9 JUDGE FULTON: Do you know whether the DCE and vinyl chloride were present only because they 10 were degradation byproducts of TCE? Or is there any 11 suggestion in the record that these substances had 12 potential origins independent of the TCE? 13 MR. PEMBERTON: To my recollection, there 14 was nothing in the record that would indicate that 1.5 these other two substances were there independently 16 of the TCE. 1.7 JUDGE FULTON: So there's no suggestion 18 that, separate and apart from Raytheon's -- or Beech 19 20 Aircraft's -- possible contribution of TCE that they also contributed DCE or vinyl chloride? 21 I do not believe there is 22 MR. PEMBERTON:

any such indication.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay. Do you know, is there a divisibility issue present here with respect to this UAO? Let me state it slightly differently.

In the Region's view, is this UAO sufficiently discrete in nature that it can be extracted from the overall cleanup and disposed of?

MR. PEMBERTON: Excuse me, could you rephrase that? I want to be sure I have the question correctly.

JUDGE FULTON: I guess a question is whether the UAO can be viewed, or whether the Region would concede that it can be appropriately be viewed as a divisible part of this overall cleanup, such that the liability relating to the UAO really can be viewed in isolation, and addressed in isolation.

MR. PEMBERTON: Not from a site-wide perspective, because we believe that the soils and subsurface soils that were removed contained the TCE contamination that was significantly impacting the groundwater at the site.

We do not know if this was the sole source

. 5

yet of the contamination; but it was a significant contributor to the groundwater contamination. So there is still the issue of liability as it applies site-wide for the groundwater contamination.

JUDGE FULTON: I understand; let me try it a different way.

If the Board were to proceed with the petition, would the Region advance the argument that

If the Board were to proceed with the petition, would the Region advance the argument that we should not reach the merits here because the cleanup at the site should be viewed as an indivisible whole?

MR. PEMBERTON: We may make that argument.

I would have to consult with some other people to see whether we would make that argument.

JUDGE FULTON: Does the Region maintain that there is a genuine issue of fact relating to the source of the TCE in the removal area in Hangar One? Recognizing that Raytheon maintains it's not theirs.

MR. PEMBERTON: They maintain that it's not theirs. We have no information indicating the Army used TCE in the degreasers at the site during World War II.

. 5

JUDGE FULTON: Do you have information that indicates that Raytheon's version of the facts in terms of their contribution is incorrect?

MR. PEMBERTON: Raytheon originally admitted they use a TCE degreaser in the area close to the contamination; they say 200 feet inside the hangar. Since they filed their original 104(e) response, they supplemented that response; and then in their petition they've indicated that there's no way they could have caused that contamination immediately outside Hangar One, that their people put the material in barrels and either were shipped off or maybe dumped somewhere else on the site, but they don't really know.

So there are some factual issues out there that need to be resolved or at least factual assertions that should be resolved in the forum; that's why we feel that the District Court is a better forum to address those issues with the availability of discovery and depositions to conduct the interviews as to the factual assertions that Raytheon has made, as to why they could not have

caused the contamination.

JUDGE FULTON: Your understanding is that there are depositions scheduled or planned that will be, that are viewed as an opportunity for testing Raytheon's factual assertions relating to the specific area?

MR. PEMBERTON: It's my understanding that those have already occurred, and I don't know if there's any more scheduled now or not. Department of Justice is defending the Army, and so I'm not completely aware of their entire deposition schedule.

JUDGE FULTON: Do you think in this proceeding Raytheon would need to prove that the Army was the liable party, or would Raytheon simply need to prove that they were not?

MR. PEMBERTON: I think it's important for their case to prove the Army is liable. Because with that, if we can't prove that the Army used TCE at the site during the period of operation, during World War II, the only other party that could have caused the contamination is Raytheon.

JUDGE FULTON: But if Raytheon is able to

demonstrate, by a preponderance of the evidence, that 1 their TCE activities were contained and confined in a 2 way that would have not allowed for transport to the 3 area addressed by the UAO, would that not be 4 sufficient? 5 Sufficient for --? MR. PEMBERTON: 6 JUDGE FULTON: For recovery. 7 8 MR. PEMBERTON: For recovery. Well, that's the standard, if they can prove that they 9 10 could have not. JUDGE FULTON: Okay, so they don't really 11 have to prove that someone else was responsible for 12 13 it; they just need to show that it wasn't theirs. MR. PEMBERTON: That is correct, but they 14 15 are attempting to prove that in this proceeding as well as the District Court proceeding, as applies to 16 17 site-wide contamination. 18 JUDGE FULTON: A second. Can we assume that the District Court 19 proceeding will necessarily include a review of this 2.0 21 evidentiary issue? It's inconceivable that it could

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

22

not.

MR. PEMBERTON: Yes. The District Court will be dealing with the same issues.

JUDGE FULTON: The idea of the stay is really based on judicial economy and not some legal limitation on the Board's ability to act here, correct?

MR. PEMBERTON: That is correct.

JUDGE FULTON: Does the Region maintain that maintaining a reimbursement petition proceeding while at the same time seeking contribution in District Court are incompatible positions?

MR. PEMBERTON: Yes. We believe that it is, that Raytheon is taking a different legal liability stance in the two proceedings; and the reimbursement petition proceeding, it has to show that it is not liable. And in the District Court proceeding, it only has contribution actions, which by the very nature of contribution means that you are assuming some sort of liability or causation for a set of circumstances.

The Court, when they dismissed Raytheon's 107 action against the United States, said that

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

	hayeneon to was not creat from the compraint
2	whether Raytheon was taking the stance that it was
3	not liable in that proceeding. And the Court issued
4	the memorandum May 26, I believe, of '06, and they
5	gave Raytheon until June 16, I think, to amend the
6	complaint; that it was not a PRP if it wanted to take
7	that stance in the District Court proceeding.
8	Raytheon declined to do that, believing that their
9	contribution action was enough.
10	JUDGE FULTON: Does the Region have the
11	authority to resolve a reimbursement petition without
12	a ruling by this Board?
13	MR. PEMBERTON: I am not sure.
14	JUDGE FULTON: In other words, if the
15	Region were of a mind to settle this dispute, is
16	there any limitation on the Region's authority in
17	that regard?
18	MR. PEMBERTON: Your Honor, I can't say
19	one way or the other if there is a limitation; that's
20	a thought that has not occurred to us, to resolve
21	this through negotiations.
22	JUDGE FULTON: Maybe if you could confer

with your colleagues there. 1 MR. PEMBERTON: Yes. And I will. 2 JUDGE FULTON: Let's see. 3 Okay, I think that's it for now. 4 MR. PEMBERTON: Thank you. 5 JUDGE FULTON: Thank you. 6 Ms. Roper. 7 We thank you very much for MS. ROPER: 8 bringing us before the Board today to discuss this in 9 assisting the Board in making its decision. We know 10 that you have great discretion over what happens 11 here; and hopefully we can clarify a few things. 12 First of all, this as you point out -- I 13 like to call it the Back 40. I don't like calling it 14 Hangar One, because Raytheon was not ordered to clean 15 up anything in Hangar One. In fact, it began six 16 feet to the north of Hangar One, and it included the 17 apron, it included part of the tarmac, and it 18 included the foundation of a building that had been 19 used during World War II but had been removed by the 20

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

So that was the area, and I like to think

time Beech leased the site in November of 1950.

21

22

of the site as a bean pod, and this was a very discrete bean that was created by EPA when it issued its UAO. I don't know if the Board has seen the statement of work, but it was very well outlined and determined and finite, and there were cells and you do this and you do that; there was nothing quantum mechanics about it. I mean, it was very, very mechanical, and the work was done.

Listening to Scott, I believe that EPA completely misunderstands what Raytheon Aircraft Company will show the Board in this reimbursement action. We haven't had an opportunity to present our case yet, but our case is not that someone else is guilty; it has nothing to do with that someone else.

Our case is that Beech Aircraft is not liable. That's the case. And perhaps it would help you if I explained, just in a nutshell, what the evidence will be.

The evidence here -- and it involves the soil excavation, and it involves an excavation in an area where an intense amount of TCE was in the soil, and there were very high levels of vinyl chloride in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the same soil, very high levels of DCE.

So we will prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the current contamination -- actually it's been excavated now -- but the way the contamination sat in the ground as of 2005 proves actually, that Beech Raytheon is not liable. And you may sit there and think "Now, how can they do that?"

Well, the way we do that is this: We know what our operation was at the site from 1950 to 1960. We know that in the first portion of the site, the company was taking old Model 18 trainers that they had made for the Army during World War II, they were breaking them down, and in the northwest corner of the Hangar One building and in the finger building, which was a building that shot off onto the apron to the north, and in the actual area around there, they were performing a paint stripping operation which, by most people's description -- and we have a picture of it -- was a fairly messy operation, and they were using something, a paint stripper on it. something that wasn't clear when they filed their initial 104(e) which they did, in 30 days, as ordered

. 5

by EPA. But this is information that we developed subsequent to that, and we gave it to prior to the UAO being issued.

In 1953, a farmer who was leasing property at the airport complained that his farm well had been somehow compromised by this substance. And so at that time, in 1953, Beech Aircraft, to be a good neighbor, contacted the State of Kansas, the Kansas Department of Health and Sanitation, in both Topeka and Lawrence, Kansas. They had experts come in from the State, they had the experts look at the operation, they took samples of the discharge, they took samples of the well itself.

We have the sample results: high in phenols. This was a Turco 3535 product -- that was the name of it -- and it was very high, it's a phenolic-based compound, and it was very high in phenols. No mention of anything chlorinated in this.

So Raytheon Beech -- it was Beech Aircraft
-- they said "Well, what should we do?" And there's
correspondence having to do with, "Can we inject it?"
You know, we want to inject it. Somebody's doing

that down in Texas; can we do that? What can we do?"

So the fellows from the State looked it over, the experts, and they said "No, we don't like this idea in Kansas of injection. What we want you to do is we want you to redirect your discharge down to Imhof tanks that had actually -- they had been used by the Army during World War II." That's exactly what Beech did.

JUDGE FULTON: What is an Imhof tank?

MS. ROPER: An Imhof tank, it's the type of a tank -- there are three tanks, they're concrete, and it's where the discharge goes into the first of the three tanks, and it's tested for pH and various things; then it goes to the next tank and then the next tank, and then it's discharged. And I'm sorry, I don't know what all the chemistry is there; but that's what they told us to do, and that's what the company did. So the company knows that.

Now in 1955 they completely reworked the Hangar One and Hangar Four areas at the base, and they became a manufacturing facility, very modern, something that they were very, very proud of. In

fact, they were so proud that they made a multipage glossy brochure, with pictures, many of them at Harrington with this operation, where they were making jettisonable fuel tanks, all under government contract. In fact, all of the work that Beech performed at Harrington was under government contract. That's neither here nor there.

But they were very proud of it, and we actually have pictures of both of the degreasers that were used, and the EPA had those pictures, of course, before it filed its UAO, and the picture shows the degreaser in Hangar One being an above-ground degreaser, part of a conversion line, that sat in the southwest corner of Hangar One.

The southwest corner of Hangar One, if there were to be a release from that tank, it would actually go to the southwest corner; there's like a divide in Hangar One; and it would have gone to the other area in the south. That area has been tested by EPA, it's been tested by a number of different entities out there, and there is no TCE contamination in that area.

Therefore, we have hired an expert for this case that we have filed against the United States; we have hired an expert, and the expert was able to review the phenolic based compound, and what it did to this area underneath the apron at the northwest corner of Hangar One, which is the only area at issue in this reimbursement case.

Where Raytheon spent money, it's my understanding under a UAO, that's what the Board has jurisdiction over. So he looked at that, and he has issued a report, he will be deposed next week in the action -- but he has issued a report, it's been peer-reviewed, that says the way the contamination actually had evolved over time with the degradation and how the plume has operated and so forth, proves that when that operation, that paint stripping operation occurred, in 1951 to 1953 to 1954, at that time when the first paint stripping operation began, the TCE had to be in the ground.

We don't care who did it; before the Board we don't care who did it. We care.

JUDGE FULTON: District Court, you care.

. 5

MS. ROPER: Oh, we care big time in the District Court, there's no question about that. But we don't need to reach that here. We don't need to reach any of the Army's behavior here; that will be reserved for the Article 3 court.

What we want to show you, by a preponderance of the evidence -- we would love to show you the file from 1953. We think there's a certain poetic justice that a company that did the right thing in 1953 would have the evidence in 2007 to be able to come before the court and receive reimbursement on this activity.

This in no way prejudices the other case, it in no way has anything -- if this Board were to decide to give Raytheon reimbursement, that relief of course would be taken out of the case. It wouldn't be available; we're not going to double recover. It would not be available.

Here, if you deny Raytheon, and I mean the Board is free to say "Well, on a hot day in 1957 when they were operating that line down in the southwest corner, if they had all the doors open in the hangar,

you know, a molecule of TCE could have wafted out and come over and landed on that apron, and a willy raindrop could have taken it down through the concrete, and therefore, we're not going to give you reimbursement."

That's fine, too. I mean, it's a decision. That's what Raytheon Aircraft Company needs in this case, is a decision by the Board. The Board is equipped to handle the review, the Board is capable of reviewing the expert report and the 1953 file; in fact, all of the information -- this Board is an Environmental Appeals Board. You're familiar with it, we don't have to educate you on it, it should be a relatively cut-and-dried proceeding.

JUDGE FULTON: We would need to do an evidentiary hearing, though, don't you think?

MS. ROPER: I do. I do. I think you would need to do that. We would present to you the evidence that we have, we would present to you -- we would bring Peter Massard in, who wrote the expert report, and allow you to cross-examine him, if you like.

We're more than happy to do that before the Board. This is no way has anything -- when I say it doesn't have anything to do with the District Court case, I don't want to say that we don't have Mr. Massard hired for that case, because we do.

JUDGE FULTON: I would assume the same quantum of proof that you would be advancing before the Board you would also be advancing in District Court.

MS. ROPER: That's correct.

JUDGE FULTON: Just going to be adding some proof to it as well.

MS. ROPER: It's a different standard.

Here we are proving that we're not liable. When the District Court invited us to file the 107 action, we weren't about to do that at that point because we already had the party we wanted in the court on a contribution action. I mean, that's basically what we wanted to do.

We also operated a large degreaser down at Hangar Four. So an expert can say yes, but that 800 parts per billion that was found in soil three feet

2.0

below that actually came from the plume that migrated up through the soil, with off-gassing and so forth.

Or it could be said, maybe some escaped from there and went down -- you know, we don't know.

But we weren't about to get into that argument; and that is a totally irrelevant argument with respect to this Board's action. We're only talking, I believe, with you -- we're only talking about that work that was performed under a UAO, that's all.

You know, it's ironic. It's interesting to look at the behavior of Raytheon Aircraft Company. In 1953 they did what they did, in 1997 they told the truth on their 104(e) response. 2000, they signed up to protect the people, then they put the whole house water treatment systems in, and they've been operating them ever since. The State came to them and said, "We want you to sign up and do an RIFS."

Raytheon Aircraft Company has completely cooperated in every sense of the word at this site, knowing that it probably wasn't liable, but it did it

anyway until the Agency, the EPA, after having been given the evidence that I just described, absent the expert report, Raytheon Aircraft Company said "No. We can't do that work in the North 40."

JUDGE FULTON: Does Raytheon maintain that

JUDGE FULTON: Does Raytheon maintain that it has no liability for this site at all? Is that the position that you're taking in the District Court litigation?

MS. ROPER: Yes. We will say that our contribution should be next to zero, and we'll maintain that. Whether or not the Court agrees with that, we'll have to wait and see. But that's what we are maintaining at this point, yes. That's not for the Board to decide.

We are definitely maintaining that the area north of Hangar One that was ordered excavated - not a molecule. That's been our position, we want to bring it to you. That's all we're asking for.

We can say that for one thing, the Board should not stay this proceeding. There is no chance of conflicting results. If the Board denies Raytheon's petition, then we will take it before the

DHAWKINS

Court and yes, we will try to bring back our asapplied constitutional challenge.

You see what happened here. I mean, the timing of everything is very interesting when you think about the Cooper versus Aviol, where it was in time when this order was issued and when the actual opinion came out by the Supreme Court two and a half months after this UAO issued.

What can happen here and what was basically, it was a superhighway provided by the Solicitor General's amicus brief in the Aviol case to the Supreme Court, is that at any of these sites where the United States is a potentially responsible party, all EPA has to do is issue a UAO to a private party; that's it.

Now, that's not before the Board, but it's an interesting sidelight. And this Board, making a determination one way or the other, if you make the determination that Raytheon deserves reimbursement, that will be fine, that will be removed from any relief sought in the District Court; those funds will be just taken off the table. And that's final agency

1	action, as I understand from the brief of the EPA,
2	and I guess that's what the EPA would say at that
3	point. One time when unitary executive might
4	help.
. 5	But at any rate, that would be fine. If
6	this Board denies Raytheon's petition, Raytheon will
. 7	live with that, and it will live with it in the
8	District Court.
9	The one thing that this Board should not
10	do is issue the stay. The other thing the Board
11	should not do is deny the stay and then sit on the
12	evidentiary hearing and a decision.
13	JUDGE FULTON: How would you be prejudiced
14	by the issuance of the stay?
15	MS. ROPER: We would be prejudiced because
16	we would never be able to argue the reimbursement
17	case before the Board.
18	JUDGE FULTON: But if you're correct,
19	you'll get your recovery in District Court, right?
20	MS. ROPER: If we're correct, we will get
21	a recovery from the Corps of Engineers in District

Court. In the District Court matter, that will be

22

. 5

for the entire bean pod.

JUDGE FULTON: Is that not arguably a more appropriate place for the recovery to come from than the Superfund?

MS. ROPER: Not in this case. In this case, if you look at the evidence that -- it's not the way the system is set up, and it's certainly, if we're talking equity and fairness. No, it would be totally appropriate for it to come from the Superfund in this case.

JUDGE FULTON: Even though you maintain that the responsible party here, the responsible actor was the Army?

MS. ROPER: That's a federal family issue.
We're a private party, a private employer. We don't
care which pot it comes out of; if the Solicitor
General wants to work that out among the various
agencies and the Office of Management and Budget,
that's the government's prerogative.

In this case, the law has been set up and it says: If you're issued an order, and you perform the work, and the work is certified complete, you

	have an opportunity at that point to go in before the
2	Environmental Appeals Board and prove, by a
3	preponderance of the evidence, that you weren't
4	liable.
5	We only ask for that to be done.
6	Any other questions?
7	JUDGE FULTON: I would imagine. Let me
8	look through my list here.
9	When we talk about Hangar One, really
10	we're talking about an interior structure. Hangar
11	One proper is a building, I assume?
12	MS. ROPER: That's correct, and it's one
13	of those very large buildings that could house two or
14	three B-29s.
15	JUDGE FULTON: Huge, right.
16	MS. ROPER: But that's not the area we're
L 7	talking about.
8 1	JUDGE FULTON: The area is just outside
L 9	the hanger, is what you're saying.
20	MS. ROPER: That's correct. That's right.
21	JUDGE FULTON: Do you know whether the
22	action levels for DCE and vinyl chloride were met

I mean, if TCE wasn't part of the equation, here? 1 would there still have been a cleanup? 2 MS. ROPER: Yes, definitely. 3 JUDGE FULTON: There still would have 4 been, okay. . 5 MS. ROPER: Vinyl chloride, I've heard the 6 term screaming. What you had there was a bioreactor. 7 You had a tremendous, just a tremendous release and 8 discharge of trichloroethylene. A massive release 9 under there -- I mean, it really -- I've heard it 10 described as the most contaminated site in Kansas, et 11 cetera. 12 You had a massive release of 13 trichloroethylene in this location. And then since 14 then you've had this injection of phenol, and it's 15 just been sitting there for 50 years, bioreacting. 16 So the levels of vinyl chloride are quite high, or 17 18 were high. There's also quite a bit of contamination. 19 I hate bringing this up -- that remains under Hangar 20 That bloomed out. 21 One. JUDGE FULTON: Any other parties involved

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

22

in the litigation?

MS. ROPER: No.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay.

MS. ROPER: We could have added parties, but it makes no sense to do that because the contamination had to be in the ground. There was a farmer there until 1942, and after Pearl Harbor, the War Department bought the property and put in its huge operation.

Between the time that World War II was over, and they quitclaimed the deed to the City of Harrington, and Beech Aircraft signing -- there was a chicken farm and a few other non-TCE related type operations there.

JUDGE FULTON: You would agree, I guess, that Raytheon's view of the facts here is still being tested through the discovery process in District Court?

MS. ROPER: Yes, and let me fill you in on that. Yes, it is being tested. The discovery has closed, but for expert witness depositions. We are also taking a deposition this week of Burns &

McDonnell. We have a 30(b)(6) of that company, because they were the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' consultant that initially went out and performed the initial site investigation.

So we have found evidence of various things that aren't really at issue here, but would be very at issue in the District Court case. So we'll be taking that deposition this week.

Next week the government will be deposing our expert, and then we will be receiving an expert witness report from the government; we'll have 60 days to review, I believe it is; and I believe all discovery will be completed by the end of October.

But right now that's where we are; fact discovery is closed.

JUDGE FULTON: Okay.

You don't have any sort of smoking gun admission through which you could argue that the Region has conceded your view of the facts at this point?

MS. ROPER: Well, no. We feel that we have tremendous evidence of the Army Corps of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Engineers' use of TCE in that very area, and we believe that it's a complete misstatement that there is no evidence that the Army Corps of Engineers or the Army Air Force used TCE at that very location.

We literally have videotape of a deposition where the colonel who was in charge of the maintenance department there for many years admits that they had a vapor degreaser and cleaned spark plugs in this building that Raytheon Aircraft Company was ordered to remove its foundation.

The other thing, too, I would like to remind the Court, and that is that this isn't a small matter, this UAO. It cost the company over \$2.5 million to do this, plus its internal resources that you can't really quantify.

Anyway, we have that. And then there was a question: "Well, you don't have the technical order for the degreaser, if spark plugs were in fact being degreased." We tracked the technical order down to a location in Suitland, Maryland, and obtaining that was tricky. We couldn't get it from the government under FOIA; the government had never

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

410-684-2550

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1.2

1.3

1.4

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

turned this over. They finally did in a 104(e), but we had that -- which says that: If you were operating a degreaser, cleaning spark plugs in World War II, you had to use TCE. You had no alternative, none."

And that was the spark plug cleaning building. We can show you, that's what it says right on the -- you know. That's one operation. We also have testimony from a man who was there who said that there was a degreaser that operated in the northwest corner inside the hangar. Of course that's not that germane to this action, but it does show TCE in the location. Really, none of it's germane to this action. We're just going to show you that when we showed up, it was in the ground.

JUDGE FULTON: What matters most to Raytheon here is the constitutional challenge or the money?

MS. ROPER: Both. Both.

I mean, the money, if the Court were to reimburse the money, I'm not sure what that would do with the constitutional challenge, to be quite frank.

Because the way we get before the Court on the

constitutional challenge is because of the UAO. 1 least that's the Court's decision now. We also filed 2 a pattern and practice, but that was dismissed. 3 This as-applied challenge, however, would 4 go forward. I'm fairly confident under the law it 5 would go forward, understanding that the EPA would 6 7 arque against it. JUDGE FULTON: Okay. Very good. 8 Thank you. 9 10 MS. ROPER: Thank you. 11 JUDGE FULTON: Mr. Pemberton, would you 12 like to offer a final word here? 13 MR. PEMBERTON: Yes, Your Honor. I just 14 had some information that was given to me about your 15 question about whether EPA had the authority to settle. 16 Apparently we can settle a 106(b) 17 petition, and what I'm told is that it would have to 18 19 be with your approval. And it's unclear what would happen if the Region wanted to go forward with the 20 settlement without your approval. 21 22 JUDGE FULTON: Thank you.

MR. PEMBERTON: I think that's the only thing that I would have.

JUDGE FULTON: All right. Thank you.

Just a question for both of the parties.

Have there been any settlement discussions relating
to this discrete element of the overall case?

MR. PEMBERTON: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE FULTON: Does that, in the view of either party, offer any potential here enough that it's worth considering? What you have here is a, it's a case for money; I understand that there's a constitutional issue lurking here, too, and particularly if ultimately disappointed by the outcome, Raytheon will certainly be interested in pursuing its constitutional claim. Of course if you're successful, there will be no constitutional claim.

So it's really, at bottom, about money.

And just a question for the parties, whether there would be any utility irrespective of how the Board deals with the stay motion, in designating a settlement judge to examine the question of

settlement with the parties.

If this is of no interest to either of you, then obviously it's not something that we can impose on you. But we'd be willing to offer that assistance if it had any potential utility here.

MR. PEMBERTON: Your Honor, Beverlee mentioned a couple things in regards to her expert's report that were quite interesting, and I'd like to have the opportunity to review this report and discuss this report with my technical people before we would say that there's no chance for settlement.

MS. ROPER: That sounds promising.

JUDGE FULTON: Well, let's let that offer

14 | -

MR. PEMBERTON: We'd like to review that, just to see what it says.

MS. ROPER: The United States has the report.

MR. PEMBERTON: They did send it to us late last week, but I've not had a chance to even start to review it. I think it's supposed to be distributed to our technical people last week, but

their response is not due until the end of this week. 1 The report was submitted in MS. ROPER: 2 3 August. JUDGE FULTON: Well, we'll let that, the 5 offer by the Board to designate a settlement judge for this stand; you can consider it further and let 6 7 us know if this is something you would care to 8 pursue. We would never say we are not 9 MS. ROPER: interested in settlement discussions. But of course 10 I can't reiterate enough today to you that the main 11 thing we want to do is move forward. 12 I think that moving forward with the 13 actual petition itself in an evidentiary hearing will 14 cause people to come up to speed on it, and it will 15 enhance the opportunities for settlement. 16 JUDGE FULTON: Understood. 17 Okay, well, thank you all very much for 18 your presence here today and for your thoughtful 19 presentations, and we'll be taking this under 20 advisement, and you'll be hearing from us shortly on 21 22 the stay motion, I'm certain.

1		(Announceme	nt :	by the	Clerk	.)		
2		(Whereupon,	at	11:45	a.m.,	the	hearing	
3	concluded.)							
4								
. 5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

800-336-6646

410-684-2550

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

i, Daniel W. Hawkins, Shorthand Teporter,
do hereby certify that the record of proceedings
appearing in the foregoing pages was taken by me in
shorthand and this transcript typed under my
direction; that said transcript is a true record of
the proceedings; that I am neither counsel for,
related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the
action in which these proceedings were held; and,
further, that I am not a relative or employee of any
attorney or counsel retained by the parties hereto,
nor financially or otherwise interested in the
outcome of the action.

Shorthand Reporter

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage 800-336-6646

410-684-2550

	<u> </u>	T	T	1 ugo o
A	agrees 44:11	38:22 39:5,7	base 37:20	41:20 44:18 45:1
ability 17:11 31:5	aim 12:21	44:16 48:16,18	based 22:2 31:4	bringing 33:9
able 14:16 23:6	Air 52:4	52:1	39:4	49:20
25:7 29:22 39:4	Aircraft 1:9 5:21	areas 13:14,15	bases 21:12	broader 11:3
40:11 46:16	8:20 34:10,15	14:11,11 37:20	basically 42:18	brochure 38:2
above-entitled 2:1	36:7,19 41:7	arguably 47:2	45:10	broper@blackwe
above-ground	43:12,19,20 44:3	argue 21:8 46:16	basis 21:16	3:21
38:12	50:12 52:9	51:18 54:7	bean 34:1,2 47:1	Brown 4:3 5:21
absent 44:2	Aircraft's 25:20	argument 5:4,5,7	Beech 8:20 25:19	Budget 47:18
accepted 23:16	airport 1:7 12:9	21:12 22:2,10,13	33:21 34:15 35:6	build 12:11
act 31:5	21:16 36:5	27:8,12,14 43:6,6	36:7,19,19 37:8	building 2:3 33:19
action 10:5 11:3	allotted 6:22	arguments 6:16	38:5 50:12	35:14,14,15
12:22 14:21,22	allow 41:21	Army 7:8 8:9,10,13	began 33:16 39:18	48:11 52:9 53:6
19:16,19 20:15	allowed 30:3	9:1,4,5,9 11:12	behavior 40:4	buildings 48:13
20:17 22:16	alternative 7:14	17:2 18:5 27:21	43:12	Burns 50:22
23:20 24:14,18	53:4	29:10,13,17,18	believe 8:4 12:14	byproducts 24:17
31:22 32:9 34:12	amend 32:5	35:12 37:7 47:13	16:8 18:10,16	25:11
39:12 42:15,18	Amendment 7:12	51:2,22 52:3,4	23:10 24:22	B-29s 48:14
43:7 46:1 48:22	amicus 45:11	Army's 19:8 40:4	25:22 26:18	
53:11,13 59:9,13	amount 17:20	Article 40:5	31:12 32:4 34:9	C
actions 14:10 31:17	34:21	asking 6:20 44:18	43:8 51:12,12	C 5:1
activities 30:2	Analysis 14:18	assertions 28:17,21	52:2	call 33:14
activities 30.2	Announcement 5:2	29:5	believing 32:8	calling 33:14
actor 47:13	58:1	assigned 11:8	best 16:3	capable 41:10
actual 35:16 45:6	answer 16:2 20:12	assistance 56:5	better 9:11 11:2	care 39:20,21,21,22
57:14	20:22 25:8	Assistant 3:3	20:6 28:19	40:1 47:16 57:7
added 50:4	anyway 44:1 52:16	assisting 33:10	Beverlee 3:14 5:20	case 7:15 9:8 18:15
adding 42:11	AOC 12:6	assume 30:19 42:6	56:6	18:22 20:18
address 12:22 17:7	AOCs 8:1 12:3	48:11	big 40:1	24:17 29:17
17:22 21:5 23:13	apart 20:8 25:19	assuming 18:18	billion 42:22	34:13,13,15,16
28:19	apparently 21:12	22:13 31:19	bioreacting 49:16	39:2,7 40:13,16
addressed 23:12	54:17	assumption 22:3	bioreactor 49:7	41:8 42:4,5 45:11
26:16 30:4	Appeals 1:1 2:8	as-applied 21:6,9	bit 10:22 49:19	46:17 47:5,6,10
addressing 10:1	41:12 48:2	21:21 22:5 23:22	Blackwell 3:15	47:20 51:7 55:6
adequate 23:21	Appearances 3:1	54:4	bloomed 49:21	55:11
administrative 2:2	4:1	attempt 9:8 17:1	Board 1:1 7:5 8:16	causation 31:19
7:11 11:2 12:19	appearing 59:4	22:19	9:14 17:5,13 20:9	cause 57:15
13:19	applied 12:10,10	attempting 30:15	20:13,19 21:10	caused 28:10 29:1
admission 51:18	45:2	attorney 59:11	21:22 22:6,13	29:20
admits 21:19 52:7	applies 10:6 15:17	August 57:3	27:7 32:12 33:9	cells 34:5
admitted 28:5	27:3 30:16	authority 32:11,16	33:10 34:3,11	central 20:3
ado 6:12	appropriate 19:14	54:15	39:9,20 40:14,20	CERCLA 1:7 7:10
advance 27:8	47:3,9	availability 28:20	41:8,9,9,11,12	certain 13:7 40:9
advancing 42:7,8	appropriately	available 40:17,18	42:2,8 44:14,19	57:22
adversely 22:14	26:13	avenue 2:4 11:10	44:21 45:16,17	certainly 47:7
advisement 57:21	approval 54:19,21	Aviol 45:5,11	46:6,9,10,17 48:2	55:14
affirmative 6:19	approximately	award 18:5,17,19	55:20 57:5	CERTIFICATE
21:4	10:2,12 11:16	19:8	Board's 5:6 31:5	59:1
agencies 47:18	apron 33:18 35:15	aware 11:14 29:11	43:7	certified 47:22
agency 1:2 2:3 3:5	39:5 41:2	a.m 2:5 58:2	bottled 12:1	certify 59:3
44:1 45:22	area 8:22 9:2 11:21		bottom 55:18	cetera 49:12
ago 11:9	11:21 12:13 14:6	<u>B</u>	bought 50:8	challenge 21:6,10
agree 50:15	14:7,15 18:4 19:7	back 19:1 33:14	breaking 35:13	21:21 22:5 24:1
agreement 14:16	27:17 28:5 29:6	45:1	brief 45:11 46:1	45:2 53:16,21
15:10	30:4 33:22 34:21	balmy 6:6	briefly 11:5	54:1,4
	35:16 38:19,19	barrels 28:12	bring 6:2 19:1	chance 44:20 56:11
			We though two states the second of the law of the second of the	

				- Fage 0
56:20	completely 29:11	27:1,2,4 28:6,10	19:5,9,16,19 20:5	49:3
changes 23:17	34:10 37:19	29:1,21 30:17	20:15 21:8,15,18	degradation 24:16
charge 52:6	43:20	35:3,5 38:21	21:20 22:3,8,16	25:11 39:14
check 16:16	completion 23:16	39:13 49:19 50:6	23:11 28:18	degreased 52:19
chemistry 37:16	complied 15:12	Continued 4:1	30:16,19 31:1,11	degreaser 8:21
chicken 50:13	complying 8:17	contract 38:5,7	31:16,21 32:3,7	28:5 38:12,13
chloride 24:17	9:14	contributed 25:21	39:22 40:2,5,11	42:20 52:8,18
25:10,21 34:22	compound 36:17	contributing 14:8	42:4,9,15,17 44:7	53:3,9
48:22 49:6,17	39:4	14:12	44:11 45:1,7,12	degreasers 9:4
chlorinated 36:18	compromised 36:6	contribution 7:7,19	45:21 46:8,19,22	27:21 38:9
circumstances	concede 22:11	7:22 8:3 9:21	46:22 50:18 51:7	degree 17:22
31:20	26:13	10:2 18:5,7,8	52:12 53:19,22	demonstrate 30:1
circumstantially	conceded 51:19	19:6 25:20 28:3	Courtroom 2:2	denies 21:11 22:6
9:1	concept 10:6 15:17	31:10,17,18 32:9	courts 17:8 23:3	44:21 46:6
City 3:8,18 12:8	concern 22:18,20	42:18 44:10	Court's 7:18 17:6	deny 20:9 40:19
50:11	24:7,9	contributor 27:2	21:13 23:4,8,20	46:11
claim 7:21,22 55:15	concerning 16:11	controls 13:17	54:2	department 8:9
55:17	16:21	conversion 38:13	cover 10:13	12:20 15:7 16:13
claims 7:19 8:3	concluded 58:3	Cooper 45:5	covered 11:16	20:18 29:9 36:9
20:2	concrete 37:11	cooperated 43:21	created 34:2	50:8 52:7
clarify 33:12	41:4	corner 24:8 35:13	credit 20:19	deposed 39:11
clarifying 6:15	conduct 12:20 14:6	38:14,15,17 39:6	cross-examine	deposing 51:9
clause 7:12	14:22 28:20	40:22 53:10	41:21	deposition 29:11
clean 33:15	conducting 13:6	Corps 8:10,11	current 10:18 16:7	50:22 51:8 52:6
cleaned 52:8	16:21 17:1	46:21 51:2,22	35:3	depositions 16:6
cleaning 53:3,5	confer 32:22	52:3	currently 13:4,6	28:20 29:3 50:21
cleanup 21:15 25:2	confident 54:5	correct 14:2 18:14	15:13,18,20	described 44:2
26:7,14 27:10	confined 30:2	22:11 23:14	16:20,22 23:20	49:11
49:2	conflicting 44:21	30:14 31:6,7	cut-and-dried	description 35:18
clear 11:13 25:6	consent 13:20	42:10 46:18,20	41:14	deserves 45:19
32:1 35:21	15:10	48:12,20	41.14	designate 57:5
Clerk 2:10 5:2 58:1	consider 15:4 21:21	correctly 26:10		designated 8:12
close 28:5	57:6	correspondence	D 5:1	designating 55:21
closed 50:21 51:15	considering 55:10	36:21	Daniel 59:2	detected 24:21 25:1
cold 6:2	constituents 24:22	cost 7:7,21,22 8:17	day 40:20	determination
colleagues 33:1	Constitution 2:4	9:10,13 10:16,17	days 35:22 51:12	45:18,19
colonel 52:6	constitutional 21:6	14:18 17:12,15	DCE 24:17 25:9,21	determined 17:15
come 20:21 36:10	21:10,21 22:18	17:20 18:17	35:1 48:22	18:17 34:5
	~1.10,~1 44.10	11.40 TO:T1		
40:11 41:2 47:3 9	23:3.22.45:2	19:20 52:13	dealing 31:2	
40:11 41:2 47:3,9 57:15	23:3,22 45:2 53:16.21 54:1	19:20 52:13 costs 10:3.5.13.13	dealing 31:2 deals 55:21	determines 17:17
57:15	53:16,21 54:1	costs 10:3,5,13,13	deals 55:21	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3
57:15 comes 47:16	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6 complete 21:16	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated 11:22 13:1 49:11	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10 court 7:7,16 9:11	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9 declined 15:9 32:8	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9 discharged 37:15
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6 complete 21:16 23:9,18 47:22	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated 11:22 13:1 49:11 contamination	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10 court 7:7,16 9:11 9:15,17,22 10:5	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9 declined 15:9 32:8 deed 50:11	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9 discharged 37:15 discovered 11:20
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6 complete 21:16 23:9,18 47:22 52:2	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated 11:22 13:1 49:11 contamination 11:11,15 13:14	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10 court 7:7,16 9:11 9:15,17,22 10:5 10:18 15:19,20	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9 declined 15:9 32:8 deed 50:11 defending 29:10	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9 discharged 37:15 discovered 11:20 discovery 15:18,22
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6 complete 21:16 23:9,18 47:22 52:2 completed 12:14,17	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated 11:22 13:1 49:11 contamination 11:11,15 13:14 14:8,12 17:2,22	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10 court 7:7,16 9:11 9:15,17,22 10:5 10:18 15:19,20 17:17,21 18:3,4	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9 declined 15:9 32:8 deed 50:11 defending 29:10 Defense 8:9 15:7	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9 discharged 37:15 discovered 11:20 discovery 15:18,22 16:3,4,11,20,21
57:15 comes 47:16 common 9:16 company 1:9 4:5 5:21,22 13:8 34:11 35:11 37:18,18 40:9 41:7 43:12,20 44:3 51:1 52:9,13 complained 36:5 complaint 21:14 32:1,6 complete 21:16 23:9,18 47:22 52:2	53:16,21 54:1 55:12,15,16 consult 27:13 consultant 51:3 contacted 36:8 contained 26:19 30:2 contaminant 24:9 24:10 contaminants 24:12 contaminated 11:22 13:1 49:11 contamination 11:11,15 13:14	costs 10:3,5,13,13 10:19 counsel 3:3,4 4:4 5:14 59:7,11 Count 21:14,17 counterclaim 10:4 10:9,10 couple 56:7 course 6:13,16 38:10 40:16 53:10 55:15 57:10 court 7:7,16 9:11 9:15,17,22 10:5 10:18 15:19,20	deals 55:21 decide 20:6 22:4 40:15 44:14 decided 12:1 decides 21:22 deciding 9:11 decision 13:18 15:3 15:15 18:13 20:13,20 23:4,8 33:10 41:7,8 46:12 54:2 declaratory 7:9 declined 15:9 32:8 deed 50:11 defending 29:10	determines 17:17 17:21 18:3 determining 13:14 developed 36:1 different 27:6 31:13 38:20 42:13 differently 26:4 direct 9:3 direction 59:6 disappointed 55:13 discharge 36:12 37:5,12 49:9 discharged 37:15 discovered 11:20 discovery 15:18,22

				Page 6
50:17,20 51:13	15:2	44:16	38:11 39:2 54:2	44:5 46:13,18
51:14	effect 20:14	excavation 34:20	fill 50:19	47:2,11 48:7,15
discrete 26:6 34:2	either 14:21 17:12	34:20	filtration 12:6	48:18,21 49:4,22
55:6	18:22 19:1 28:12	exchanging 16:8	final 45:22 54:12	50:3,15 51:16
discretion 33:11		excludes 10:15,17		1
•	55:9 56:2	,	finalized 13:3	53:15 54:8,11,22
discuss 33:9 56:10	element 55:6	Excuse 10:8 26:8	finally 53:1	55:3,8 56:13 57:4
discussed 14:14	eligible 18:7	executive 46:3	financially 59:12	57:17
discussions 55:5	employed 59:8	expect 6:17	finding 21:13	funds 45:21
57:10	employee 59:10	expects 9:18	fine 41:6 45:20	further 6:12 24:2
dismiss 7:14	employer 47:15	expenses 20:9	46:5	57:6 59:10
dismissed 31:21	Engineering 14:18	expert 39:1,3,3	finger 35:14	future 13:18
54:3	Engineers 8:10,11	41:10,20 42:21	finished 6:18	
dismissing 21:14	46:21 51:2 52:1,3	44:3 50:21 51:10	finite 34:5	G
disposed 9:2 26:7	enhance 57:16	51:10	first 5:8 33:13	G 5:1
dispute 32:15	enter 12:5 15:6,9	experts 36:10,11	35:10 37:12	gather 25:6
distributed 56:22	entered 12:2,18	37:3	39:18	General 47:17
District 7:7,16 9:10	entire 29:11 47:1	expert's 56:7	five 7:1	Generally 19:18
9:15,17,22 10:5	entirely 19:7	explained 34:17	Florida 6:8	General's 45:11
10:18 15:19,20	entities 38:21	Extensive 15:18	focus 13:10,12,13	genuine 27:16
19:9,16,19 20:5	Environmental 1:1	extracted 26:7	13:16	germane 53:11,12
20:15 21:8,13	1:2 2:2,8 3:5	E-mail 3:11,21	FOIA 52:22	getting 12:15 23:2
22:3,7,16 28:18	14:18 41:12 48:2	4:10	follows 19:5	give 20:19 40:15
30:16,19 31:1,11	EPA 2:3 5:15 9:3	"""	Force 52:4	41:4
31:16 32:7 39:22	10:2,14 11:9,18	F	foregoing 59:4	given 44:2 54:14
40:2 42:3,8,15	11:22 12:2 14:5,9	F 3:10,20 4:9	forth 39:15 43:2	glossy 38:2
44:7 45:21 46:8	14:17 15:11 34:2	facility 37:21	forthcoming 21:20	go 20:10 38:17 48:1
46:19,21,22	34:9 36:1 38:10	fact 9:7 15:19	forum 9:16 28:17	54:5,6,20
50:17 51:7	38:20 44:1 45:14	23:14 27:16	28:19	goes 37:12,14
		33:16 38:1,5	forums 17:5	going 12:21 16:6
divide 38:18	46:1,2 54:6,15			
divisibility 26:3	EPA's 5:15 18:10	41:11 51:14	forward 20:10 54:5	40:17 41:4 42:11
divisible 26:14	18:12 21:7 22:4	52:18	54:6,20 57:12,13	53:13
doing 11:12 15:8	equation 49:1	facts 28:2 50:16	found 11:10 42:22	good 5:3,20 7:3
19:8 36:22	equipped 41:9	51:19	51:5	36:7 54:8
DOJ 10:4	equity 47:8	factual 28:15,16,21	foundation 33:19	governing 7:10
door 22:15	escaped 43:3	29:5	52:10	government 38:4,6
doors 40:22	Esq 3:2,14 4:3	fails 18:22	Four 37:20 42:21	51:9,11 52:22,22
double 40:17	establishes 19:6	fairly 35:19 54:5	frank 53:21	government's
drive 24:13	establishing 9:1	fairness 47:8	free 40:20	47:19
driven 25:5	estimated 10:11	faith 20:19	fuel 38:4	grant 12:11
driving 24:11	et 49:11	familiar 16:7 41:12	full 20:19	Granting 17:10
due 7:12 17:20	Eurika 2:10	family 47:14	FULTON 2:7 5:3	great 33:11
18:20 22:5 57:1	evaluations 11:18	far 20:4	5:16,19 6:1,4,10	ground 11:11
dumped 28:13	eventually 12:21	farm 36:5 50:13	7:3 8:2,6,11,14	17:12 35:5 39:19
duplicative 17:3	evidence 9:3 30:1	farmer 36:4 50:7	10:8,20 13:10,19	50:6 53:14
Durr 2:10	34:18,19 35:3	favorably 15:4	13:22 14:3 15:22	groundwater 11:15
D.C 1:3,13 2:4	40:7,10 41:19	federal 7:6 47:14	16:13,16 18:2	11:22 13:1,11,13
	44:2 47:6 48:3	feel 15:16 20:2,5	19:4,12 20:7 21:2	14:8,13 25:3
E	51:5,22 52:3	28:18 51:21	22:12,22 23:11	26:21 27:2,4
E 5:1,1	evidentiary 30:21	feet 28:6 33:17	23:19 24:5,15	guess 6:12 16:3
early 11:7,9 14:5	41:16 46:12	42:22	25:4,9,18 26:2,11	26:11 46:2 50:15
earning 17:14	57:14	fellows 37:2	27:5,15 28:1 29:2	guilty 34:14
East 2:3	evolved 39:14	Fifth 7:12	29:12,22 30:7,11	gun 51:17
economy 10:6	exactly 11:10 24:21	file 10:4 22:15 40:8	30:18 31:3,8	l
15:17 31:4	37:8	41:11 42:15	32:10,14,22 33:3	H
educate 41:13	examine 55:22	filed 7:6,14 8:16	33:6 37:9 39:22	half 45:7
EECA 14:17,22	excavated 35:4	19:21 28:7 35:21	41:15 42:6,11	handle 41:9
the William Committee of the Committee o	A TELEVISION OF THE PROPERTY O	CONTROL STATE OF THE STATE OF T	The same of the sa	A Part of The Control

handling 16:14	immediately 28:11	invited 42:15	jurisdiction 21:9	20:14 29:14,17
hangar 14:7 18:4	impacting 26:20	involved 49:22	21:17 22:4 39:10	31:16 32:3 34:16
24:8 27:17 28:7	implement 14:21	involves 34:19,20	jurisdictional	35:6 42:14 43:22
28:11 33:15,16	15:3	ironic 43:11	22:10	48:4
33:17 35:14	implementing	irrelevant 43:6	justice 16:13 20:19	lift 19:2
37:20,20 38:12	14:15	irrespective 55:20	29:10 40:9	lifted 17:9,18
38:14,15,18 39:6	implied 7:20 18:8	isolation 26:16,16		limitation 31:5
40:22 42:21	18:12 19:5	issuance 22:4 46:14	K	32:16,19
44:16 48:9,10	important 29:16	issue 9:15,16 10:1	Kansas 3:8,8,18	limited 8:7
49:20 53:10	impose 56:4	11:3 20:16 23:3	12:19 13:19 14:5	line 38:13 40:21
hanger 24:9 48:19	inclination 6:14	26:3 27:3,16	14:14 25:3 36:8,8	list 48:8
happen 20:17 45:9	include 30:20	30:21 39:7 45:14	36:10 37:4 49:11	Listening 34:9
54:20	included 33:17,18	46:10 47:14 51:6	keep 14:11	litany 6:17
happened 45:3	33:19	51:7 55:12	kind 11:5	literally 52:5
happens 14:9 33:11	incompatible 31:11	issued 7:16 15:11	know 7:2 16:10	litigate 17:4
happy 42:1	inconceivable	15:16 23:16 32:3	18:16 25:9 26:2	litigation 8:6,13
Harbor 50:7	30:21	34:2 36:3 39:11	26:22 28:14 29:8	10:18 15:19
Harrington 12:9	incorrect 28:3	39:12 45:6,8	33:10 34:3 35:8	16:14 20:8,10
38:3,6 50:12	incurred 8:1,17	47:21	35:10 36:22	44:8 50:1
hate 49:20	10:16,17	issues 9:12 16:11	37:16 41:1 43:4,4	little 6:17 9:20
Hawkins 59:2	independent 25:13	19:3 20:3,6,21	43:11 48:21 53:7	10:22
Health 36:9	independently	28:15,19 31:2	57:7	live 6:5 12:12 46:7
hear 21:9 23:1	25:16		knowing 43:22	46:7
heard 49:6,10	indicate 25:15	J	known 14:6,10	lived 11:21
hearing 2:1 5:4	indicated 28:9	J 3:2,14	knows 37:18	LLP 3:15
17:19 41:16	indicates 28:2	January 1:14 2:5		location 49:14 52:4
46:12 57:14,21	indicating 27:20	8:15	L	52:20 53:12
58:2	indication 21:20	jettisonable 38:4	landed 41:2	logs 16:9
held 17:19 59:9	26:1	judge 2:8 5:3,16,19	large 9:19 11:17	long 15:6
help 34:16 46:4	individuals 12:1	6:1,4,10 7:3 8:2,6	42:20 48:13	look 36:11 43:12
helpful 11:1	indivisible 27:11	8:11,14 10:8,20	late 56:20	47:6 48:8
hereto 59:11	information 16:10	13:10,19,22 14:3	Laughing 6:3	looked 37:2 39:10
high 34:22 35:1	27:20 28:1 36:1	15:22 16:13,16	law 13:20 18:14	lot 14:9 24:12
36:14,16,17	41:11 54:14	18:2 19:4,12 20:7	47:20 54:5	love 40:7
49:17,18	initial 35:22 51:4	21:2 22:12,22	Lawrence 36:10	lower 24:13
hired 39:1,3 42:5	initially 51:3	23:11,19 24:5,15	lawsuit 7:6	lurking 55:12
history 10:22	initiated 19:19,20	25:4,9,18 26:2,11	leased 33:21	
hold 6:15	inject 36:21,22	27:5,15 28:1 29:2	leasing 36:4	M
holiday 6:6,9	injection 37:4	29:12,22 30:7,11	legal 31:4,13	main 3:16 57:11
HON 2:7	49:15	30:18 31:3,8	legitimacy 17:19	maintain 19:16
Honor 16:15 24:3	inside 28:6 53:10	32:10,14,22 33:3	legitimate 17:15	27:15,19 31:8
32:18 54:13 55:7	institutional 13:16	33:6 37:9 39:22	let's 33:3 56:13	44:5,11 47:11
56:6	intends 10:4	41:15 42:6,11	level 24:19	maintaining 31:9
hopefully 33:12	intense 34:21	44:5 46:13,18	levels 24:13,21 25:2	44:13,15
hot 40:20	interest 5:15 17:14	47:2,11 48:7,15	25:3 34:22 35:1	maintains 27:18
house 43:16 48:13	17:20 18:19 56:2	48:18,21 49:4,22	48:22 49:17	maintenance 52:7
houses 12:4,16	interested 55:14	50:3,15 51:16	liability 9:11,15,19	making 33:10 38:4
huge 48:15 50:9	57:10 59:12	53:15 54:8,11,22	10:1 16:22 17:4,7	45:17
	interesting 43:11	55:3,8,22 56:13	17:9 18:12 20:3,6	man 53:8
I	45:4,17 56:8	57:4,5,17	20:16 22:1 26:15	Management 47:18
idea 31:3 37:4	interior 48:10	judgement 7:15	27:3 31:14,19	manufacturing
II 9:5 27:22 29:20	internal 52:14	judgment 7:9	44:6	37:21
33:20 35:12 37:7	interviews 28:21	judicial 10:6 15:17	liable 7:8 8:19 9:9	Martin 3:15
50:10 53:3	investigation 51:4	31:4	9:18 17:2,13,13	Maryland 52:20
imagine 48:7	investigations	July 7:6 19:20	17:16,18,21 18:3	Massachusetts 4:7
Imhof 37:6,9,10	_	June 32:5	10.10 10.12 17	Massard 41:20
	11:19	June 32:3	18:18 19:13,17	Massard 41:20

		[
42:5	N 5:1	24:2,5 26:2 30:11	38:13 49:1	23:10 27:8 28:9
massive 49:9,13	name 5:11,13 36:16	33:4 43:19 49:5	particular 12:17	31:9,15 32:11
material 28:12	Natural 12:20	50:3 51:16 54:8	15:13,16 18:14	44:22 46:6 54:18
materials 24:16	nature 26:6 31:18	57:18	20:17,18 24:22	57:14
matter 1:6 2:1 5:5	near 8:21 14:7	old 35:11	particularly 8:9	Petitioner 1:10
10:7 15:16 19:12	necessarily 30:20	ongoing 15:18	55:13	pH 37:13
46:22 52:13	necessary 7:2 13:17	open 22:15 40:22	parties 8:3 12:7	phenol 49:15
matters 8:13 53:15	need 9:22 23:6	operated 8:21	16:8 49:22 50:4	phenolic 39:4
McDonnell 51:1	28:16 29:13,14	39:15 42:20 53:9	55:4,19 56:1 59:8	phenolic-based
mean 34:7 40:19	30:13 40:3,3	operating 40:21	59:11	36:17
41:6 42:18 45:3	41:15,18	43:17 53:2	parts 42:22	phenols 36:15,18
49:1,10 53:19	needs 41:8	operation 29:19	party 5:8,10,11 7:8	picture 35:18 38:11
means 31:18	negotiating 15:5	35:9,17,19 36:12	9:9 18:7 19:13,13	pictures 38:2,9,10
mechanical 34:8	negotiations 12:2	38:3 39:16,17,18	19:17 29:14,20	pieces 13:22
mechanics 34:7	32:21	50:9 53:7	42:17 45:14,15	piping 12:11
memorandum 7:17	neighbor 36:8	operations 50:14	47:12,15 55:9	place 47:3
7:18 21:13 32:4	neither 24:18 38:7	opinion 45:7	path 23:2	planned 29:3
mention 36:18	59:7	opportunities	pattern 9:7 54:3	plans 10:2
mentioned 12:3	never 46:16 52:22	57:16	Pearl 50:7	please 7:3,5
56:7	57:9	opportunity 29:4	peer 39:12	plug 53:5
merits 27:9	night 6:9,9	34:12 48:1 56:9	Pemberton 3:2	plugs 52:9,18 53:3
messy 35:19	nonliability 8:22	oppose 22:21 23:1	5:13,14,18 6:20	plume 39:15 43:1
met 48:22	9:9	order 5:6 7:11,17	6:22 7:5 8:4,8,12	plus 52:14
migrated 43:1	nonliable 18:7	7:19 11:2 12:17	8:15 10:11,21	pod 34:1 47:1
miles 11:16	non-TCE 50:13	12:19,19 13:20	11:7 13:12,21	poetic 40:9
million 10:3,12	north 3:7 33:17	14:4 15:3,5,6,8	14:2,4 16:2,15,19	point 18:6 23:5
52:14	35:16 44:4,16	15:12,14 21:14	18:10 19:10,18	33:13 42:16
mind 32:15	northwest 24:8	23:6 45:6 47:21	20:11 21:5 22:19	44:13 46:3 48:1
minutes 5:7 7:1	35:13 39:6 53:9	52:18,19	23:8,13 24:3,10	51:20
Missouri 3:18 6:5	noted 21:18	ordered 33:15	24:20 25:7,14,22	policy 19:12
misstatement 52:2	notice 23:16 24:15	35:22 44:16	26:8,17 27:12,19	portion 35:10
misunderstands	November 5:6 7:13	52:10	28:4 29:7,16 30:6	position 18:11,12
34:10	16:5 33:21	original 16:3 28:7	30:8,14 31:1,7,12	44:7,17
Model 35:11	NPL 13:3,3,5	originally 8:2	32:13,18 33:2,5	positions 31:11
modern 37:21	number 6:13 11:20	14:14 15:4 28:4	54:11,13 55:1,7	positions 31.11 possible 19:4 22:17
molecule 41:1	38:20	origins 25:13	56:6,15,19	25:20
44:17	nutshell 34:17	outcome 55:14	pemberton.scott	pot 47:16
Molly 4:3 5:21	NW 2:4	59:13	3:11	potential 25:13
	14 44 2:4	outlined 34:4	pending 23:20	55:9 56:5
molly_brown@r 4:10	0	outside 28:11 48:18	pending 23.20 people 27:13 28:11	potentially 45:13
	O 5:1	outstanding 10:13	43:15.56:10,22	practice 54:3
money 39:8 53:17	obtaining 52:21	16:10	57:15	practice 34.3
53:19,20 55:11	obviate 19:9	overall 26:7,14		
55:18		overa ll 26:7,14 55:6	people's 35:18	predicate 23:21
months 12:14	obviously 56:3 occurred 29:8		Peper 3:15	prejudice 17:11
19:21 45:8	32:20 39:17	oversight 13:9 owns 12:9	percent 9:19 perform 47:21	prejudiced 20:8,12
moot 18:1		UWIIS 12:9	, ·	20:22 46:13,15
morning 5:3,3,17	October 15:20	P	performed 38:6	prejudices 40:13
5:20	51:13		43:9 51:3	premised 13:20
motion 5:4 7:14,16	offer 54:12 55:9	P 5:1	performing 35:17	preponderance
21:7 55:21 57:22	56:4,13 57:5	pages 59:4	period 29:19	30:1 35:2 40:7
move 57:12	Office 3:4 5:14	paint 35:17,20	perspective 26:18	48:3
moving 5:8 57:13	47:18	39:16,18	Peter 41:20	prerogative 47:19
multipage 38:1	off-gassing 43:2	parents 6:5	petition 1:9 8:16,18	presence 57:19
M.A 4:3	Oh 40:1	part 9:5 13:18	10:16 17:9 18:1	present 2:10 10:15
NT NT	okay 5:19 7:3 8:14	14:20 15:7 21:4	18:21 19:3,22	25:10 26:3 34:12
N	10:20 14:3 21:2	26:14 33:18	21:11 22:6,14	41:18,19

	I			
presentation 6:19	quantum 34:6 42:7	7:1	removal 8:21 9:2	33:8 37:10 40:1
presentations	question 26:9,11	receive 40:11	14:6,15,20 27:17	41:17 42:10,13
57:20	40:2 52:17 54:15	received 12:10,11	remove 12:15	44:9 46:15,20
presenting 5:17	55:4,19,22	receiving 51:10	14:11 52:10	47:5,14 48:12,16
pretty 6:6	questions 6:14,15	Recognizing 27:18	removed 13:15	48:20 49:3,6 50:2
prior 36:2	6:15 48:6	recollection 25:14	26:19 33:20	50:4,19 51:21
private 45:14 47:15	quitclaimed 50:11	record 5:11 25:12	45:20	53:18 54:10
47:15	quite 13:7 49:17,19	25:15 59:3,6	repeat 10:8	56:12,17 57:2,9
privileged 16:9,9	53:21 56:8	recover 8:17 9:13	rephrase 26:9	ruled 22:14
probably 6:17 11:7		10:5 17:11 19:20	report 23:17 39:11	ruling 32:12
13:16 43:22	R	40:17	39:12 41:10,21	running 8:3
procedure 23:10	R 5:1	recovery 7:7 18:8	44:3 51:11 56:8,9	rural 11:20,21
proceed 5:5,8,10	raindrop 41:3	30:7,8 46:19,21	56:10,18 57:2	12:13
7:4 17:10 20:10	raise 22:20	47:3	reporter 59:1,2,16	
27:7	raising 22:18 23:22	redirect 37:5	represent 5:12 8:13	S
proceeding 8:18	rate 46:5	reference 24:16	representing 5:15	S 5:1
9:6 17:6,14,17,21	Raytheon 1:9 4:5	referenced 23:14	request 14:21 20:9	sample 36:14
19:9 20:3,5 29:13	5:21,22 7:6,9,19	regard 32:17	requested 14:5,17	samples 36:12,13
30:15,16,20 31:9	7:22 8:15,19,20	regarding 15:15	15:2	Sanders 3:15
31:15,17 32:3,7	8:22 9:13,18,20	regardless 21:22	reserve 5:9 7:1	Sanitation 36:9
41:14 44:20	12:3,5,15,18 13:6	regards 56:7	reserved 40:5	sat 35:5 38:13
proceedings 31:14	14:14,16,21 15:2	regime 7:11	residents 11:20	saying 23:2 48:19
59:3,7,9	15:3,8,9,11,12	Region 3:6 5:4,8,15	12:12	says 39:13 47:21
process 7:12 13:7	16:21,22 17:12	5:17 6:13 20:7	resolve 9:22 17:8	53:2,6 56:16
19:15 20:1 22:5	17:14,16,18,21	26:12 27:8,15	32:11,20	schedule 16:1,4
23:6 50:17	18:3,5,17,18,20	31:8 32:10,15	resolved 16:11	29:11
product 36:15	19:6,19 20:14	51:19 54:20	28:16,17	scheduled 15:20
promising 56:12	21:8,12,19 22:7,9	Regional 3:3,4 5:14	resources 12:20	29:3,9
proof 42:7,12	22:14,15 23:1	Region's 26:5	52:14	Scott 2:7 3:2 5:13
proper 48:11	27:18 28:4,22	32:16	respect 18:4 21:22	34:9
property 36:4 50:8	29:13,14,21,22	reimburse 53:20	26:3 43:7	screaming 49:7
proposed 13:2,4,4	31:13 32:1,2,5,8	reimbursement	responded 15:4	second 30:18
protect 43:15	33:15 34:10 35:6	8:16,18 10:16	response 7:15 10:3	Section 1:7 7:21,21
Protection 1:2 2:3	36:19 39:8 40:15	17:6,10 18:1,20	10:12,22 11:6	18:9 21:17
3:5	40:19 41:7 43:12	19:2,15,21 21:11	21:7 24:14 25:5	see 27:13 33:3
proud 37:22 38:1,8	43:19,20 44:3,5	22:7 23:9 31:9,15	28:8,8 43:14 57:1	44:12 45:3 56:16
prove 8:22 9:8,18	45:19 46:6 52:9	32:11 34:11 39:7	responsible 30:12	seek 14:11
17:1 29:13,15,17	53:16 55:14	40:12,15 41:5	45:13 47:12,12	seeking 7:7 9:13
29:18 30:9,12,15	Raytheon's 9:8,15	45:19 46:16	result 7:18 11:12	31:10
35:2 48:2	9:18 10:1 16:22	reiterate 57:11	results 36:14 44:21	seeks 8:22 22:7
proves 35:5 39:15	17:4,7,8,11,20	related 50:13 59:8	retained 59:11	seen 34:3
provide 12:4,6	22:1,2 25:19 28:2	relates 11:3	review 11:5 30:20	select 12:22
provided 45:10	29:5 31:21 44:22	relating 26:15	39:4 41:9 51:12	selected 14:10,22
proving 9:9 42:14	46:6 50:16	27:16 29:5 55:5	56:9,15,21	25:2
provisions 7:10	reach 14:16 20:13	relative 59:10	reviewed 39:13	send 56:19
PRP 32:6	27:9 40:3,4	relatively 41:14	reviewing 41:10	Senior 3:3 4:4
Public 1:7 21:16	reached 18:13	release 38:16 49:8	reworked 37:19	sense 19:11 43:21
purchased 8:20	ready 12:15	49:9,13	RIFS 12:20 13:6,8	50:5
purposes 22:13	real 11:13 16:7	relief 40:15 45:21	13:11 14:19	separate 25:19
pursue 23:7 57:8	really 20:11 24:13	remaining 7:20	43:18	September 15:11
pursuing 55:15	26:15 28:14	remains 49:20	right 22:16 40:10	sequencing 11:6
put 28:11 43:15	30:11 31:4 48:9	remedial 11:3	46:19 48:15,20	serve 22:17 23:21
50:8	49:10 51:6 52:15	12:22 14:9,19	51:14 53:6 55:3	set 31:20 47:7,20
	53:12 55:18	remediation 13:11	Room 2:4	settle 19:3 32:15
Q	realm 14:19	13:13	Roper 3:14 5:20,20	54:16,17
quantify 52:15	rebuttal 5:9 6:21	remind 52:12	6:3,8 16:17 33:7	settlement 54:21
water state from the course with the course of the course	CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF	CONTRACTOR	arraman and an ann an	COMMON TO SELECT AND S

55:5,22 56:1,11	sought 7:9 45:21	subsurface 26:19	testimony 53:8	truth 43:14
57:5,10,16	sounds 56:12	successful 55:16	testing 29:4	try 22:20 27:5 45:1
seven 11:16	source 13:14,15	sufficient 30:5,6	Texas 37:1	Turco 36:15
share 9:19 21:3	14:6,10 26:22	sufficiently 26:6	thank 5:19 16:19	turned 53:1
shipped 28:12	27:17	suggestion 25:12	33:5,6,8 54:9,10	two 8:1 11:8 13:22
shorthand 59:1,2,5	south 38:19	25:18	54:22 55:3 57:18	25:16 31:14 45:7
59:16	Southeast 6:4	Suite 3:17	theirs 27:18,20	48:13
shortly 57:21	southwest 38:14,15	Suitland 52:20	30:13	type 37:10 50:13
shot 35:15	38:17 40:21	summary 7:15	theoretically 19:4	typed 59:5
show 8:19 30:13	spark 52:8,18 53:3	Superfund 47:4,9	theory 18:8	
31:15 34:11 40:6	53:5	superhighway	thing 40:10 44:19	U
40:8 53:6,11,13	speaking 19:18	45:10	46:9,10 52:11	UAO 7:21 8:18,21
showed 53:14	specific 29:6	supplemented 28:8	55:2 57:12	9:2,10,14 15:11
shows 38:11	speed 57:15	supply 12:1	things 6:18 24:5	17:11,15,22 22:1
side 5:7	spent 39:8	supported 22:9	33:12 37:14 51:6	22:5 26:4,5,12,15
sidelight 45:17	square 11:16	supposed 16:4	56:7	30:4 34:3 36:3
sign 43:18	stance 31:14 32:2,7	56:21	think 6:14 11:22	38:11 39:9 43:9
signed 43:14	stand 57:6	Supreme 45:7,12	12:14 16:3,6	45:8,14 52:13
significant 27:1	standard 30:9	sure 11:9 15:1	23:11 29:12,16	54:1
significantly 26:20	42:13	18:11,19 20:14	32:5 33:4,22 35:7	UAOs 21:19
signing 50:12	stands 16:18	20:17,20,22	40:8 41:16,17	ultimately 17:15
similar 14:19	start 6:13 56:21	22:22 23:2 24:20	45:5 55:1 56:21	55:13
simply 29:14	started 20:1	26:9 32:13 53:20	57:13	unclear 54:19
simultaneously	state 5:11 13:9,20	system 12:4,6,11,12	thought 32:20	unconstitutional
17:4	14:5,17 26:4 36:8	47:7	thoughtful 57:19	7:11
sit 35:7 46:11	36:11 37:2 43:17	systems 12:16	thoughts 16:17	underneath 39:5
site 1:7 9:4 10:14	stated 21:15	43:16	three 11:8 37:11,13	understand 11:1
•		45:10	42:22 48:14	27:5 46:1 55:11
11:1,4,6,8,11,13	statement 21:4 34:4	T	time 5:9 6:6,21 7:1	understanding
11:15,19 12:9,10	1	T 2:7 3:9,19 4:8	1	11:17 29:2,7 39:9
13:2,17 14:6 17:2	States 1:2 7:8,13,16	•	11:22 12:18 14:9	54:6
26:21 27:10,21	7:20 8:8 9:17,21	table 45:22	31:10 33:21 36:7	
28:13 29:19	15:2,10 16:21	take 32:6 44:22	39:14,18 40:1	Understood 57:17
33:21 34:1 35:9	18:6,11 22:10,21	taken 40:16 41:3	45:6 46:3 50:10	Unilateral 7:10
35:10 43:21 44:6	23:1 31:22 39:3	45:22 59:4	timing 15:1 45:4	11:2 14:4
49:11 51:4	45:13 56:17	talk 10:22 48:9	today 33:9 57:11	unique 9:7
sites 45:12	status 13:4 16:7	talking 43:8,8 47:8	57:19	unitary 46:3
site-wide 26:17	stay 5:5 15:15 17:6	48:10,17	told 37:17 43:13	United 1:2 7:8,13
27:4 30:17	17:9,10,18 19:2	tank 37:9,10,11,14	54:18	7:16,20 8:8 9:17
sitting 49:16	20:9 21:7 31:3	37:15 38:16	Topeka 36:9	9:21 15:1,10
six 12:13 19:20	44:20 46:10,11	tanks 37:6,11,13	totally 43:6 47:9	16:20 18:6,11
33:16	46:14 55:21	38:4	tracked 52:19	22:10,21,22
slightly 26:4	57:22	tarmac 33:18	trainers 35:11	31:22 39:2 45:13
small 52:12	stop 18:2	TCE 8:21 9:2,4	transcript 59:5,6	56:17
smoking 51:17	Street 3:7,16 4:6	11:14 24:9 25:11	transport 30:3	unreimbursed 10:3
soil 25:3 34:20,21	stripper 35:20	25:13,17,20	treat 12:5	10:12
35:1 42:22 43:2	stripping 35:17	26:19 27:17,21	treatment 12:4,15	use 28:5 52:1 53:4
soils 26:18,19	39:16,18	28:5 29:18 30:2	43:16	useful 10:21
sole 26:22	structure 48:10	34:21 38:21	tremendous 49:8,8	utility 55:20 56:5
solely 17:19	subject 22:1	39:19 41:1 49:1	51:22	U.S 2:2 17:13 51:2
Solicitor 45:11	submitted 57:2	52:1,4 53:4,11	trial 15:19	
47:16	subsequent 12:8	technical 52:17,19	trichloroethylene	V
Somebody's 36:22	36:2	56:10,22	49:9,14	value 10:9
soon 16:8 23:15	subsequently 15:5	term 49:7	tricky 52:21	vantage 23:5
sorry 37:15	substance 36:6	terms 28:3	Tri-County 1:7	vapor 52:8
sort 19:5 31:19	substances 25:12	tested 37:13 38:19	21:15	various 37:13
51:17	25:16	38:20 50:17,20	true 59:6	47:17 51:5
- appears of the contract of t	The second secon			

				Page 6
vehicle 22:17	weren't 42:16 43:5	100 9:19	6	
ventilated 23:3	48:3	1000 3:17	60 51:11	
venue 9:11 20:6	we'll 6:12 44:10,12	104(e) 28:7 35:22	64112 3:18	
version 28:2	51:7,11 57:4,20	43:14 53:1	66101-2907 3:8	
versus 45:5	we're 18:18 20:14	106(b) 1:8 22:16	00101-2907 5:0	
videotape 52:5	20:17,20,22	23:4 54:17	7	
view 9:10 18:6 19:6	40:17 41:4 42:1	107 31:22 42:15		
23:20 26:5 50:16	42:14 43:7,8	107 31:22 42:13 107(a) 7:21 18:9	7 3:6 5:15	
51:19 55:8	44:18 46:20 47:8	11:45 58:2	7's 5:4	
		11.45 38.2 113(h) 7:22	781.522.3061 4:8	<u>'</u>
viewed 23:5 26:12	47:15 48:10,16	113(h) 7.22 113(h)(1) 21:17	781.522.6465 4:9	
26:13,16 27:10	53:13 we've 10:16,17	115(h)(1) 21.17 1152 2:4		
29:4		1132 2.4 1201 2:3	8	
vinyl 24:17 25:10	willing 56:4	16 32:5	800 42:21	
25:21 34:22	willy 41:2	17 1:14 2:5 7:13	816.983.8080 3:20	
48:22 49:6,17	Winter 4:6		816.983.8143 3:19	
violated 22:5	wish 5:9	18 35:11 1042 50:7	870 4:6	
W	witness 50:21	1942 50:7		
	51:11	1950 33:21 35:9	9	
W 59:2	word 43:21 54:12	1951 39:17	901 3:7	
wafted 41:1	words 32:14	1953 36:4,7 39:17	913.551.7276 3:9	
wait 44:12	work 6:18 10:14	40:8,10 41:10	913.551.7925 3:10	
wake 22:12 23:4	11:12 12:17 15:8	43:13		
Waltham 4:7	15:13 19:14	1954 39:17		
want 26:9 36:22	23:15,17 34:4,8	1955 37:19		
37:4,5 40:6 42:4	38:5 43:9 44:4	1957 40:20		
43:18 44:17	47:17,22,22	1960 35:9		
57:12	World 9:5 27:22	1980 8:21		
wanted 21:3 32:6	29:19 33:20	1997 10:15 43:13		
42:17,19 54:20	35:12 37:7 50:10	l — —		
wants 47:17	53:3			
War 9:5 27:22	worth 55:10	2nd 15:21		
29:19 33:20	wouldn't 40:16	20 5:7		
35:12 37:7 50:8	wrote 41:20	200 28:6		
50:10 53:3		2000 43:14		
Washington 1:3,13	X	2004 15:11		
2:4 6:10	x 1:5,11	2005 7:6,13 19:20		
wasn't 30:13 35:21		35:5		
43:22 49:1	Y	2006 5:7 7:17 8:15		
wasteful 17:3	year 15:21	16:5		
water 11:11 12:1,4	years 11:9 49:16	2007 1:14 2:5 40:10		
12:5,11,12 43:16	52:7	26 7:17 32:4		
way 13:2 19:15				
20:8 27:6 28:10		3	•	
30:3 32:19 35:4,8	zero 44:10	3 40:5		
39:13 40:13,14		30 5:6 35:22		
42:2 45:18 47:7	\$	30(b)(6) 51:1		
53:22	\$2.4 10:3,12	3535 36:15		
ways 19:14	\$2.5 52:14			
weather 6:2		4		
Wednesday 2:5	0	40 33:14 44:4		
week 39:11 50:22	02451-1449 4:7	4801 3:16		
51:8,9 56:20,22	06 32:4			
57:1	06-01 1:9	5		
welcome 6:1,10		5 21:14,17		
went 11:18 43:4	1	5th 3:7		
51:3	10:30 2:5	50 49:16		
J1.J				
CONTRACTOR AND A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF	and the second s		and the second s	The second secon