

1 Respondent's Exhibit 1. admitted into the record? challenged. 1 to Line 1000. All of it.

MR. CHU: I understand. the record?

MR. CHU: Your Honor, we would join in that submission.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Respondent's Exhibit 1 is admitted into the record.
(The document referred to was
marked for identification as
Respondent's Exhibit No. 1,
and was received into
evidence.)

MR. KULSCHINSKY: The other matter is, we would like to offer the deposition transcript of Mr. Matao Cao into evidence. We understand that Respondents do not intend to call Mr. Cao at this time. They're representing that he's not available. While the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure don't strictly apply to this matter, Federal Rule 32 does allow a party opponent, or an adverse party to use the transcript of an opponent or a party's officer for any purpose.

We would represent that Mr. Cao's deposition transcript does contain a number of statements against interest, and we would like to offer it into the record.

MR. CHU: We would oppose and object, Your Honor. That's not the proper procedure for the use of a deposition. It should not be made an exhibit.
know, whatever issues he has with those portions, I'll take it under consideration in the post-hearing briefing period.

MR. CHU: Your Honor, will we also be afforded the opportunity to go ahead and submit the depositions that we took of Ms. Isin, Mr. Jackson as well as Dr. Carroll?

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any objection to that?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: I guess our only objection would be that those witnesses have all been made available to testify, and been subjected to cross-examination in this matter.

JUDGE BIRO: Why do we need more of their testimony than we already have?

MR. CHU: Because, Your Honor, if they're going to be afforded the opportunity to submit the complete deposition, then all I'm saying is we'd like to have that same opportunity. That's all we're asking, Your Honor.

JUDGE BIRO: I just don't see the point of that. We've had those witnesses come and testify live. You've gotten to cross examine them.

MR. CHU: I understand, Your Honor. The reason is, the purpose of the deposition is to discover matters, and so once you make that discovery you formulate your strategy and your question and answers based upon that deposition. To submit a complete deposition in this
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JUDGE BIRO: And how do you think it should be

MR. CHU: I believe that they would have to identify the line and page number that they intend to use so that any appropriate objections that are available are decided by the Court in terms of each question that's being

JUDGE BIRO: Let's assume they introduce from Line

MR. CHU: I understand, but I believe the proper procedure is for them to read it into the record.

JUDGE BIRO: Oh, we're not doing that.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we would propose that the transcript would enter into the record, the parties can cite it in the papers, and any objections to the citations could be raised and resolved through the briefing.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Is there any other basis for objecting to it, other than you want them to read it into

MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Then we're going to admit Mr. Matao's deposition, Mr. Cao's deposition in total, and if you want to identify a narrower, admit a narrower portion of the deposition in your brief and then Mr . Chu can raise, you
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situation tends to thwart what is the purpose of the deposition. And so if they're using it the way I think they're using it, and laying out everything that's there, then certain things in depositions shouldn't ever be heard or seen by this Court. So if they're going to be given the opportunity to throw it all into the wash, then all we're saying is please allow us the same courtesy and opportunity to do what they're doing today. Because this is very surprising to me, that a complete deposition would be admitted as an exhibit.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. We'll put all the depositions in.

We're going to mark Mr. Cao's deposition as the Agency Exhibit 216.
(The document referred to was marked for identification as Complainant's Exhibit No. 216 and was received in evidence.)
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
JUDGE BIRO: And Ms. Isin's deposition as
Respondent's Exhibit whatever your last number is it, Mr. Dixon?
(Pause.)
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, if we're going in this direction, then we would ask to also offer the

|  | Page 696 |  | Page 698 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | deposition transcripts of Mr. Garibyan and Mr. Shefftz. | 1 | submitted an errata sheet. |
| 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Of course. | 2 | JUDGE BIRO: And has anybody signed and submitted |
| 3 | MR. CHU: Yeah, like I said. Throw everything | 3 | an errata sheet? |
| 4 | into the wash. | 4 | MR. CHU: not that we're aware of, Your Honor. |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: It's just more work for me, but okay. | 5 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Ms. Isin has. |
| 6 | MR. CHU: I'm willing to step back from all that. | 6 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: What's the last Respondent's Exhibit | 7 | Well maybe when we're off the record we can try to |
| 8 | number? Thirty-eight? | 8 | resolve some of these issues of getting all the depositions |
| 9 | MR. DIXON: It's going to be 38 . | 9 | in their final form into the record. |
| 10 | JUDGE BIRO: So, Ms. Isin's is going to be | 10 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 11 | Respondent's Exhibit 38. | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, thanks. |
| 12 | (The document referred to was | 12 | (Pause.) |
| 13 | marked for identification as | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Hello. |
| 14 | Respondent's Exhibit No. 38, | 14 | Whereupon, |
| 15 | and was received in evidence.) | 15 | AMELIE CARA ISIN |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: What was the other exhibit you | 16 | having been previously duly sworn, resumed the |
| 17 | wanted? What was the other deposition other than Ms. Isin? | 17 | stand and was examined and testified as follows: |
| 18 | MR. CHU: Mr. Jackson. | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, can we take up on whatever the |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Jackson, we'll mark that as | 19 | last question for Ms. Isin was? |
| 20 | Respondent's Exhibit 39. | 20 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No further questions for Ms. |
| 21 | (The document referred to was | 21 | Isin at this time, Your Honor. |
| 22 | marked for identification as | 22 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you. |
| 23 | Respondent's Exhibit No. 39 | 23 | MR. CHU: May it please the Court. |
| 24 | and was received in evidence.) | 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Good morning. |
| 25 | MR. CHU: And I'm going to save the Court work. | 25 | MR. CHU: Good morning. |
|  | Page 697 |  | Page 699 |
| 1 | That's it. I don't want anymore else. | 1 | Good morning, Ms. Isin. |
| 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And then for the Agency? | 2 | THE WITNESS: Good morning. |
| 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Mr. Garibyan's deposition would | 3 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 4 | be 217. And Mr. Shefftz's deposition would be 218. | 4 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 5 | (The documents referred to | 5 | Q Ms. Isin, I want to commend you on what a great |
| 6 | were marked for identification | 6 | job you've done so far. |
| 7 | as Complainant's Exhibit Nos. | 7 | A Thank you. |
| 8 | 217 and 218 and were received | 8 | Q We had a struggle during the depositions, didn't |
| 9 | in evidence.) | 9 | we? |
| 10 | JUDGE BIRO: Anybody else? | 10 | A It didn't feel like it was a struggle. |
| 11 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor, that was all. | 11 | Q We kind of had to dance around the ASA, remember? |
| 12 | JUDGE BIRO: I'm not sure we even have copies of | 12 | A No. |
| 13 | all these depositions. Have they all been submitted into | 13 | Q Okay. Well you seem to be very familiar with it |
| 14 | the record? You're shaking your head. | 14 | now, is that right? |
| 15 | MR. DIXON: No, ma'am. | 15 | A I'm familiar with the ASA. |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Well, you're going to have to | 16 | Q Now let me ask you something. Did you notice a |
| 17 | give us five copies so that we can have a copy for | 17 | sign outside when you walked in, the little banner to the |
| 18 | everybody. So please do that before we end our hearing. | 18 | right? |
| 19 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. | 19 | A No. |
| 20 | This is the original copy. May I give this to the | 20 | Q You didn't see where it says "Sensible Policies"? |
| 21 | court reporter? | 21 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form and |
| 22 | JUDGE BIRO: Are these signed? Do we have signed | 22 | relevance. |
| 23 | deposition -- | 23 | MR. CHU: Your Honor, this is a case about the so- |
| 24 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: This is a certified deposition, | 24 | called regulatory scheme, and I believe that's a good place |
| 25 | but Mr. Cao, to our understanding, has not yet signed it or | 25 | to start. A regulatory scheme involves policies and what |


|  | Page 700 |  | Page 702 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | we're doing here today. So I'm -- | 1 | that had you down as one of the authors, what year that was |
| 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. | 2 | submitted to the NEIC conference? |
| 3 | BY MR. CHU: | 3 | A I never submitted a paper to the NEIC conference. |
| 4 | Q Sensible Policies. Have you ever heard that as a, | 4 | Q I didn't say you did, I'm just saying -- was your |
| 5 | as a purpose for the EPA? You were asked about the purposes | 5 | name on a paper that was presented at an NEIC event? |
| 6 | yesterday, remember? | 6 | A No. |
| 7 | A I don't remember. | 7 | Q Okay. Now in 2010 can you tell us again what |
| 8 | Q Okay. All right. And do you remember telling me | 8 | division at headquarters you were working in? |
| 9 | that you're not the best writer, but you're not the worst | 9 | A I was working in the Air Enforcement Division in |
| 10 | writer? | 10 | the Mobile Source Enforcement Branch. |
| 11 | A I remember that. | 11 | Q And how long had you been there at that time? |
| 12 | Q We got into that conversation. | 12 | A Approximately three years. |
| 13 | A Yes. | 13 | Q So we would roll that back, and that would be |
| 14 | Q Okay. Because you tended to be involved in | 14 | what, 2006? |
| 15 | writing things, right? | 15 | A I started in the Air Enforcement Division in 2007. |
| 16 | A Yes. | 16 | Q So what month, do you remember? |
| 17 | Q And you wrote articles and papers in the past, is | 17 | A I think it was summer time. I don't remember |
| 18 | that accurate? | 18 | exactly which month. |
| 19 | A I've written documents before. I've drafted | 19 | Q Now the Air Enforcement, is that accurate? |
| 20 | documents. | 20 | A What are you referring to? |
| 21 | Q I'm specifically talking about articles. | 21 | Q The department. |
| 22 | A Papers? Yes. | 22 | A My old office? |
| 23 | Q Thank you. In fact those papers have been | 23 | Q Yes. |
| 24 | submitted to places like environmental forums in South | 24 | A The Air Enforcement Division? |
| 25 | Africa, is that accurate? | 25 | Q Right. How would you compare that to the normal |
|  | Page 701 |  | Page 703 |
| 1 | A Yes. | 1 | regulatory scheme of the everyday society that we're in? |
| 2 | Q And also used in NEIS, is that a correct acronym? | 2 | Would it be something like the police officer? |
| 3 | NEIS? | 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. |
| 4 | A No. | 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. |
| 5 | Q What is it? | 5 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 6 | A Are you referring to NEIC? | 6 | Q Okay. You do understand what police officers do, |
| 7 | Q Yes. And what does that stand for, for the | 7 | correct? |
| 8 | record? | 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | A It stands for the National Enforcement | 9 | Q It's their job to enforce the law, right? |
| 10 | Investigation Center. | 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Okay. And do you remember that last article that | 11 | Q So when you say Air Enforcement Division, is that |
| 12 | you didn't kind of remember contributing to but your name | 12 | somewhat the same thing? |
| 13 | was on it? | 13 | A The Air Enforcement Division enforces Clean Air |
| 14 | A Yes. | 14 | Act and associated regulations. |
| 15 | Q Okay. And it's in your deposition, right? | 15 | Q So do you perform the same functions as a police |
| 16 | A The paper? I don't think so. | 16 | officer? |
| 17 | Q Okay. And, but you reviewed your deposition, | 17 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To form |
| 18 | correct? | 18 | and relevance. |
| 19 | A Yes. | 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. |
| 20 | Q In preparation for this testimony. | 20 | THE WITNESS: Not exactly. |
| 21 | A Yes. | 21 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 22 | Q Okay. And so do you remember the date of that | 22 | Q How is it any different? |
| 23 | paper that was submitted at the NEIC? Year. | 23 | A I think there are a lot of differences. It's |
| 24 | A I don't understand the question. | 24 | different laws. You know, mobile source inspections are |
| 25 | Q Do you remember the year that the article or paper | 25 | very different than what, you know, the types of violations |


|  | Page 704 |  | Page 706 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | a police officer looks into. | 1 | the regulation -- your penalty policy. Correct? |
| 2 | Q Can you tell us the similarities? | 2 | A Right. |
| 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls | 3 | Q Don't you really mean mistake? |
| 4 | for speculation. | 4 | A No. |
| 5 | MR. CHU: If you know. | 5 | Q When you say willfulness/negligence are you |
| 6 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. | 6 | describing a mistake? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: I'm, to be honest, I'm not that | 7 | A No. |
| 8 | familiar with police work so it would be speculation. | 8 | Q What are you describing? |
| 9 | MR. CHU: I see. | 9 | A I'm describing something that could have been |
| 10 | BY MR. CHU: | 10 | prevented. The, the, something the Respondent knew or |
| 11 | Q So basically we have the same word in law | 11 | should have known to prevent. |
| 12 | enforcement as we have in air enforcement, is that accurate? | 12 | Q Now you've been fortunate to have a very good |
| 13 | The word enforcement? | 13 | education, correct? |
| 14 | A Yes, the word enforcement appears in both phrases. | 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q But it's your belief that since you're not | 15 | Q Have you ever ran into or seen that one kid, the |
| 16 | familiar with what police officers do, that you can't | 16 | Donald or the Johnny that just didn't seem to get things in |
| 17 | articulate any differences or similarities other than what | 17 | the classroom? |
| 18 | you've given us so far, is that accurate? | 18 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 19 | A I think I said it would be speculating because I'm | 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. |
| 20 | not that familiar with what police officers do. | 20 | THE WITNESS: I don't know what you're referring |
| 21 | Q You're aware that a police officer doesn't decide | 21 | to. |
| 22 | guilt or innocence? | 22 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | Q Some, so you've never had any experiences with |
| 24 | Q So, but in your job, that's what you do, don't | 24 | someone that was somewhat disruptive and didn't necessarily |
| 25 | you? | 25 | get what the teachers wanted them to get? You've never seen |
|  | Page 705 |  | Page 707 |
| 1 | A No. | 1 | that situation? |
| 2 | Q Well yesterday you were throwing out the word | 2 | A It's possible. |
| 3 | willfulness. Is that accurate? | 3 | Q So you might have. |
| 4 | A I mentioned the word willfulness. Yes. | 4 | A Yes. |
| 5 | Q And you also in that same sentence said negligence | 5 | Q Okay. Because isn't the EPA somewhat like a |
| 6 | or was it willfulness or negligence? I couldn't quite catch | 6 | teacher in this situation? Do you remember listening to Mr . |
| 7 | it. | 7 | Jackson yesterday? |
| 8 | A I believe it's willfulness or negligence. | 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q Do you remember using it in that way, willfulness | 9 | Q Do you remember him talking about or maybe it was, |
| 10 | or negligence or did you just say willfulness negligence? | 10 | a day ago -- I'm losing my days. A day ago, right? Some of |
| 11 | A I may have said willfulness negligence. | 11 | it yesterday. And he was talking about Headstart and |
| 12 | Q That's not, that's somewhat of a misnomer, isn't | 12 | outreach and helping and suggestions. Do you remember all |
| 13 | it? | 13 | that? |
| 14 | A I would have to look at the penalty policy to see | 14 | A I remember those terms, yes. |
| 15 | exactly how it's described. | 15 | Q I mean do you remember the testimony? Not the |
| 16 | Q Word wise, I'm talking about. Willfulness or | 16 | terms. |
| 17 | negligence has a completely different meaning from | 17 | A I don't think he talked about Headstart. I think |
| 18 | willfulness negligence, would you agree? | 18 | you did. He did talk about compliance assistance they |
| 19 | A No. | 19 | provide. |
| 20 | Q So a willfulness negligence describes what? | 20 | Q I apologize, you're absolutely correct. I asked a |
| 21 | A Willfulness negligence, the way I was using the | 21 | question, he answered it, and I thought he and I talked |
| 22 | term in my mind, I had a slash between the two terms. | 22 | about it, so you didn't see that? |
| 23 | Willfulness/negligence. | 23 | A I saw him answering your question. |
| 24 | Q But what you really meant was willfulness or | 24 | Q But to you that's not talking about it, is that |
| 25 | negligence as the regulation requires. Right? Sorry, not | 25 | accurate? |


|  | Page 708 |  | Page 710 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A It's not a conversation, no. | 1 | event, correct? |
| 2 | Q I agree. Okay. And so how many conversations | 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | have you had since 2007 with Matao Cao? | 3 | Q So subsequent to that, I believe your emails that |
| 4 | A I don't recall. | 4 | were introduced yesterday indicated that you were in contact |
| 5 | Q Any? | 5 | with a Jackie Wang, W-A-N-G? |
| 6 | A I'm sure I had some. | 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Weren't they just emails? | 7 | Q Are you certain that you're not confusing Jackie |
| 8 | A No. | 8 | Wang with Matao Cao? |
| 9 | Q Well if you're sure that you had some, could you | 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | at least tell us approximately what year, because there are | 10 | Q Why is that? |
| 11 | a lot of events that you were involved in from 2009 on with | 11 | A Because they're two different people and I've met |
| 12 | Taotao USA. | 12 | both of them. |
| 13 | A I believe I spoke to him, I don't recall which | 13 | Q Did either gentleman speak with an accent? |
| 14 | year specifically or the specific content of the | 14 | A I know Mr. Cao has an accent. I don't recall off |
| 15 | conversations, but I believe I spoke with him regarding the | 15 | the top of my head, Terry might have a slight -- sorry. |
| 16 | violations we found at the Port of Long Beach in 2010. And | 16 | Jackie might have a -- Mr. Wang might have a slight accent. |
| 17 | I'm also sure I spoke with him at some point regarding the, | 17 | Q You do remember Mr. Wang talking fast though, |
| 18 | the subsequent catalyst testing issues that we raised | 18 | right? |
| 19 | throughout the years between 2011 and 2014. | 19 | A Not particularly. |
| 20 | Q Were you aware that after the 2010 ASA in June, | 20 | Q So he was a moderate speaking individual? |
| 21 | that he returned back to China for many, many years? | 21 | A I remember I had no problem understanding him. |
| 22 | A No, I was not aware of that. | 22 | Q Now you calculated the penalty calculations for |
| 23 | Q And I'm just telling that to see if you're certain | 23 | the allegations in 2009, 2010. Is that accurate? |
| 24 | that you did talk with him after June 2010. Does that help | 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | you refresh your memory? | 25 | Q And when I mention 2009, in fact it involved |
|  | Page 709 |  | Page 711 |
| 1 | A I'm certain that I did talk with him after 2010. | 1 | vehicles that were associated with the year 2009. Is that |
| 2 | Q So it would have been in a telephone conversation? | 2 | right? |
| 3 | A It was a conversation. I don't recall details. | 3 | A Actually I don't think there were, well, maybe |
| 4 | Q Do you believe you had a face to face? | 4 | there were. I, I don't recall. I'd have to look. |
| 5 | A We may have had a face to face, yes. | 5 | Q Feel free, I believe the document is there in |
| 6 | Q Okay. And when you say we may have, that has a | 6 | front of you, the ASA? The one that you participated in |
| 7 | certain degree of uncertainty to it, correct? | 7 | drafting. Remember? |
| 8 | A That's correct. | 8 | A Yes. |
| 9 | Q But you did visit the facilities in Texas, and you | 9 | Q Do you need to look at that to refresh your memory |
| 10 | described it yesterday as Dallas. I believe the correct | 10 | as to whether or not it included 2009 vehicles? |
| 11 | name of the place was Carrollton, Texas. Is that accurate? | 11 | A If you'd like me to look at it, I'd be happy to |
| 12 | A It was the Camp Avenue address. I don't recall if | 12 | open it. |
| 13 | it was Dallas or Carrollton. | 13 | Q Certainly. |
| 14 | Q But your notes would indicate where, right? | 14 | (Pause.) |
| 15 | A I'm sorry? | 15 | Q It's 67, I believe. Did you find it? |
| 16 | Q Your notes would indicate what city -- | 16 | A Yes, I'm looking at it right now. |
| 17 | A The inspection work sheets would, yes. | 17 | Q And in that it describes the year and the models, |
| 18 | Q I'm sorry? | 18 | right? So -- |
| 19 | A The inspection work sheets would. | 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | Q So are you telling this Court that it was possible | 20 | Q Are there any 2009s in that? |
| 21 | that you had talked with Mr. Matao Cao in 2000 and, was that | 21 | A Yes, there are. |
| 22 | '12 or '13 that you were in Texas? | 22 | Q Okay. I'm glad you told me that. I thought I |
| 23 | A I believe it was 2013. I didn't say that I spoke | 23 | might be wrong. Okay. |
| 24 | with Matao Cao at that time. | 24 | So the total number of vehicles were only what? |
| 25 | Q So we can eliminate that as being a possible | 25 | A It looks like, I'm looking at Bates ending in 823, |


|  | Page 712 |  | Page 714 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | it's 3,768 vehicles. | 1 | under the ten engine families in this complaint. They're |
| 2 | Q As compared to this complaint here of how many? | 2 | vehicles that were identified by Respondents in their |
| 3 | Do you remember? | 3 | information request response. |
| 4 | A This complaint deals with approximately 109,000 | 4 | (Pause.) |
| 5 | vehicles. | 5 | A I'm sorry, let me add one more thing. |
| 6 | Q Okay. And the way that you selected those | 6 | They were also identified in Respondents' |
| 7 | vehicles, can you describe for this Court whatever method | 7 | production reports to EPA, submitted to EPA's Certification |
| 8 | you used to select those vehicles? | 8 | Office. |
| 9 | A Select which vehicles? | 9 | Q There were other things that you utilized as well, |
| 10 | Q The 109,000 vehicles. | 10 | that you don't remember, is that accurate? |
| 11 | A I didn't select 109,000 vehicles. | 11 | A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question? I missed |
| 12 | Q We went through your testimony, you went through | 12 | a -- |
| 13 | your testimony. Not we, but you. And you were describing | 13 | Q There were other ways, methods, ideas which you |
| 14 | how you collected that data, remember? | 14 | utilized other than what you described, is that accurate? |
| 15 | A Are you talking about data on 109,000 vehicles? | 15 | A I'm not sure I understand the question. |
| 16 | A Yes. | 16 | Q Is it my choice of the four words or what is it? |
| 17 | Q Yes, and I may have chosen the inappropriate word | 17 | So I can help formulate the right question. |
| 18 | and the accurate word here when I say select. Select to me | 18 | A I, I don't know what you're asking. |
| 19 | means I go out and identify certain items and pick those. | 19 | Q I asked you to explain to the Court the methods |
| 20 | So does select have a different meaning for you? | 20 | which you utilized to identify the 109,000 vehicles, and I |
| 21 | A No. | 21 | was following up and saying that you used some other methods |
| 22 | Q So how did you, would you please describe for this | 22 | that you haven't told us about, is that correct? |
| 23 | Court how you selected those 109,000 vehicles. | 23 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor. |
| 24 | A I can talk about how I identified them. I didn't | 24 | THE WITNESS: Not that I can recall. |
| 25 | go anywhere to pick them out. I -- | 25 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Vague question. |
|  | Page 713 |  | Page 715 |
| 1 | Q I'm sorry. You just said I didn't go anywhere to | 1 | JUDGE BIRO: It's argumentative. |
| 2 | pick them out. Did I hear that accurately? | 2 | MR. CHU: Okay. I'll rephrase. Okay? |
| 3 | A Yes. | 3 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 4 | Q Did you not go to Carrollton, go into the | 4 | Q You also asked for a current list of the inventory |
| 5 | warehouse and actively pick out six vehicles? | 5 | that Taotao USA had at the time you visited Carrollton, |
| 6 | A Yes. Six vehicles, yes. Not 109,000. | 6 | Texas, is that accurate? |
| 7 | Q Thank you. So you did go and pick vehicles out, | 7 | A I did ask for such a list. Yes. |
| 8 | correct? | 8 | Q Thank you. So when I say you left out some other |
| 9 | A Yes. | 9 | methods, that's another one you didn't tell us about just |
| 10 | Q Thank you. So back to my question. Can you | 10 | now, is that accurate? |
| 11 | please describe the methods you used to select the 109,000 | 11 | A I didn't mention that just now because I assumed |
| 12 | vehicles. | 12 | that would be included in the production lists that the |
| 13 | A I said before, I didn't select 109,000 vehicles. | 13 | Respondents provided to EPA for all the vehicles they built |
| 14 | Q I understand. Is there a better word that you'd | 14 | under those engine families. |
| 15 | like me to use? | 15 | Q Right, but I just wanted this Court to understand |
| 16 | A You can use whichever word -- | 16 | your methods that you used and so to me when you say |
| 17 | JUDGE BIRO: I believe the word she said was | 17 | production list, that doesn't quite explain it. So if you |
| 18 | identify. | 18 | could please break it down for us here, in terms of the |
| 19 | MR. CHU: Okay. I was going to go there, okay. | 19 | details of your methodology in your investigation that |
| 20 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Let's go with that. | 20 | identified the 109,000 vehicles, please. |
| 21 | MR. CHU: Sorry, Your Honor. Okay. | 21 | A If you're asking how I identified vehicles for |
| 22 | BY MR. CHU: | 22 | inspection, I can go into that. |
| 23 | Q Can you tell the Court what methods you used to | 23 | Q Yes, ma'am. |
| 24 | identify the 109,000 vehicles. I'm sorry, Your Honor. | 24 | A So for the Texas warehouse inspection in 2013 I , |
| 25 | A The 109,000 vehicles were the vehicles produced | 25 | in preparation for that. That was an announced inspection. |


|  | Page 716 |  | Page 718 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | I contacted Mr. Wang several days before the inspection to | 1 | A I -- I don't, it depends what you're, what you |
| 2 | ensure that they would be there, staff at the warehouse | 2 | mean to describe. I don't know. I'm taking you at face |
| 3 | would be there. And I requested at that time a list of | 3 | value. |
| 4 | their inventory by engine family and VIN, and then I used | 4 | Q I was just going back through your testimony |
| 5 | that information to select the vehicles that I wanted to | 5 | yesterday. I'm trying to get a clear time line of how this |
| 6 | inspect and I did so randomly. | 6 | investigation started, how it proceeded, and how we got to |
| 7 | Q You added, "I did that randomly". Correct? | 7 | where we are today. |
| 8 | A That's right. | 8 | A Okay. |
| 9 | Q So was there a methodology associated with that | 9 | Q So we have to have a beginning point right? |
| 10 | randomness or is it random in the common sense of random? | 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | A It's common sense random. | 11 | Q And I thought I heard you say that this started as |
| 12 | Q Thank you. | 12 | an investigation, seizure, by Customs in Long Beach. Is |
| 13 | Now when I asked about the 109,000 what you just | 13 | that accurate or not? |
| 14 | described for us basically didn't include the investigation | 14 | A To the best of my recollection, it's accurate. |
| 15 | that were called in on at Long Beach, correct? | 15 | Q And that's what you testified to yesterday, you |
| 16 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this | 16 | remember? |
| 17 | line of questioning. | 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | MR. CHU: May I respond? | 18 | Q Okay. And you had to go from headquarters here in |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. | 19 | DC, correct, to Long Beach? |
| 20 | BY MR. CHU: | 20 | A For that -- are we talking about a 2012 entry? |
| 21 | Q Remember, this all initiated from a Customs | 21 | Q I'm not going to say the time, the date or the |
| 22 | seizure and I think you used the word quarantine. Remember | 22 | place anymore. If you remember, that's the beginning. I'm |
| 23 | that? | 23 | just talking about the first step in this investigation. |
| 24 | A Who used the word? | 24 | A In the investigation of the 109,000 vehicles at |
| 25 | Q You. Did you use the word quarantine yesterday? | 25 | issue here? |
|  | Page 717 |  | Page 719 |
| 1 | A Yes, I might have. Yes. | 1 | Q Yes, ma'am. |
| 2 | Q You're not sure? | 2 | A Yes. I believe it stemmed from a 2012 |
| 3 | A It's possible. I, I would have to go back and | 3 | investigation, uh, inspection at the Port of Long Beach. I |
| 4 | check to be certain. | 4 | was not directly involved in that inspection. |
| 5 | Q Again, the reason I ask that, I might have missed | 5 | Q So you didn't travel out there. |
| 6 | it. I might have thought that or imagined it, so that's why | 6 | A I did not travel out there. |
| 7 | I ask the question. | 7 | Q So whatever occurred was at the initiative of |
| 8 | But what does the word quarantine mean in | 8 | Customs, correct? |
| 9 | reference to what EIS does? | 9 | A It was, since I wasn't involved in the inspection, |
| 10 | A In my mind, usage of the word quarantine means | 10 | I can say it was, it was a collaborative initiative between |
| 11 | setting aside certain vehicles, separating them from the | 11 | EPA and Customs. |
| 12 | rest of the vehicles so that they don't get mixed up. | 12 | Q And this is what I'm getting at. Because in 2010 |
| 13 | Q And if you used that word, that's what you meant | 13 | you have an ASA signed by Mr. Brooks -- no, signed on behalf |
| 14 | yesterday, correct? | 14 | of Mr. Brooks by a Mr. Morrison, correct? |
| 15 | A That's exactly what I meant. Yes. | 15 | A Yes. |
| 16 | Q So you do remember using that word yesterday. | 16 | Q Who had apparently authority to sign off for him, |
| 17 | A I don't remember a hundred percent. No, I don't. | 17 | right? |
| 18 | Q That's fine. Okay. | 18 | A That's correct. |
| 19 | So somehow a shipment coming in from overseas that | 19 | Q Okay. And that's established here on the record |
| 20 | Taotao USA was associated with caught the attention of | 20 | now. |
| 21 | Customs in Long Beach, California in 2012. Is that | 21 | So does June 28, 2010 sound like that's the date |
| 22 | accurate? | 22 | you looked at yesterday? |
| 23 | A I believe there was an inspection in 2012, yes. | 23 | A I believe so. To the best of my recollection. |
| 24 | Q I'm just saying, did I describe the scene and the | 24 | Q Would you like to confirm that? |
| 25 | date correctly? | 25 | A If you'd like me to, I can. |

Q Please. I want your most accurate testimony today.

A June 28, 2010, on Bates 822.
Q Thank you. And I just want to say lawyers sometimes mix dates, exhibit numbers and things up, so that's why sometimes we like to clarify and get assurances. Okay?

A Yes.
Q All right, thank you. So the Taotao USA Company, which is an American company, would you agree?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Became a focus of attention for your Air Enforcement Division in 2010 and possibly as early as 2009. Would that be accurate?

A It depends on what you mean by focus of attention.
Q They were on your radar?
A Yes, they were on our radar.
Q Okay. Because there's a difference between focus and radar, right?

A It sounds to me like there is, yes.
Q I'm sorry?
A It sounds to me like there is a difference, yes.
Q Okay. And I apologize, I studied engineering as an undergrad so I didn't have the benefit of the literary education formally. Okay? So if I choose the wrong words
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then please tell me. I will do my best to select words that you can respond to. Is that okay?

A Yes.
Q So why was Taotao USA on the Air Enforcement's radar?

A Taotao USA was, I, I have to say, this is to the best of my recollection. It was seven years ago. As far as I remember, Customs identified Taotao USA as an importer that was importing a high volume of products into the United States. And that was how it initially came on our radar.

Q Was there any malefactor to that identification other than volume?

A I don't know what you mean.
Q The, M-A-L, does that root mean anything to you?
A No.
Q Malificent, malfeasance, words that associate with evil or badness?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. Can we get to a point here?

MR. CHU: Okay.
BY MR. CHU:
Q So was there anything bad, other than volume, associated with the identification, and I use the word bad, it's not a very good word.

The main point about cross-examination is that you can lead and hopefully make points efficiently.

MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. I will try to find better words.

## BY MR. CHU:

Q Again, we're talking about the regulatory scheme, right?

A We're talking about whatever you want to talk about.

Q What I'm saying is, we're here today pursuant to the permission and authority of the Department of Justice, okay, to talk about the harm to the regulatory scheme, is that your understanding or not?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor.
Mischaracterization of the proceeding.

## JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.

## BY MR. CHU:

Q Is that your understanding or not?
A Yes. We are talking about harm to the regulatory scheme.

Q And so harm would be individuals who don't follow the rules and regulations that associate with the Clean Air Act, would you agree?

A Not entirely.
Q Because there are certain rules that can be

|  | Page 724 |  | Page 726 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | violated without consequences, right? | 1 | Q Let's talk about how -- the process of how these |
| 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls | 2 | catalysts are produced. You've done extensive work in that |
| 3 | for a legal conclusion. | 3 | area, have you not? |
| 4 | MR. CHU: I'll withdraw that question. | 4 | A Producing catalysts? No. |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. | 5 | Q I'm talking about investigating, writing and |
| 6 | BY MR. CHU: | 6 | talking about how 80 percent of the catalysts from China are |
| 7 | Q Let me ask you this, okay? Did you see a sign | 7 | probably not in compliance. Do you remember that in one of |
| 8 | outside in front of the courtroom here? | 8 | your articles? |
| 9 | A No. | 9 | A I remember that you identified a phrase, something |
| 10 | Q Did you see no food or drinks? | 10 | like that. |
| 11 | A Yes, I did see that sign. | 11 | Q That is associated with your name. So is that |
| 12 | Q Do you see the table over here? | 12 | accurate? |
| 13 | A Yes. | 13 | A Is what accurate? |
| 14 | Q Do you see the water box back there? | 14 | Q That there was an article that talked about the |
| 15 | A Yes. | 15 | converters, catalysts, okay, more than 80 percent are |
| 16 | Q Okay. So we're in the EPA building, right? | 16 | probably not in compliance. |
| 17 | A Yes. | 17 | A I remember you showed an article that talked about |
| 18 | Q So some rules can be broken, would you agree? | 18 | catalytic converter non-compliance. |
| 19 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To the | 19 | Q And that article had your name on it, did it not? |
| 20 | relevance. | 20 | A I don't recall. |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. I mean | 21 | Q But the Court has your depo, right? |
| 22 | MR. CHU: I'm going to go on, but I had to get | 22 | A It sounds like they do. |
| 23 | this one, Your Honor. I had to get this one. I'm sorry, | 23 | Q Okay. So was that something that was common |
| 24 | okay? I have to get this one. | 24 | knowledge to you back around 2011? |
| 25 | JUDGE BIRO: So yes, can you break certain rules | 25 | A The 80 percent number? |
|  | Page 725 |  | Page 727 |
| 1 | and is the police not going to come in and arrest us for | 1 | Q What if you say catalysts from China. |
| 2 | having water bottles in this courtroom? | 2 | A Sorry, I'm -- |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Vague. |
| 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, yes. Let's move on. | 4 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 5 | BY MR. CHU: | 5 | Q Catalysts from China. |
| 6 | Q Okay, now let me ask you this. Okay? Are you | 6 | A Did I know about catalysts from China in 2011? |
| 7 | familiar with chocolate covered espresso nuts? | 7 | Q Yes. |
| 8 | A Espresso nuts? | 8 | A Yes, I did. |
| 9 | Q Yes, ma'am. | 9 | Q Thank you. In fact that was one of the areas Air |
| 10 | A Espresso beans, yes. | 10 | Enforcement was clued in on on their radar? |
| 11 | Q Okay. So you would never expect the same amount | 11 | A The Air Enforcement Division was looking at |
| 12 | of nut nor chocolate nor espresso in that bag per nut, would | 12 | catalytic converter compliance in 2011. Yes. |
| 13 | you? | 13 | Q Thank you. |
| 14 | A I would expect some level of consistency. | 14 | And to accomplish that, part of what was necessary |
| 15 | Q Exact in every material respect? | 15 | was to determine a proper method of testing a catalyst, |
| 16 | A Well, to the extent beans are organic products, I | 16 | would you agree? |
| 17 | mean they vary in size and shape. So. | 17 | A Yes, we were evaluating, we were, we were, we were |
| 18 | Q So there is a method to the madness? | 18 | analyzing catalysts, and our methods evolved over time. |
| 19 | A I don't know what you're referring to. | 19 | Yes. |
| 20 | Q This talk about how these catalysts are produced. | 20 | Q And it wasn't until some time after or during 2014 |
| 21 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. To | 21 | that the NEIC adopted a method that could be utilized, would |
| 22 | relevance of this line. | 22 | you agree? |
| 23 | MR. CHU: It goes to the gravity. | 23 | A I don't necessarily agree with that, no. |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Go ahead. | 24 | Q Okay. Now let's look at that loose exhibit from |
| 25 | BY MR. CHU: | 25 | yesterday from the Chinese testing facility. Do you have |

that up there?
A I'm sorry, what exhibit did you want me to look at?

Q Remember this one?
A Yes.
Q Now can you tell us what the method that was used in the testing of that catalyst?

A In this exhibit?
Q From the Chinese testing facility.
A I believe it's described in these documents.
Q Right. So can you tell us what that method was?
A I don't recall without looking.
Q Would you please look?
I'll tell you, would you please read the first two lines, it will move faster.

A Of the test method?
Q Right, the one in English, not in Chinese. Please.

A So I'm looking on Bates 550. This is the first test report. And under the results section it says, "The sample is dissolved using hydrochloric acid and the inner core is almost completely dissolved."

Q Now, you have a license as a professional engineer. You also studied engineering from the Virginia Institute, is that correct?
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A I have a -- I have a license as a professional
engineer, and I have a master's in science in environmental engineering. Yes.

Q From Virginia Tech?
A From Virginia Tech, yes.
Q Is that across the bridge? It's actually a couple of hundred miles away, isn't it?

A It's in Virginia, yeah.
Q But it's not across the bridge, it's actually a couple of hundred miles away from here?

A The main campus is, yes.
Q But wasn't where you did your master's is that correct?

A I took most of my classes at a satellite campus in Northern Virginia.

Q Okay. And so you heard Mr. Jackson yesterday or the day before testify that the, one of the ways to test a catalyst is to crush it, right?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And when you see here as an engineer, okay, when it say it's dissolved. Is there any difference in crushing something and dissolving something? Is the result the same? Would you agree or disagree?

A I'm not sure that the result would be the same.
It sounds like different methods to me.

Q I see. So if the catalyst was dissolved, can you tell us how they extracted the precious metals?

A Would you like me to continue reading?
Q Please.
A "The sediment after acid dissolution is alkali dissolved using sodium peroxide. Mix the resulting solution. TiO2 is added to coprecipitation enrichment noble metal platinum, palladium and rhodium of mixed liquid. Coprecipitation is dissolved using aqua regia. The absorbance of the resulting solution is measured by atomic absorption spectrometer and the noble metal platinum, palladium and rhodium content is calculated from a previously determined value for the absorptivity."

Q Now, from that can you explain to us from an engineering perspective how, what it means to you as to how it was separated? The precious metals.

A It looks like the precious metals were precipitated out of the dissolved solution.

Q And in layman's terms, precipitating out means what?

A It means extracting, probably in a powder format.
Q Do you think that precious metals can be put into a powdered format?

A That's my understanding.
Q Now when you mention powder, you're talking about
some substance that can completely dissolve in a solvent?
A I'm talking about a precipitate. Usually in my experience a precipitate is a powder.

Q I see, but you do understand that these are precious metals and that the precipitate would have to come out in a format or form that could be further separated. Is that correct? Or you don't know?

A You're reaching the extent of my knowledge here on the chemistry of this method. I haven't observed this method. I don't know much about it.

Q But you do understand what you read, right?
A Sorry?
Q You do, or you did understand what you read back
in 2012 when you received this report, right?
A We never contested this report on the basis of test method. I'm not sure the relevance of all these questions.

Q Do you remember the emails from Jackie and Matao Cao saying we can't find a lab in China that the EPA will accept, or something like that?

A Yes, I do remember that.
Q And --
A Well, I'm sorry. Not in the way you just
described, but --
Q I understand. It's never going to be in the way

1 that I described. I understand that, right?

A Your words, not mine.
Q So can you tell us what your words were when you informed the two individuals that these tests were or were not acceptable?

A I think I went through yesterday some of my concerns with the tests, and it didn't involve the test method. They involved the, the actual sample and the vehicle that the sample came from.

Q Would you tell me what page that you want to talk about that helps support what you just said?

A We can look at the same page, Bates 550 .
Q Can we start with the test date.
A Do you want to know the test date?
Q No, can we start with the test date?
A We can start with whatever you want to start with.
Q That's a yes?
A Yes, we can.
Q Thank you. Now, you mentioned that it was a 2012 model year vehicle, is that accurate?

A It looks to me that it's a model year 2012 vehicle. Yes.

Q And you get that from what identifier?
A From the VIN number provided.
Q And can you tell this Court what alphabet position
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of that VIN number tells the Court how to identify the year?
A It's the 10th digit of the VIN is typically designates the model year.

Q And what is the symbol associated in the 10th position on this page?
A What I see here on this page is a C which to me would indicate a 2012 model year vehicle.

Q Okay. And is it accurate to say that from the COC application for this engine family class, whether or not this is associated with an engine family class that was a carry-over or not?
A I wouldn't know that off the top of my head.
Q Where would you have to look? Because --
A We would have to look at the application for a 2012.

Q And we did this dance yesterday, remember? You went from one to another. So can you go ahead and do that please? Go back to the application that you went to through, in the direct?
A I don't think we have this application in the exhibit.

Q Oh, that wasn't one of them that we went back and forth on.

A No.
Q Okay. Assuming that we're talking about a carry-
over application, okay?
A Yes.
Q Isn't it accurate to say that the OEM in China is granted the authority to produce VIN numbers through a different agency in the United States?

A I -- I'm not sure.
Q You wouldn't know, right?
A I don't know.
Q This is what I want to develop, is the depth of familiarity with VIN numbers and identifiers such as those. Okay? But you can tell from the VIN number, okay, that a test is being sought for a 2012 model vehicle. Correct?

A That's what it appears to be, yes.
Q And is it your understanding that the vehicle manufacturers, be it ATVs, scooters, SUVs, luxury vehicles, produce vehicles before the actual year that they're identified in. For instance, 2017 vehicles could be -would be produced, but the actual model year would be known as 2018?

A It's my understanding that the model year often begins before the calendar year, if that's what you're getting at.

> Q Yes, I am.

And so for a manufacturer or an importer to test a 2012 vehicle, more than likely if they're seeking a COC
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renewal that that would have been done in the preceding year. Would you agree?

A Yes.
Q So there's absolutely nothing wrong with what's on
here as you alleged yesterday, that a test from a 2012 model was performed, because that's what it says, isn't it?

A I disagree.
Q I'm sorry. Then tell me why that's inaccurate that this is not a test that was performed in 2011 for a 2012 model year vehicle.

A So even if there -- you're -- this page shows a VIN number which corresponds to model year '12 and an engine family which corresponds to model year '11. That's not -the certification program requires annual certification, you know. No matter what time of year it happened, those are different model years and the compliance plan under the ASA required that every model year be tested. This is a discrepancy.

As I also mentioned yesterday, this report came in, you know, six months after we requested it. So there was a lot of doubt about what actually was tested here.

Q Does this test result test record not purport to be a test result for a 2012 model year vehicle?

A In my opinion, yes.
Q Thank you. As far as the family, and this is very

|  | Page 736 |  | Page 738 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | important because it's on all these charts, identifiers, as | 1 | MR. CHU: Please finish reading. |
| 2 | to engine family class. Okay? | 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: -- the entire definition. |
| 3 | All right. And when you said specifically under | 3 | MR. CHU: Please finish reading. |
| 4 | oath that there is a certain year associated with the engine | 4 | THE WITNESS: "-- and with the same vehicle mass, |
| 5 | family classes, that is totally inaccurate. Isn't that | 5 | transmission type, displacement and power, i.e. horsepower |
| 6 | right? | 6 | or kilowatts." |
| 7 | A No. | 7 | MR. CHU: Thank you. |
| 8 | Q It's actually the model year of that engine family | 8 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 9 | class that is described in the ASA. Would you like me to | 9 | Q So are you aware of any other provisions, |
| 10 | show you that paragraph? | 10 | paragraphs, sentences, fragments in this ASA document that |
| 11 | A I'm not following. | 11 | talks about the term "model year" other than what you just |
| 12 | Q We had some difficulty with you following on the | 12 | read? |
| 13 | ASA in your deposition. Do you remember that? | 13 | A It looks like paragraph seven talks about model |
| 14 | A No. | 14 | year. |
| 15 | Q I had to lead you to some definitional sections to | 15 | Q Very good. Anything else? |
| 16 | understand some of that. | 16 | A I'd have to do a word search, I mean, if you'd |
| 17 | So will you please turn to the page of the ASA | 17 | like me to -- |
| 18 | where it describes model year for us? | 18 | Q No, that's fine. I'm not going to ask you to do |
| 19 | A Okay. | 19 | that. Okay. |
| 20 | (Pause.) | 20 | But now, and you're telling this Court that an |
| 21 | MR. CHU: And, Your Honor, I beg the Court's | 21 | engine family class, there is a year associated with the |
| 22 | indulgence, but F. Lee Bailey had Mark Fuhrman on for nine | 22 | class and not that the year is associated with the model |
| 23 | hours. | 23 | under that, under that class. |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: I'm looking at the ASA now. | 24 | A You keep talking about class. Do you mean engine |
| 25 | BY MR. CHU: | 25 | family? |
|  | Page 737 |  | Page 739 |
| 1 | Q Okay, do you see the paragraph that describes | 1 | Q Is that not described as an engine family class? |
| 2 | model year? | 2 | A Not in my experience. |
| 3 | A I see the definition of vehicle or engine model, | 3 | Q I'm sorry, then help me. How do you describe that |
| 4 | on the Bates page ending in 828. | 4 | group? |
| 5 | Q It's two words. Model year. Is that the same | 5 | A I would, I think you're trying to refer to engine |
| 6 | thing? | 6 | family. |
| 7 | A No. | 7 | Q I said engine family. |
| 8 | Q Okay, can you find the paragraph that has those | 8 | A You said engine family class. I just wanted to be |
| 9 | two words? | 9 | clear. |
| 10 | JUDGE BIRO: Maybe you could direct her, we could | 10 | Q The class known as engine families that are |
| 11 | move a little faster. | 11 | identified more specifically by a specific identifiers as to |
| 12 | BY MR. CHU: | 12 | how that engine family belongs to the class known as engine |
| 13 | Q If you will please look at Attachment C. | 13 | families. Is that clear? |
| 14 | (Pause.) | 14 | A No. |
| 15 | Q And look and read for us paragraph four. | 15 | Q Okay. So we'll just stick with engine families, |
| 16 | A The definition of vehicle or engine model? | 16 | okay? |
| 17 | Q If you will please read paragraph four for us. | 17 | A Okay. |
| 18 | A "Vehicle or engine model means any set of subject | 18 | Q So is it your belief that there is a year |
| 19 | vehicles or engines that are certified in the same EPA | 19 | associated with the engine family different from the model |
| 20 | engine family built by the same manufacturer in the same | 20 | year? |
| 21 | model year as designated by the manufacturer --" | 21 | A No. |
| 22 | Q Thank you. That's good enough. | 22 | Q Thank you. So why is it that you're telling this |
| 23 | So you see -- | 23 | Court, this Judge, that it's the wrong engine family year? |
| 24 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, he asked her to read | 24 | A The engine family shown on that page, BTAOX.250AAB |
| 25 | what the definition -- | 25 | is a 2011 engine family. |


|  | Page 740 |  | Page 742 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Right. And this was a renewal application which | 1 | Manufacturers are required to submit applications for |
| 2 | is permitted per Mr. Jackson, then it's okay to identify | 2 | certification annually. |
| 3 | that class and then identify as what you just read here, a | 3 | Q Tell me what identifiers you're looking for to |
| 4 | model year, correct? | 4 | indicate it's a 2012 engine family? |
| 5 | A I'm not sure I understood the question, but I | 5 | A In your hypothetical scenario, were there a 2012 |
| 6 | think the answer is no. | 6 | carry-over engine family, that engine family would most |
| 7 | Q Well, my point is, there's a misinterpretation on | 7 | likely begin with a C for 2012, and then have the same |
| 8 | your side when you were looking at these back in 2012 or | 8 | remaining characters. |
| 9 | '13. Is that not accurate? | 9 | Q So when you're saying that that B right here, |
| 10 | A No, that's not accurate. | 10 | correct? |
| 11 | Q So you understand recertifications? | 11 | A It's kind of covered up. |
| 12 | A Are you talking about carry-overs? | 12 | Q Is it in front of you there? On your screen. |
| 13 | Q Carry-overs, I'm sorry. | 13 | A You can see what the screen looks like, right? Do |
| 14 | A Yes, I know the concept carry-over. | 14 | you see that engine family on it? |
| 15 | Q And that's not recertifying vehicles? | 15 | Q Actually I can't see -- |
| 16 | A I wouldn't call it recertifying. I would say | 16 | A I see the same thing. |
| 17 | certifying. | 17 | MR. CHU: May I approach? I can show her mine. |
| 18 | Q Okay. I'll take the re out. It's certifying, | 18 | Thank you. |
| 19 | right? | 19 | THE WITNESS: If you just tell me the Bates |
| 20 | So in a carry-over application is it accurate to | 20 | number. Is it the 550 ? Okay. |
| 21 | say that is a certification of a vehicle based upon a prior | 21 | Yes. |
| 22 | approval? | 22 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 23 | A I would add to that that the prior approval would | 23 | Q The B is what you're talking about, right? |
| 24 | be the identical vehicle. Yes. | 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | Q Right. And so if the identical vehicle here as | 25 | Q So you're saying that they should have changed the |
|  | Page 741 |  | Page 743 |
| 1 | identified belonged to the engine class, engine family. | 1 | B to a C to identify that this is being utilized for |
| 2 | That's what you like. Engine family, right? | 2 | certification for 2012. Correct? |
| 3 | A Engine family. | 3 | A No, that's not what I'm saying. |
| 4 | Q Okay, I'm going to stay with that. Engine family. | 4 | Q But -- but, if the certifying agency, the EPA, |
| 5 | So if I had one that was approved in 2011 and I'm | 5 | receives this and notices that B , that's something that they |
| 6 | doing a carry-over, is it not accurate to identify the | 6 | can go ahead and tell the submitting entity, party, |
| 7 | engine family as is identified in this exhibit also Bates | 7 | contractor, consultant to, oh, I think you need to change |
| 8 | number 550? | 8 | that to a C. Wouldn't you consider that some sort of |
| 9 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Assuming | 9 | typographical error? |
| 10 | facts not in evidence. We don't have any evidence about the | 10 | A At this point, that's what I'm trying to tell you. |
| 11 | engine family or the VIN depicted on this report. | 11 | At this point, you know, we had been requesting these |
| 12 | MR. CHU: I didn't talk about a VIN right now. | 12 | documents for six months. There was always some problem |
| 13 | I'm only talking about the engine family. | 13 | related to it. We did not, we were not comfortable |
| 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. | 14 | ascribing this to a typographical error. |
| 15 | Do you understand the question? | 15 | Q And I appreciate that, and that's why we talked |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: I think so. And no, I don't think | 16 | about Donald, Johnny, that one student that just didn't |
| 17 | it's accurate. I think the engine family listed here is a | 17 | quite get it every time. So this is what's happening, |
| 18 | 2011 engine family. If they meant to say 2012 engine family | 18 | right? Taotao USA was just not getting it in 2011. Is that |
| 19 | then they should have listed the 2012 engine family. | 19 | accurate? |
| 20 | BY MR. CHU: | 20 | A That's not my interpretation. |
| 21 | Q And that's what we've been talking about for ten | 21 | Q Okay, but would you agree that sometimes it takes |
| 22 | minutes. There's no such thing as a 2011 and then a 2012 | 22 | wrongs to make things right? |
| 23 | engine family because it's the same engine family, right? | 23 | A Possibly. |
| 24 | A No, it's not. Engine families change every year. | 24 | Q People like those kids that didn't quite get it |
| 25 | The certification process is an annual process. | 25 | sometimes end up to be what, presidents maybe? |

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. BY MR. CHU:
Q Now let's talk about what you were doing to try to help Taotao USA get it. Can you tell us?

A I think we went through a number of exhibits yesterday where there was email correspondence back and forth between me and Christopher Thompson and Mike Hillman and possibly even Mr. Wang regarding these catalyst test reports. We had requested them, they came to us in Chinese. We requested translation. Then they came without photos. We requested the photos, then there were concerns about the photos not matching up with what we saw on the work sheets.

This was an iterative process. We sent numerous emails, numerous letters. That was, that was a lot of effort on EPA's part in my opinion.

Q Did you ever send an email saying I think you made a boo-boo here. This B needs to be a C?

A I never sent an email like that.
Q Why not?
A This -- at this point the decision was made to go forward with a stipulated penalty agreement.

Q I'm sorry. This is after, remember, June 2010.
That's when that one was signed. So I don't think you're accurate in what you just said. Would you agree?

MR. CHU: With chandeliers.
JUDGE BIRO: With humongous chandeliers. This would be the worst place to probably be.

## (Laughter).

(Off the record discussion.)
JUDGE BIRO: I think we can go on. I'm sorry.
I'm very sorry.
MR. CHU: Okay.
BY MR. CHU:
Q So are you still with me?
A Yes.
Q What I said was I want to confirm, and not be redundant, that when you said the discrepancies which you just identified, again, you never identified the B/C scenario that we just talked about. Right?

A These catalyst test reports hadn't been submitted at the time we sent the January letter.

Q Okay. So, can you tell this Court specifically what discrepancies you know exactly that you had identified in those two January letters?

A If you'd like me to speak exactly, we should go probably look at the letters.

Q I'm good with that.
A Okay. Do you know what exhibit numbers they are?
Q Again, yesterday this flipping back and forth, I
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just kind of got lost there. So any assistance would be great. Because we went from one to another in another book and another. But she knows.

CX72 to start with. Thank you, Salina.
A CX72 is not the letter I was referring to.
Q That is a January 2012 letter, is it not?
A As I mentioned, there are two January 2012
letters. I was referring to one in mid-January.
Q Would you look at 73 and see if it doesn't follow in chronological order by the EPA exhibit identifications?

A 73 does follow in chronological order.
Q So is that the letter you're referring to?
A No, I'm referring to an earlier letter.
Q How about 71? Would you look at 71, please? Or
70. It's got to be in there somewhere.

A It's Exhibit 71.
Q Is it? Okay, because she just handed me 70. So it's 71. I apologize, again.

A So here again we were requesting complete catalyst test results, and we also had identified some label issues which were very similar to these issues that we identified here in the catalyst test report just now that we were talking about.

Q The ones that were falling off is what I heard yesterday. Is that what you're talking about? Things that

|  | Page 748 |  | Page 750 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | were falling off? | 1 | I'm sorry. Seventy-one is what you said, right? |
| 2 | A I'm not talking about things that are falling off. | 2 | A Yes. No, 70. Seventy. |
| 3 | Q But you did mention that yesterday about some | 3 | Q I'm sorry. Did I make a mistake. I thought she |
| 4 | labels that if they fall off then -- | 4 | said 71, I had 70 here, so we were talking about 70, right? |
| 5 | A I mentioned that as an example of a minor | 5 | Okay. |
| 6 | egregiousness violation. Yes. | 6 | A Sorry, if I said 71 I meant 70. |
| 7 | Q Go ahead, please. | 7 | Q And it may have been the earthquake alert that |
| 8 | A So this letter talks about how in the inspection | 8 | threw me off. |
| 9 | checklists the English translations that we received when we | 9 | So 70 is -- that's what I had here, okay? So and |
| 10 | looked at the photos of the labels on those vehicles which | 10 | you said that they didn't provide any catalyst report to you |
| 11 | were inspected, the photos showed, the engine family on the | 11 | as of that letter date, is that accurate? |
| 12 | photos didn't match up with the engine family on the | 12 | A Let's see, it says here that you have not provided |
| 13 | worksheets. So again, there was a discrepancy related to | 13 | the complete catalyst test results. Maybe they provided |
| 14 | what was purportedly inspected and what was actually | 14 | something that wasn't complete. |
| 15 | inspected. | 15 | MR. CHU: I'm going to object to being non- |
| 16 | Q And is it accurate to say at or about these times | 16 | responsive. |
| 17 | you were dealing with a person charged with the | 17 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 18 | responsibility of satisfying the EPA that was not Chinese? | 18 | Q I'm asking you, okay? Did you say that they had |
| 19 | A This letter was sent to Mr. Cao, President, Taotao | 19 | not provided you any catalyst report as of the date of this |
| 20 | USA, Inc. | 20 | letter? Did you say that? |
| 21 | Q The person I'm referring to is Mike Hillman. | 21 | A I don't, I don't recall. |
| 22 | A I'm not sure if we were dealing with him at this | 22 | Q Okay. If you did, it's in the record. If you |
| 23 | point. | 23 | didn't, it's accurate. Okay. |
| 24 | Q So it's your belief that in January 2012 he had | 24 | So in fact this letter supports the fact that |
| 25 | kind of left the farm or something? | 25 | there were catalyst reports that were given to you. |
|  | Page 749 |  | Page 751 |
| 1 | A I -- I think sometime in 2012 he left, but I don't | 1 | Correct? |
| 2 | recall when. | 2 | A It just says "you have not provided complete |
| 3 | Q Okay. So we'll go through the emails later. But | 3 | catalyst test results". I'm not sure -- |
| 4 | you were dealing with Mike Hillman to try to get compliance | 4 | MR. CHU: Objection. Not responsive. |
| 5 | with -- | 5 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 6 | A Initially, yes. Yes. | 6 | Q The question was, you did receive some catalyst |
| 7 | Q And throughout the year 2011. Right? | 7 | reports, right? |
| 8 | A I believe so, yes. | 8 | A I don't know. |
| 9 | Q And that would include the time period before the | 9 | Q Well doesn't this letter help refresh your memory? |
| 10 | ASA being signed because, for a fact, you were dealing with | 10 | I mean it says here, you didn't give us complete catalyst |
| 11 | Mike Hillman in reference to that agreement and settlement, | 11 | reports. So to me that would mean you had received some. |
| 12 | were you not? | 12 | Would you agree or disagree? |
| 13 | A At least partly. | 13 | A It actually says results, not reports. |
| 14 | Q And he asked to negotiate that document with the | 14 | Q I see. |
| 15 | EPA, did he not? | 15 | Can you tell me, tell this Court whether or not |
| 16 | A I don't recall if it was, if it -- yeah, I know | 16 | Exhibit 215 is something you would consider a result? |
| 17 | Mr. Cao was involved, but I don't recall the specifics. | 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q Okay. But you do remember that there were no | 18 | Q And so by not saying catalyst test in your letter, |
| 19 | translators used at that time, right? | 19 | it's your opinion that you did not receive any catalyst |
| 20 | A Not to my recollection. | 20 | tests but you did receive catalyst test results. Is that |
| 21 | Q And Mr. Hillman was not an attorney, you know | 21 | accurate? |
| 22 | that, right? | 22 | A I can't say what I received. All I can say based |
| 23 | A I never believed him to be an attorney. | 23 | on this letter is what I didn't receive, and based on this |
| 24 | Q Thank you. | 24 | letter I did not receive complete catalyst test results. |
| 25 | Now here in this letter that you just kind of -- | 25 | Q Now you had a whole set of emails that you just |


|  | Page 752 |  | Page 754 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | testified about, and that you identified yesterday that was | 1 | JUDGE BIRO: I think there's no question. She |
| 2 | offered, and we also asked for the submission of those to be | 2 | acknowledges having received the reports. |
| 3 | accepted by the Court. Do you remember that? | 3 | MR. CHU: Thank you |
| 4 | A Yes. | 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Can we move on? |
| 5 | Q Could you please go to those emails and look at | 5 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 6 | the ones on or before this letter, January 3, 2012, and see | 6 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 7 | if you identify these catalyst tests being sent to you from | 7 | Q There was this real long attachment we talked |
| 8 | China. | 8 | about yesterday, those were those test results and reports? |
| 9 | A Okay. | 9 | A The CX215? |
| 10 | (Pause.) | 10 | Q No, there was an email that we talked about |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: I apologized, Your Honor, I didn't | 11 | yesterday where the Court allowed us optional completeness |
| 12 | wait for a ruling, but -- because I just asked the question, | 12 | to submit all those attachments that were sent to the EPA. |
| 13 | a different one. I'm sorry, I'm trying to move this along, | 13 | So I'm just asking, if you don't know, you tell me you don't |
| 14 | you told me to move it along. I'm trying to move it along. | 14 | know. Whether that long list of attachments included |
| 15 | So I'm going to wait next time. | 15 | catalyst test results, because we don't have that in front |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: That's fine. So how does this, what | 16 | of the Court right now. |
| 17 | element of penalty is this related to? | 17 | A Are you talking about CX069, Bates 851? |
| 18 | MR. CHU: It goes to that, where I started was | 18 | Q Yes. |
| 19 | willful negligence, willful or negligence. It's a 20 | 19 | A I believe those are inspection checklists in |
| 20 | percent factor. | 20 | Chinese. They're not catalyst test reports. |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Uh-huh. | 21 | Q That's fine, but it shows a level of cooperation. |
| 22 | MR. CHU: And so I want to identify the fact that | 22 | A Well yeah. Nobody said that they didn't do |
| 23 | here, right after this 2010 agreement that was signed, she, | 23 | anything as far as their compliance plan. They, they seemed |
| $24$ | they were doing catalyst tests the very next month in July | 24 | to have inspected some vehicles and they tested some |
| 25 | and all the way to August, and it was because it had Chinese | 25 | vehicles. |
|  | Page 753 |  | Page 755 |
| 1 | that she says there's something wrong with it, then there's | 1 | Q Are you aware of like a military school for |
| 2 | something else wrong, there's something else wrong, when | 2 | importers that they can get this stuff right? Discipline |
| 3 | they're doing their best to try to work with the situation. | 3 | institution where they can learn how to get it right. |
| 4 | And without Mike Hillman, who was the English-speaking | 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. |
| 5 | intermediary that didn't speak Chinese. So this goes to the | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. |
| 6 | element of that willful or negligent factor, Your Honor. | 6 | Do you know of any school they can go to to learn |
| 7 | And if you've had enough on it, I'll move on. | 7 | to comply with EPA's emission requirements? |
| 8 | JUDGE BIRO: So other than the reference that you | 8 | THE WITNESS: I don't know a school per se, but |
| 9 | were judging it based on the fact that there was Chinese on | 9 | you know, as Cle Jackson testified, they offer workshops on |
| 10 | it, Would you agree that they had done some catalyst testing | 10 | how to apply for certificates. |
| 11 | after the ASA was executed? | 11 | MR. CHU: Good. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: I received catalyst test reports. | 12 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Whether they actually conducted them, | 13 | Q And short of that, you talking with Jackie Wang |
| 14 | you don't know. | 14 | when he threw his hands up as to what to do, you said I know |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: (Laughing). | 15 | of some groups that use Harrison Wolf. Was that your |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Catalyst test reports from the | 16 | testimony? |
| 17 | Respondents -- | 17 | A I said I was aware that, that there were companies |
| 18 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 18 | that had used Harrison Wolf. |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: -- through their agents -- | 19 | Q Is that a yes? |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: -- in response to the ASA. | 21 | Q Thank you. |
| 22 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 22 | A I can paraphrase your, your question. |
| 23 | MR. CHU: I can go on, if that's established. You | 23 | Q It wasn't -- okay. |
| 24 | know, without me having to establish it, reading through | 24 | So that's how the name Harrison Wolf appeared on |
| 25 | these emails to confirm that she was sent these reports. | 25 | the radar of Taotao USA. Would you agree? |


|  | Page 756 |  | Page 758 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A I -- I honestly, I know that I said that, but as | 1 | Q Okay. Do you know where Harrison Wolf, Margaret |
| 2 | far as how they, how else they might have found it, I don't | 2 | Gold-- |
| 3 | know. | 3 | A Goldstein. |
| 4 | Q I'm going to take a minute to look for that email | 4 | Q Stein. Thank you. Found CEE? |
| 5 | that thanked you. Do you remember the email thinking you | 5 | A I don't know. |
| 6 | from Jackie, thank you for getting us this introduction to | 6 | Q Okay. But she did. CEE or am I tricking you, I'm |
| 7 | Harrison Wolf or something like that? Do you remember that | 7 | talking about SGS? |
| 8 | email? I'll find it. I'll take the time. | 8 | A I don't know. |
| 9 | Do you remember that? | 9 | Q Well, she found a company that could do the |
| 10 | JUDGE BIRO: I remember that. | 10 | catalyst test, you remember? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I vaguely remember it. | 11 | (Pause.) |
| 12 | JUDGE BIRO: I remember that. | 12 | Q Exhibit number, please? |
| 13 | MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm going to | 13 | A I assume she found it for them. I, I don't know |
| 14 | move on. Thank you. | 14 | that process. |
| 15 | Okay, now, I'm going to go on. Okay? | 15 | Q Okay. |
| 16 | BY MR. CHU: | 16 | Does the name SGS ring a couple of bells? |
| 17 | Q So then as a result, Harrison Wolf, Margaret | 17 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Goldstein, you're familiar with her, right? | 18 | Q Okay. How many? |
| 19 | A Margaret Goldstein? | 19 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague. |
| 20 | Q Goldstein, I'm sorry. Okay. | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. |
| 21 | You're familiar with her right? | 21 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 22 | A Yes, I know who she is. | 22 | Q When I said bells, you know, what that refers to, |
| 23 | Q Okay. But it's spelled the same was as Goldstein, | 23 | right? |
| 24 | is it not? | 24 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 25 | A I was just confirming that I heard correctly. | 25 | Argumentative. |
|  | Page 757 |  | Page 759 |
| 1 | Q I understand, but is it spelled the same way is | 1 | MR. CHU: Thank you. I'll withdraw it okay? All |
| 2 | what I want to know. | 2 | right. |
| 3 | A I don't know how you spell it. | 3 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. | 4 | Q So you know when I say that who we're talking |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: I don't know how you spell it. | 5 | about, right? |
| 6 | MR. CHU: Okay, thank you. | 6 | A When you say the word SGS? Yes. SGS Lab, yeah. |
| 7 | BY MR. CHU: | 7 | Q Right. That's a non-American company in Canada |
| 8 | Q But we know who we're talking about, right? | 8 | that employs Canadians, right? |
| 9 | A I know who I'm talking about. | 9 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 10 | Q Thank you. | 10 | Relevance. |
| 11 | Okay, so does my Texas accent disturb you? | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. |
| 12 | A No. | 12 | THE WITNESS: I believe they're located in Canada. |
| 13 | Q If it does, I apologize. | 13 | I don't know anything else about the ownership of the |
| 14 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. | 14 | company or -- |
| 15 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. | 15 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 16 | MR. CHU: Okay. So, I'd never make fun of anyone | 16 | Q And some of the writings from that company are |
| 17 | from Jersey. | 17 | somewhat grammatically incorrect and written in a form as if |
| 18 | Anyway. | 18 | someone was writing that had a first language either in one |
| 19 | BY MR. CHU: | 19 | of the Asian languages. Have you ever noticed that? |
| 20 | Q So now, CEE, that's a EPA approved facility. | 20 | A No. |
| 21 | Accurate? | 21 | Q Okay. Have you ever heard the phrase Chinglish or |
| 22 | A No. | 22 | Hinglish in the English usage? |
| 23 | Q They're on the web site, aren't they? The EPA web | 23 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 24 | site as to testing facilities? | 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Have you heard of that? |
| 25 | A I don't know. | 25 | THE WITNESS: No. |
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|  | Page 760 |  | Page 762 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. CHU: | 1 | we're just going to talk about it. But I believe this was |
| 2 | Q Have you ever noticed that when Mr. Wang spoke to | 2 | identified yesterday. Do you remember that? |
| 3 | you it wasn't in perfect grammatical English? | 3 | A No, I don't. |
| 4 | A I don't recall. | 4 | Q Okay. |
| 5 | Q When you said an accent on Terry, did you mean | 5 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it would be a good |
| 6 | accent or did you mean English usage? | 6 | time for a break if you want an opportunity to locate that |
| 7 | A Um -- | 7 | and -- |
| 8 | Q Maybe a little bit of both? | 8 | MR. CHU: She's pretty -- I can continue. She can |
| 9 | A Maybe a little bit of both. Yes. | 9 | find it. |
| 10 | Q And I believe overhead, the screens are working | 10 | JUDGE BIRO: Would you like a break, Ms. Isin? |
| 11 | better now. | 11 | THE WITNESS: I don't know. What time is it? |
| 12 | Now, Margaret, and I'm not going to use her last | 12 | MR. CHU: I'm okay with a break, Your Honor. |
| 13 | name anymore, okay? She gets working and starts getting | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: It's 10:42. |
| 14 | what you want. Right? | 14 | THE WITNESS: Yeah, I would like a break. Thank |
| 15 | A It's not what I personally want. | 15 | you. |
| 16 | Q I'm sorry. Let me rephrase that. She starts | 16 | JUDGE BIRO: We'll stand in recess until 11:00. |
| 17 | working and attempts to satisfy the EPA through your | 17 | Take a break. |
| 18 | request. | 18 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 19 | A Not my request. | 19 | (Brief recess.) |
| 20 | Q I'm sorry. Ms. Margaret begins working and starts | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. |
| 21 | attempting to reply to your demands that you sent out on | 21 | Oh, Mr. Chu, not you. |
| 22 | behalf of EPA. | 22 | MR. CHU: I don't want to be accused of not |
| 23 | A I disagree. | 23 | following instructions. |
| 24 | Q So she was not attempting to satisfy the demand | 24 | (Laughter.) |
| 25 | and complaints that you had? | 25 | // |
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| 1 | A My understanding is that Margaret Goldstein was | 1 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 2 | hired by Taotao USA to help them with their compliance | 2 | Q So as of now, are you saying that Taotao USA was |
| 3 | report under the compliance plan. | 3 | negligent or not in your analysis? |
| 4 | Q That did not include responding to your written | 4 | A I'm saying the Respondents were negligent. Yes. |
| 5 | demands and complaints? | 5 | Q How many catalyst reports for model year 2012 do |
| 6 | A I don't know what the scope of her hiring was. | 6 | you remember having ever seen from Taotao USA? |
| 7 | Q Did she respond and talk to you about your letters | 7 | A I don't recall the exact number. |
| 8 | in January? | 8 | Q Would it have been more than ten? And I remind |
| 9 | A I believe she sent one or two emails, yes. | 9 | you, you identified quite a number yesterday. |
| 10 | Q So that's a yes, right? When you say I believe, | 10 | A I don't recall. |
| 11 | I'm not sure if that means it might have happened, may not | 11 | Q Remember the ones that we flipped through with |
| 12 | have happened. So did she or did she not? | 12 | you, with Mr, Kulschinsky, and you said good, good, bad, |
| 13 | A She sent emails to me. Correct. | 13 | bad, something wrong here. I think there were at least ten |
| 14 | Q Thank you. Now so those emails addressed your | 14 | or more. You don't really remember? |
| 15 | concerns and complaints in your letters to Taotao. Did they | 15 | A If you're talking about Exhibit 215, there are 12 |
| 16 | not? | 16 | catalyst reports in there. I, I don't recall how many are |
| 17 | Do you want me to pull those up? The Margaret | 17 | for 2012 VINs. |
| 18 | Goldstein emails. | 18 | Q I'm sorry? |
| 19 | A I'm not quite sure which concerns and complaints | 19 | A I don't recall how many are for 2012 VINs, if |
| 20 | you're talking about. | 20 | that's what you're asking. |
| 21 | (Pause.) | 21 | Q Okay, good. And just to make it clear, because it |
| 22 | Q I'd ask you to look at this and see if this, if | 22 | was kind of tricky in the answers yesterday, I didn't |
| 23 | you remember this being one of the excerpts from those | 23 | receive a couching of in a year. But we're really more |
| 24 | emails that were offered and submitted to the Court. It's | 24 | concerned, or the EPA's more concerned that two word |
| 25 | R10, but I don't want to submit another one. So this is, | 25 | description, model year. That's what's more important. |

Isn't it?
A I --
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, vague. JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Model year is more important than what?

BY MR. CHU:
Q Having received a report in a certain year.
A I would say both are important. Timeliness of reports as well as what was actually tested.

Q Certainly. But yesterday in your answers you kept on talking about I didn't get a certain report in a year. You didn't talk about model year reports. Remember that?

A I don't know what you mean by model year reports.
Q Okay. A model year as we just saw, is the year in which, a year that is defined by the manufacturer. Do you remember reading that?

A Yes.
Q Is that accurate?
A Model year is a defined term in the regulations.
Q But did that ASA not also say that is, well, I'll turn back to that.

A Sure.
Q Sixty-seven ASA.
A I'm looking at the ASA.
little chart we had up for at least half an hour or so yesterday? You don't re--, do you remember the chart, is what I'm asking you?

A I don't know which one you're referring to.
Q The chart where you went and compiled information from Customs, pulling out information about the number of vehicles, the pricing associated with the invoice, and then the number of vehicles. Do you remember that?

A The total declared value of Taotao's imports?
Q Right. You didn't put a title name to that chart, did you?

A I don't recall.
Q Well what would the name for that chart have been had you named it?

A Taotao USA's importations between 2009 and 2016.
Q Very good. So when I talk about the number of vehicles, you said you'd have to take a look at it, but you just don't know what exhibit number that was, right?

A That's correct.
(Pause.)
Q Does the number 1,290 ring a bell in terms of one of those counts?

JUDGE BIRO: That would be count nine. MR. CHU: Thank you. I thought I heard a bell on this side. Count nine.
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JUDGE BIRO: And there are 391 for count ten. MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. CHU:
Q Now the associated penalty with 300-plus vehicles was how much?

A I don't recall off the top of my head.
Q The magnitude we just talked about, okay? Now you decided to use a very high egregious factor on that, did you not?

A For counts nine and ten I used egregiousness of major, meaning a 6.5 multiplier.

Q Is that a yes or a no? I'm sorry.
A Uh--
Q You just said very high factor.
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor, to the characterization. JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
MR. CHU: Okay.
BY MR. CHU:
Q What's the highest factor you could use?
A The highest factor in the penalty policy is major. A 6.5 .

Q Thank you. So you used the very high number, is that accurate?
(Pause.)

MR. CHU: I'll withdraw it. Okay, let's go on. BY MR. CHU:
Q Now, and you based that on the fact that you chose to ignore the history of emissions testing associated with Taotao USA. Is that accurate?

A No.
Q Well, if you remember the testimony of Mr. Jackson, he said emission wise, that it was 50 to 60 percent in reference to the standard and they were doing a good job there. Do you remember that?

A I remember he talked about some low hour testing. I -- I don't recall that it was counts nine and ten specifically.

Q Well, count nine and ten would have had to have some emissions testing before a certificate was ever approved, recertified, or whatever language you want to use.

A A certificate application usually includes submission test results, correct.

Q So contrary to your statement to this Court that there are no test results, that's not true, is it?

A It is true.
Q That there were no test results?
A There were no test results for the vehicles that were built.

Q I understand that, but as far as the model, when

Q Right, and you discussed the fact that you had to speculate that these particular vehicles would probably have the highest levels of emissions. Is that accurate?

A I don't recall that.
Q Well isn't that what you have to do? If you claim there are no test results, to get to 6.5 you had to basically violate the DLJ letter and say that we are punishing them for egregious emissions violations.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I disagree.
BY MR. CHU:
Q Okay. Egregiousness, when there are no test results, would you agree we're referring to emissions tests?

A There were no emission tests to refer to for counts nine and ten.

Q I understand, but we're talking about emission tests. My question wasn't was there or was there not. But we're talking about emission tests in determining the egregious factor that you placed.

A Egregiousness is, is, in this case based on the absence of emission tests.

Q But not in the absence of data in history, right?
A I'm not sure what you're referring to.
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we talk about the group of vehicles relating to what you identified to the left-hand side here, you didn't identify
it. I'm sorry. It's another document where you talk about engine families. Okay?

A Yes.
Q So when you identify nine and ten in those engine families, you weren't talking about a specific vehicle. You were talking about specific vehicles, right?

A I was -- I was talking about the vehicles that were labeled as belonging to the vendor families.

Q So I want to go to CX213. Maybe that will help both of us, okay?

A Okay.
(Pause.)
JUDGE BIRO: But this is not on counts nine and ten, the page that we put up.

THE WITNESS: I'm looking at it.

## BY MR. CHU:

Q Okay. So when you said there were no emission results for this engine family --

A Uh-huh.
Q -- that's not accurate, is it?
A Perhaps the better way of phrasing it would be there were no emission test results for the vehicles that were built under this engine family.
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Q Well, history refers to what Mr. Jackson testified to, that there's not been a problem with violating the Clean Air Standard for emissions with Taotao USA product.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony of Mr. Jackson.

JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it please?

MR. CHU: Yes. Okay.
BY MR. CHU:
Q There were discussions about the history of emission standards being met or not met by Taotao USA. Do you remember that?

A Vaguely.
Q Do you remember whether or not you heard any evidence that Taotao USA had a history of emissions standards violations?

A I didn't hear anything about that.
Q So you had that data available to you as well when you decided to perform the calculations on counts nine and ten, did you not?

A Yes.
Q And you chose to ignore that historical information, did you not?

A It wasn't relevant.
Q You chose to ignore it. Did you not?
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A Ignoring it implies that it's relevant, and it's | 1 | helping me get some understanding. I thought it was a broad |
| 2 | not. | 2 | range of saying look, they're so super hot, so super great |
| 3 | Q It's not relevant because your job is to hit these | 3 | that they're, you know, have lots of money to pay the EPA |
| 4 | companies with the highest possible dollar amount to force | 4 | for anything the EPA wants. That's the message I got. |
| 5 | them to settlement. Isn't that what the policy states | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: And so your counter response is |
| 6 | that's admitted here? | 6 | that -- |
| 7 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, form. Argumentative. | 7 | MR. CHU: Is that maybe one of the reasons is |
| 8 | THE WITNESS: That is not what the policy is | 8 | because they need to get out of this business because you |
| 9 | stating. | 9 | guys are putting them out of business, which is one of the |
| 10 | BY MR. CHU: | 10 | policy considerations the Court has to consider, health |
| 11 | Q And you're certain of that? | 11 | versus economic viability of a business. That's -- again, |
| 12 | A It doesn't tell me to hit them with the highest | 12 | I'm taking this from the George Washington -- |
| 13 | possible penalty. | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Have you got any evidence to support |
| 14 | Q You've never heard of that, that the purpose of | 14 | that conclusion? |
| 15 | the penalty policy which has been admitted, is a platform to | 15 | MR. CHU: Not any more than what they've |
| 16 | use for settlement negotiations? | 16 | submitted. But I've got to address it because they brought |
| 17 | A The penalty policy is used for settlement | 17 | it up. |
| 18 | negotiations. Correct. | 18 | I don't think the produced anything showing |
| 19 | Q Thank you. The plight of these Chinese companies | 19 | anything, but they brought it up so how else am I supposed |
| 20 | has been long, arduous and difficult in these past ten | 20 | to address it if I don't address it? |
| 21 | years. Would you agree? | 21 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, this is argument, |
| 22 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. | 22 | the characterizing of -- |
| 23 | Characterization. | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Right, this is just speculation. I |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. | 24 | don't know why they went into that and you don't know why |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: It doesn't appear to me to be as | 25 | they went into it and I doubt the Agency knows why they went |
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| 1 | long, arduous and difficult or a plight from what I see. | 1 | into those other areas except they did and that's a fact. |
| 2 | BY MR. CHU: | 2 | MR. CHU: Right, and one can suppose from that |
| 3 | Q You read yesterday Taotao Group, how they had to | 3 | that possibly these extractions -- let me go to the next |
| 4 | go and try to develop other industries. Did you see that? | 4 | question. |
| 5 | A I saw how they manufacture other types of | 5 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 6 | products. | 6 | Q You haven't been in DC for a while, right? |
| 7 | Q Correct. And so if the development, | 7 | A On this trip or -- |
| 8 | manufacturing, exporting, selling of these ATVs and scooters | 8 | Q No, in the city. |
| 9 | were so profitable, you would assume it's not necessary to | 9 | A I lived in DC, yes. Or in this area. |
| 10 | endeavor into other areas of manufacturing, would you agree? | 10 | Q But you don't drive, you don't have a license, |
| 11 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Calls | 11 | right? |
| 12 | for speculation and counsel is testifying. | 12 | A I'm sorry? |
| 13 | MR. CHU: May I response, Your Honor? | 13 | Q You don't drive. |
| 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Sure. | 14 | A Uh -- |
| 15 | MR. CHU: They brought this up yesterday, showing | 15 | Q That's what you told me. But let me ask you this. |
| 16 | that chart. So, you know, she was qualified or attempted to | 16 | You know the license plates? |
| 17 | be qualified as an expert and they asked her about this, I | 17 | A Yes, I know the license plates. |
| 18 | believe. Fairness allows me to -- | 18 | Q What do you notice the wording on those plates? |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: You're saying that the evidence that | 19 | A I'm sorry? |
| 20 | a company went into other manufacturing areas is evidence | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: No taxation without representation. |
| 21 | that the current area in which it manufactures is not | 21 | MR. CHU: Thank you, thank you. |
| 22 | generating enough revenue? | 22 | JUDGE BIRO: I know what's on them, and I don't |
| 23 | MR. CHU: Not current, there's nothing about | 23 | even live here. Go ahead. |
| 24 | revenue per se. It's just that I didn't really understand | 24 | MR. CHU: Okay. |
| 25 | what they were offering that evidence for, so maybe this is | 25 | // |


|  | Page 776 |  | Page 778 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. CHU: | 1 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 2 | Q So these companies in China. Taotao Group, Junyun | 2 | Relevance. Comparing this case to another case is most, on |
| 3 | -- are you with me? | 3 | its face irrelevant. |
| 4 | A Yeah, I know they're Chinese companies. | 4 | MR. CHU: May I please respond to the record? |
| 5 | Q They have no agreement with the EPA, but your | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Followed onto your point. Overruled. |
| 6 | complaint wants to hold them responsible at first for \$3.3 | 6 | Go ahead. Is there a point? |
| 7 | million, then you got nice and said we only want \$1.6 | 7 | THE WITNESS: As part of the settlement agreement, |
| 8 | million -- | 8 | manufacturers were not part of the settlement agreement. |
| 9 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, relevance. | 9 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 10 | MR. CHU: I haven't finished -- | 10 | Q They weren't part of the complaint either, were |
| 11 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: -- seems to be talking about | 11 | they? |
| 12 | liability as opposed to the penalty calculation in this | 12 | A Sorry. Can you repeat? |
| 13 | matter. | 13 | Q They weren't part of the complaint. Were they? |
| 14 | MR. CHU: You've got to start from somewhere. | 14 | A No. They were not. |
| 15 | JUDGE BIRO: Go ahead. And what's the question? | 15 | Q So in this situation, because when you were |
| 16 | MR. CHU: I was in the middle of getting to it. | 16 | talking yesterday, they're all the same, they're all the |
| 17 | Okay? | 17 | same. Remember saying that? Or did I say that wrong? Did |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: That they did not submit any | 18 | you not say that? |
| 19 | documentation to get the certificates of compliance -- | 19 | A I don't recall. |
| 20 | MR. CHU: Right. | 20 | Q They are not all the same, are they? |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: -- and yet they're being held -- | 21 | A I don't know who you're referring to. |
| 22 | MR. CHU: Yes, yes, yes. | 22 | Q Those companies, those people, they're not the |
| 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 23 | same, are they? |
| 24 | MR. CHU: Taxation without representation. | 24 | A Which companies and which people |
| 25 | Are you following? | 25 | Q The companies involved in the complaint in this |
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| 1 | THE WITNESS: Somewhat. | 1 | case. They're not all the same, are they? |
| 2 | BY MR. CHU: | 2 | A They're different companies. |
| 3 | Q Boston tea party? In other words, you were | 3 | Q I'm sorry? |
| 4 | holding, and you're wanting, the EPA's wanting to hold | 4 | A They appear to have different names. |
| 5 | Taotao Group responsible for things that Taotao USA had an | 5 | Q And different nationalities, wouldn't you agree? |
| 6 | agreement to do. Is that not accurate? | 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion, | 7 | Q Because you identified Taotao USA as an American |
| 8 | Your Honor. | 8 | company in the beginning of our discussions, right? |
| 9 | JUDGE BIRO: I, sustained. The statute says | 9 | A Yes. |
| 10 | whatever the statute says about who can be held liable. | 10 | Q And the two other companies are companies in what |
| 11 | MR. CHU: And as such, and the case law supports | 11 | country? |
| 12 | who can and who cannot be. And I would at this point ask | 12 | A China. |
| 13 | the Court to take judicial notice of the Pep Boy | 13 | Q And those would be Chinese companies, would they |
| 14 | settlements. | 14 | not? |
| 15 | JUDGE BIRO: You can put it all in your post- | 15 | A As far as I know. |
| 16 | hearing brief. I'll look at whatever you cite -- | 16 | Q Okay. And so please start with Taotao Group. |
| 17 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. | 17 | Because you identified, you did research on them and you |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: -- just like I looked at things | 18 | produced web page identifying information on them. |
| 19 | before. | 19 | A Yes. |
| 20 | MR. CHU: Yes. Your Honor. Okay. | 20 | Q How many vehicles did Taotao Group fail to meet |
| 21 | BY MR. CHU: | 21 | requirements that they were obligated to meet? |
| 22 | Q You worked on that Pep Boy case, didn't you? | 22 | A Would you like me to look at the documents? I |
| 23 | A I did. | 23 | don't recall off the top of my head. |
| 24 | Q And in fact none of the manufacturers was accused | 24 | Q Please do, because you can't blame two |
| 25 | or asked to pay any penalties. Do you remember that? | 25 | manufacturers in which they didn't manufacture, can you? |
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|  | Page 780 |  | Page 782 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection -- | 1 | Q Okay, so let's just talk about the penalty because |
| 2 | MR. CHU: That's a question. | 2 | that's what we're talking about. |
| 3 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. | 3 | A Okay. |
| 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: It calls for a legal conclusion. | 4 | Q Isn't it? |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: The statute says that they can. | 5 | A I think so. |
| 6 | MR. CHU: I'm sorry? | 6 | Q Okay, so you were clear, and I want to make it |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: Be held liable. | 7 | clear to the Court, that you weren't attempting to ask this |
| 8 | MR. CHU: But manufacturers? In other words if A | 8 | Court to incorrectly put an amount on Taotao Group, because |
| 9 | manufactures five, B manufactures ten, A and B can't be | 9 | you have an amount on Taotao Group that's not duplicate or |
| 10 | responsible for 15 . | 10 | aggregate, or in the aggregate. Are you? |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Well, if they both participated in | 11 | A As far as I know it's not inaccurate. |
| 12 | manufacturing the same vehicle, they can. Somebody | 12 | Q I said aggregate. |
| 13 | manufactured the catalyst. Somebody manufactured the rest | 13 | A Aggregate? |
| 14 | of it. So arguably, they could both be manufacturers. In | 14 | Q Adding numbers, adding things. |
| 15 | this case maybe they're not, but they could theoretically be | 15 | A What are you asking me? |
| 16 | two manufacturers of a car. | 16 | Q There are two companies on your chart here. Is |
| 17 | MR. CHU: Agreed, but I think that, maybe to | 17 | that accurate? |
| 18 | shorten this, but there's 109,000 vehicles. X belongs to -- | 18 | A Yes. Actually three. Taotao USA, Taotao Group, |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: So, are we talking about this | 19 | and Junyun County. |
| 20 | specific case or are we talking in general? | 20 | Q I stand correct. Okay? |
| 21 | MR. CHU: No, we're talking about this specific | 21 | And what you've done is have calculated a penalty |
| 22 | case. | 22 | as to Taotao Group, right? |
| 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So I'm confused. | 23 | A Taotao USA and Taotao Group together. As well as |
| $24$ | MR. CHU: Okay. | 24 | Taotao USA and Junyun County together. |
| 25 | // | 25 | Q Did you or did you not make a penalty calculation |
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| 1 | BY MR. CHU: | 1 | as to Taotao Group, the company that you did internet |
| 2 | Q Can you tell us how many vehicles are associated | 2 | research on and produced copies of Alibaba identifiers? |
| 3 | with Taotao Group? | 3 | A Yes, together with Taotao USA. |
| 4 | MR. CHU: Because my two questions before that was | 4 | Q I'm sorry? |
| 5 | talking about Taotao Group, talking about her research on | 5 | A I did a penalty calculation for Taotao Group and |
| 6 | Taotao Group. I didn't even try to talk about Junyun yet. | 6 | Taotao USA together. |
| 7 | I've been right there on Taotao Group. | 7 | MR. CHU: I'm going to object. Not responsive as |
| 8 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Object to the relevance of this. | 8 | to Taotao USA. I'm trying to focus on Taotao Group. |
| 9 | The penalty demand is broken out in our papers by individual | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Right, but she said but she just did |
| 10 | companies. I'm just not sure where this is going. | 10 | a calculation for them together. She didn't do an |
| 11 | MR. CHU: If it is, she can tell us. She's the | 11 | individual calculation. |
| 12 | one that did the penalty calculations. I have a right to | 12 | MR. CHU: Oh, I didn't hear that last part. |
| 13 | examine her on those calculations. So I would object to the | 13 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 14 | objection. | 14 | Q Is that -- may I clarify that? Are you saying you |
| 15 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Do you know -- | 15 | never did a penalty calculation on Taotao Group? |
| 16 | THE WITNESS: I don't know off the top of my head, | 16 | A Not individually, no. |
| 17 | I'm sorry. | 17 | Q Okay. Well, can you do one for us right quick? |
| 18 | BY MR. CHU: | 18 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Again, |
| 19 | Q It was one of the last exhibits by your lawyers, | 19 | where -- |
| 20 | 213. | 20 | MR. CHU: It's the evidence. |
| 21 | A At 213, so we would need to sum up the total | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Can you? |
| 22 | vehicles in counts one through four. To answer your | 22 | THE WITNESS: Well, I think it would be the same |
| 23 | question. I don't have a calculator here. | 23 | as the one for Taotao USA and Taotao Group. If you wanted |
| 24 | Q It's already calculated, is it not? | 24 | one individually for it. |
| 25 | A The number of vehicles is not. The penalty is. | 25 | // |


|  | Page 784 |  | Page 786 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | BY MR. CHU: | 1 | manufacturers identified with them was decided in the |
| 2 | Q And I appreciate that, okay? Because my | 2 | summary judgment ruling, and I believe many of those numbers |
| 3 | understanding was you start off with the number of vehicles. | 3 | have even been admitted to by the Respondents in this |
| 4 | Isn't that what you said? | 4 | matter. I just don't understand the relevance -- |
| 5 | A Yes. | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: So are we asking how many in total is |
| 6 | Q And we see the number of vehicles here, do we not, | 6 | there between counts one through four mathematically? |
| 7 | from Taotao Group? | 7 | MR. CHU: We know what that is because -- |
| 8 | A Actually, we don't see the total number. | 8 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so am I, I'm sorry. I'm still |
| 9 | Q So you didn't have the data to determine that or | 9 | missing the point. |
| 10 | you failed to extract that data from the Customs records | 10 | MR. CHU: My point is, this Court has to make a |
| 11 | that you so, that you worked on. | 11 | determination. Should this Court decide to impose any civil |
| 12 | A No, I did extract that information. | 12 | penalties on any of the Respondents as to the actions of |
| 13 | Q Thank you. So tell us what the number of vehicles | 13 | that Respondent and the legal liabilities of that |
| 14 | is as a starting number. | 14 | Respondent. |
| 15 | A If you have a pen, I'll add it together. | 15 | And so therefore, if Taotao Group didn't produce |
| 16 | Q You don't have that data, do you? | 16 | the ones that Junyun County produced, they can't be held |
| 17 | A Not off the top of my head. | 17 | liable for what they did. |
| 18 | Q So is it safe to say that you have no information | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, So they only are being sought |
| 19 | supporting your claim as to Taotao Group on the record. | 19 | to be held liable on counts one through four. |
| 20 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. | 20 | MR. CHU: Correct. |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: No. | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: A total of about I don't know, maybe |
| 22 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: This is, the relevance of this | 22 | 70,000 vehicles. |
| 23 | and -- | 23 | MR. CHU: Right, but the amount is on here, Your |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: I don't understand the point. | 24 | Honor. I'm just saying, telling her, asking -- |
| 25 | MR. CHU: Your Honor, it -- | 25 | JUDGE BIRO: -- seeking joint and several |
|  | Page 785 |  | Page 787 |
| 1 | JUDGE BIRO: She divided the counts up by | 1 | liability. |
| 2 | manufacturer, isn't that correct? | 2 | MR. CHU: Which doesn't make sense as to vehicles |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: I'm happy to add it up. | 3 | not manufactured by the manufacturer that didn't manufacture |
| 4 | JUDGE BIRO: I mean -- | 4 | them. It's joint and several as to the importer and that |
| 5 | MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I don't know -- | 5 | manufacturer. |
| 6 | I see and I believe I see what I see and it means what I | 6 | JUDGE BIRO: Yes, that's right. Joint and several |
| 7 | think it means, but when I ask this witness, I get a totally | 7 | as to the importer and the manufacturer. |
| 8 | different understanding, and I'm confused. So I want to ask | 8 | MR. CHU: And this is why I'm saying all through |
| 9 | questions to clarify this for the record so that when we do | 9 | these last three days, they're just lumping everything |
| 10 | our brief and our appeal, if necessary, this is clear. | 10 | together and asking this Court, ignore the legal |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Don't we have counts one through four | 11 | significance of a legal entity. And I'm saying, I'm not |
| 12 | are against Taotao Group and Taotao USA? | 12 | going to allow that to happen. |
| 13 | MR. CHU: That's what I see. | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So Taotao Group -- so Taotao |
| 14 | JUDGE BIRO: And counts five through ten are | 14 | Group was the manufacturer, and Taotao USA was the importer. |
| 15 | against Taotao USA and Junyun County. | 15 | MR. CHU: Correct. And that's what's written on |
| 16 | MR. CHU: That's what I see written on here, and I | 16 | here. |
| 17 | focused on Taotao Group and I see the Court is saying the, | 17 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And so they're seeking joint |
| 18 | and it's accurate to put Taotao USA on top, and that's what | 18 | and several liability and you're claiming that -- |
| 19 | I'm saying. Let's not talk about that. Can we just extract | 19 | MR. CHU: That's okay. I'm saying that it's okay |
| 20 | this down to does this or does this not represent the number | 20 | for them to seek that. You know, my challenge is to, the |
| 21 | of vehicles manufactured by that specific manufacturer for | 21 | jurisdiction of the Court, as to the entities in China will |
| 22 | the importer, the certificate holder, Taotao USA. I believe | 22 | stand on that, but I'm not going to discuss it today. |
| 23 | that's what this says. I'd just like to hear her say yeah. | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So what -- |
| 24 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, the number of | 24 | MR. CHU: What I'm saying -- |
| 25 | vehicles involved with each engine family and the | 25 | JUDGE BIRO: -- the issue? |

MR. CHU: The issue is, I want to focus in on Taotao Group which they --

JUDGE BIRO: Which is the manufacturer of those number of vehicles in counts one through four.

MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
MR. CHU: And I want to get her to state on the record that, on behalf of EPA, we have determined a penalty of $\$ 225,472.50$. If they want to stipulate to that, I can move on.

JUDGE BIRO: I'm still a little confused.
MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm confused as well, Your Honor. I'm not --

JUDGE BIRO: Why don't you ask the next question?
Maybe that will clarify it.
BY MR. CHU:
Q Did you -- did you not -- did you or did you not make a penalty calculation as to vehicles manufactured by the Taotao Group Company LTD in China?

A I calculated a penalty for Taotao Group and Taotao USA combined.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's the answer. You've got to move on now.

BY MR. CHU:
Q And is that amount $\$ 225,472.50$ ?
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A Yes.
Q Okay. So are you asking this Court to make Taotao
Group responsible for the vehicles manufactured by Junyun
County Xiangyuan Industry Company as well?
MR. HAWKINS: Again, Your Honor. I'm going to
object. This is all just in our papers in terms of what we
requested of the Court and the breakout is clear. I'm just
not sure of the relevance of spending time on this.
JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
So you've divided up the penalty?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, we divided up the penalty for Taotao USA and Taotao Group. We went over that number. And then we have another number for Taotao USA and JCXI which is \$1,375,676.45.

BY MR. CHU:
Q And my question was, are you asking this Court, Judge Biro, to -- are you asking this Court to find that Junyun County Xiangyuan Company LTD located in China also be responsible for the penalty assessment calculations that you have against Taotao Group Company? Yes or no?

A I don't think so.
Q You say I think so?
A I don't think so.
Q Okay, good. Thank you very much.
So all this internet research you did on Taotao

Group, it's your opinion that Taotao Group would not have an issue with the ability to pay, was that the purpose?

A Yes.
Q Thank you. And is it accurate to say that you had no internet research, Alibaba results, for Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Company LTD.

A I believe that was one of the companies mentioned on the Taotao Group page. I believe Taotao Group owns Junyun County.
Q So you're telling this Court based upon your research, okay, that you have submitted evidence and information indicating that the ownership interest of Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry Company is owned as a subsidiary of the Taotao Group company. Is that accurate?
A That's my understanding, yes.
Q I'm asking do you believe that you offered
evidence and supported that? Because I'm going to ask you what that evidence is.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, asked and answered.
JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
BY MR. CHU:
Q Okay. So what is that evidence that you submitted showing ownership?

A Well, the web page cites it and then I believe we have a PowerPoint which shows that as well.

Q But you have no documents from the government of China that shows the registration of ownership, do you?

A I don't think so.
Q And I understand that you classified these groups, these people as China, Chinese. Is that the way we're doing this?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of the question.

JUDGE BIRO: Sustained.
BY MR. CHU:
Q Let me ask you about the Daction. Okay?
A Okay.
Q Is it your position that Daction is owned by one of the Respondents?

A I'm not, I'm not certain.
Q Well is that information clear on the records that you utilize isn't it? There's a page there that tells you who the owner is. Isn't that accurate?

A Yes, I believe so.
Q And it says 100 percent shareholder, and you remember that, right? Do you need me to show you --

A I don't remember exactly. You're welcome to show it to me.

Q Do you need me to show that to you?
A If you want an exact answer you're going to need

|  | Page 792 |  | Page 794 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | to show it to me, yes. | 1 | A I don't recall. |
| 2 | Q Do you remember whether or not you saw Matao Cao's | 2 | Q CX19, it's been offered and admitted as Exhibit |
| 3 | name as the hundred percent shareholder of Daction or not? | 3 | 38. I know you've seen the color version of this, right? |
| 4 | A I don't -- no, I don't recall. | 4 | A Probably, yes. |
| 5 | Q You don't recall that or you didn't see that? | 5 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. I don't |
| 6 | A I don't recall seeing that. | 6 | think this has been admitted. |
| 7 | Q Thank you. And you did not see Taotao Group | 7 | MR. CHU: We would offer -- |
| 8 | Company or Junyun County Xiangyuan Industry as the owner on | 8 | JUDGE BIRO: Nope. |
| 9 | those tax returns either, did you? | 9 | MR. CHU: -- CX19 at this time if it hasn't been |
| 10 | A Sorry, which tax returns? | 10 | admitted. |
| 11 | Q Daction. | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Let me find it. |
| 12 | A Oh, I don't recall. | 12 | (Pause.) |
| 13 | Q You don't recall seeing it or you don't recall | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Is there any objection to CX19? |
| 14 | anything? | 14 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. |
| 15 | A I don't recall the tax returns in that, in that | 15 | MR. CHU: My apologies, Your Honor, because I had |
| 16 | specificity. | 16 | Mr. Jackson read off a document that had not been offered |
| 17 | Q Do you remember the discussion I had with the | 17 | and admitted if I didn't offer it. I thought we had. |
| 18 | Court about a person named Lee? | 18 | That's what my mistake was. |
| 19 | A Qiong Lee? | 19 | JUDGE BIRO: CX19 has been admitted into the |
| 20 | Q Yes. | 20 | record. |
| 21 | A I do recall. | 21 | (The exhibit previously |
| 22 | Q And that was in reference to the owner of Daction? | 22 | identified as Complainant's |
| 23 | A Yes. | 23 | Exhibit No. 19, was received |
| 24 | Q Do you remember that conversation? Does that help | 24 | in evidence.) |
| 25 | you refresh your memory, what you saw on that tax return? | 25 | // |
|  | Page 793 |  | Page 795 |
| 1 | A I don't recall the tax returns in any specificity. | 1 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 2 | I'm sorry. | 2 | Q Do you remember Mr. Jackson reading the second |
| 3 | JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? | 3 | line, starting with A? I'm going to ask you to read it |
| 4 | MR. CHU: I'm sorry, Your Honor? | 4 | because -- you don't remember it, do you? |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: What exhibit number is this? | 5 | A I do remember that. |
| 6 | MR. CHU: This is 197, CX. Yeah, 197. Bates | 6 | Q Will you read that starting with A, please? |
| 7 | number EPA, 2610. | 7 | A "A disturbing portion of these engines are not |
| 8 | BY MR. CHU: | 8 | certified to meet emission standards under the Clean Air |
| 9 | Q Is that clear on your screen there? | 9 | Act." |
| 10 | A Yes, it is. | 10 | Q What was the EPA's basis for that? |
| 11 | Q Now do you remember whether or not those named | 11 | A I don't know. This is before I joined the Air |
| 12 | entities that I just mentioned are listed as the owner of | 12 | Enforcement Division. |
| 13 | Daction or not? | 13 | Q Well why isn't it that there is a file, a cabinet |
| 14 | A I see, it says Qiong Lee is the 100 percent owner | 14 | or an area that talks about these types of problems when you |
| 15 | in 2012. | 15 | join that department? |
| 16 | Q That's non-responsive. I asked you about three | 16 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, vague. Form of the |
| 17 | companies. | 17 | question. |
| 18 | A Oh, I only see Qiong Lee's name. I don't see any | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Is there a file? Is the |
| 19 | other company's name. | 19 | question why isn't there? |
| 20 | Q Thank you. So yesterday when you said they're all | 20 | MR. CHU: Yes. |
| 21 | the same, you did not, you're not including Daction, are | 21 | THE WITNESS: I don't know that there isn't. |
| 22 | you? | 22 | There may be one. |
| 23 | A I don't recall saying they're all the same. | 23 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 24 | Q What did you say about them being all different? | 24 | Q But you don't know anything about it. |
| 25 | Anything? | 25 | A I -- I -- I didn't draft this document. I wasn't |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | involved in drafting it. I don't know who drafted it. | 1 | not racial in any way, it's just regional, right? |
| 2 | Q Now in your studies and research on Taotao USA, | 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection Your Honor, to the |
| 3 | you identified it as starting being registered as a Texas | 3 | form of the question. |
| 4 | company in what? 2007? Do you remember those records? | 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. |
| 5 | A That sounds about right. | 5 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 6 | Q Okay. So obviously this enforcement alert came | 6 | Q So the EPA has nothing against Chinese-owned |
| 7 | out prior to that time. A company that started out | 7 | companies that you're aware of. Is that accurate? |
| 8 | afterwards wouldn't necessarily know about that, would they? | 8 | A That's accurate. |
| 9 | A I can't speculate about what they knew or didn't | 9 | Q In fact, the EPA has in the certification |
| 10 | know. | 10 | department, engineers that speak Chinese and English, don't |
| 11 | Q And that's even worse in a situation where you are | 11 | they? |
| 12 | in the Air Enforcement area, the key word "enforcement", and | 12 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 13 | you didn't know anything about this letter, right? Or | 13 | Relevance. |
| 14 | this -- | 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Do you know? |
| 15 | A I knew that this enforcement alert existed. | 15 | THE WITNESS: I believe Emily Chen speaks Chinese |
| 16 | Q Oh, thank you. When did you discover that? | 16 | and English, yes. |
| 17 | A Probably sometime around the time I joined the Air | 17 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 18 | Enforcement office. | 18 | Q In fact you deal a lot with her, don't you? |
| 19 | Q Two thousand and -- | 19 | A A lot is a relative term. |
| 20 | A Seven. | 20 | Q That is one of the individuals that in fact went |
| 21 | Q About the same time that the birth of Taotao USA | 21 | with Mr. Jackson to China this year, right? |
| 22 | came into place, right? | 22 | A I don't know who he took with him. |
| 23 | A If it was 2007, yes. | 23 | Q You didn't hear that? |
| 24 | Q Okay. When I say birth, we treat a company, the | 24 | A I don't recall |
| 25 | EPA does, as a company separate from the owners, do we not? | 25 | Q Okay. So Junyun appears to be a major culprit |
|  | Page 797 |  | Page 799 |
| 1 | A I think that's -- | 1 | here, Would you agree? |
| 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. Asking for a legal | 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Form of |
| 3 | conclusion. | 3 | that question. |
| 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. | 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. |
| 5 | BY MR. CHU: | 5 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 6 | Q And how does the EPA treat a company versus the | 6 | Q Don't you like to use the word illegal in your |
| 7 | owners of the company? Do you know? | 7 | writings? And didn't you see the word illegal in the |
| 8 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Vague | 8 | enforcement action? |
| 9 | question. | 9 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. |
| 10 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. | 10 | Argumentative, irrelevant. |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I would say that depends on the | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. |
| 12 | context. I don't know. | 12 | THE WITNESS: I use the term illegal where it |
| 13 | BY MR. CHU: | 13 | applies. |
| 14 | Q Because I believe what you've been doing in your | 14 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 15 | testimony, you've been making Matao Cao the same as one of | 15 | Q Right. And it's your opinion that what these |
| 16 | the Respondents, have you not? | 16 | Respondents have done is illegal. Is it not correct? |
| 17 | A I don't think so. | 17 | A That's my opinion. |
| 18 | Q Well you want to take his wife's house, don't you? | 18 | Q Yes. And so therefore when I say culprit, we |
| 19 | A I don't think so. | 19 | normally use that term when we associate or discuss things |
| 20 | Q Wasn't that the purpose of what you did yesterday | 20 | that are in violation of the law, acts, people, et cetera, |
| 21 | by telling this Court that they have a house, okay, his wife | 21 | do we not? |
| 22 | has a house that's her residence in Texas. Isn't that what | 22 | A I suppose. |
| 23 | you want this Court to do? | 23 | Q Okay Now your bachelor's degree, one of your |
| 24 | A No. | 24 | minors or major was in international what, business? |
| 25 | Q When the EPA identified China as a problem, that's | 25 | A Studies. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Studies. And I take it that you did not do any | 1 | Q Do you understand the question? |
| 2 | studies of Asia, is that accurate? | 2 | A Could I have used Chinese interpreters? |
| 3 | A I don't recall. | 3 | Q Yes, ma'am. |
| 4 | Q So your real understanding of these Chinese | 4 | A If I thought they were necessary maybe I could |
| 5 | companies is somewhat limited? | 5 | have figured out a way. |
| 6 | A It's limited to the extent that information we | 6 | Q Thank you. So now that you want to tag, when I |
| 7 | requested was not provided by Respondents. | 7 | say you, I'm talking about EPA. Now that EPA wishes to tag |
| 8 | Q And you never attempted to communicate with one of | 8 | the Chinese national companies, where are these |
| 9 | the Chinese speakers at the EPA, correct? | 9 | communications warning them, get with the program or else |
| 10 | A For what purposes? | 10 | you're going to get nailed? |
| 11 | Q Now back in 2010 there were in excess of 10,000 | 11 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection to the form of that |
| 12 | EPA employees, were there not? | 12 | question, Your Honor. It's argumentative. |
| 13 | A I'm sorry. Can you repeat that? | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. |
| 14 | Q Back in 2010 were there over 10,000 EPA employees? | 14 | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. You said tagged? |
| 15 | A Probably. | 15 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 16 | Q And did you find that in a lot of these fine | 16 | Q I'm sorry. Maybe that's too colloquial. Become |
| 17 | schools and institutions surrounding this DC area, that | 17 | the subject of a complaint by the EPA. |
| 18 | there are a lot of Chinese scholars, students in those so- | 18 | A Could you restate your question? I'm sorry. I |
| 19 | called universities? | 19 | kind of lost the back end. |
| 20 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. | 20 | Q We're going to replace tagged with complaint, and |
| 21 | Relevance of this? | 21 | the subject of a complaint by the EPA. |
| 22 | MR. CHU: It goes to the gravity factors. | 22 | A Uh-huh. |
| 23 | JUDGE BIRO: The gravity of the violation? | 23 | Q And would you agree that those Chinese companies |
| 24 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. We're blaming those | 24 | are being accused and subject to severe penalties at this |
| 25 | people for things wherein these people are choosing not to | 25 | time? |
|  | Page 801 |  | Page 803 |
| 1 | effectively communicate because her surprise response was, | 1 | A I don't think I would use that word choice, |
| 2 | you know, basically why? | 2 | accused. I think there are alleged violations and those |
| 3 | So I want to lay it out here that they're not -- | 3 | violations carry with them penalties. That's what we're |
| 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Your argument is that the U.S. | 4 | discussing here. |
| 5 | Environmental Protection Agency is obliged to speak to | 5 | Q And so tell me where are the notices to these |
| 6 | Chinese companies in Chinese. | 6 | companies in a language that they are familiar with that |
| 7 | MR. CHU: It's not just that. They've been doing | 7 | they would be subject to civil penalty assessments because |
| 8 | it, and they've done it, and she's chose not to utilize | 8 | they have failed to do something and then tell us what that |
| 9 | those facilities. That's what I'm saying. Because she's | 9 | something was supposed to be? |
| 10 | saying they don't get it. Johnny doesn't get it. And I'm | 10 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: It's a compound question. |
| 11 | like well, maybe -- | 11 | MR. CHU: I left it as answering one. |
| 12 | JUDGE BIRO: You said that. She didn't | 12 | JUDGE BIRO: Are you talking about in this case |
| 13 | necessarily say that. | 13 | specifically? |
| 14 | MR. CHU: I'm hoping that's the conclusion of the | 14 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 15 | Court later on from my arguments and my briefs. | 15 | JUDGE BIRO: Letters as compared to the laws that |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: So the question you want to ask her | 16 | exist. You're talking about a specific notice to them in |
| 17 | is whether she used Chinese interpreters in her interactions | 17 | this case? |
| 18 | with the Respondents? | 18 | MR. CHU: Other than the complaint. |
| 19 | MR. CHU: She's already said she didn't. And I'm | 19 | In other words, you've got a history here of 2010 |
| 20 | asking her about, you know, whether or not they have this | 20 | and to the current time, this complaint was filed in 2015. |
| 21 | available to them. And then the follow-up question -- | 21 | You want to hit the manufacturers which are separate |
| 22 | JUDGE BIRO: Could she have used Chinese | 22 | entities, and I'm asking her why didn't you on your |
| 23 | interpreters. | 23 | enforcement side have the cultural awareness and the decency |
| 24 | MR. CHU: Yeah. Thank you, Your Honor. | 24 | to send a notice to them pursuant to the Hague Convention |
| 25 | BY MR. CHU: | 25 | stuff that we mentioned before, advising them of potential |
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| 1 | liabilities and telling them that if they don't do $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z | 1 | JUDGE BIRO: As to her, as to how the penalty was |
| 2 | they're going to be in trouble. And this goes back to the | 2 | calculated. |
| 3 | Hague, the Hague requires these things. So if they're going | 3 | MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 4 | to contact Chinese companies, they chose not to, and they | 4 | JUDGE BIRO: And her, you know, her experience on |
| 5 | chose not to do it in a language where they could | 5 | calculating penalties made her qualified to do that. |
| 6 | understand. And now -- | 6 | Is that a problem? |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: You can make that argument in your | 7 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. |
| 8 | post-hearing brief. | 8 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 9 | MR. CHU: This is the evidence, Your Honor. This | 9 | MR. CHU: I don't have a problem. It just saves |
| 10 | is the evidentiary phase. I have to have the evidence -- | 10 | me three pages of my brief. Thank you. |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Ask her if she sent a notice pursuant | 11 | Your Honor, Ms. Tariq has worked very hard on this |
| 12 | to the Hague requirements, assuming there is a Hague | 12 | and prepared a series of questions. I would ask the Court's |
| 13 | requirement. And I don't even know that. And if it didn't, | 13 | indulgence to allow her to ask those questions. And I'm not |
| 14 | you can argue that in your brief. | 14 | going to come back on. |
| 15 | BY MR. CHU: | 15 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 16 | Q Did you send notices in Chinese to the two Chinese | 16 | MR. CHU: If that's okay with the Court. |
| 17 | national companies? | 17 | JUDGE BIRO: I think that violates the switch |
| 18 | A I don't recall. | 18 | hitter rule. But okay. |
| 19 | Q So it might have been done and someone else might | 19 | MR. CHU: I know. |
| 20 | have that and we didn't get that in discovery, right? | 20 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm sorry, I don't fully |
| 21 | A I don't know. | 21 | understand what series of questions. Is this direct |
| 22 | Q Okay. Hypothetically, since you're an expert, if | 22 | examination, is this further cross? |
| 23 | the Chinese were to accuse you of something and they sent | 23 | MR. CHU: It's the cross that's being done. |
| 24 | you something in Chinese, what would you have done with that | 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Continuing the cross with Ms. Tariq. |
| 25 | paper? | 25 | MR. CHU: Right. Just on her questions that I |
|  | Page 805 |  | Page 807 |
| 1 | A That's -- that would be speculation. | 1 | haven't, you know, covered. |
| 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. | 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a problem with that? |
| 3 | BY MR. CHU: | 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. I think that's |
| 4 | Q Thank you. But you're an expert, so I'm asking | 4 | all right. |
| 5 | that as an expert. I'm asking a hypothetical. | 5 | MR. CHU: She's a lot nicer. |
| 6 | JUDGE BIRO: She's not an expert. She hasn't been | 6 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor |
| 7 | certified as an expert. | 7 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 8 | MR. CHU: She has not. That's clear. I want to | 8 | MR. CHU: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 9 | make sure. So I'm okay. I'll step off the expert area. I | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Good morning, Ms. Tariq. |
| 10 | thought that's why the -- | 10 | MS. TARIQ: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm going |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: She has not. She was offered as a | 11 | to try to keep it brief. I have them all listed here, so. |
| 12 | fact witness. | 12 | JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. |
| 13 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, it's EPA precedent, | 13 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 14 | there is precedent for witnesses who are offered to testify | 14 | Q Ms. Isin, yesterday you testified embedded in your |
| 15 | about penalty, a discussion of treatment as an expert, but | 15 | calculation of the proposed penalty, you increased the |
| 16 | we never, and I think that largely goes to the ability to | 16 | gravity by 20 percent for history of non-compliance. |
| 17 | speak about how the penalty was calculated in this matter | 17 | A That's correct. |
| 18 | and the requirement that we offer her resume or curriculum | 18 | Q And that adjustment was based on the 2010 |
| 19 | vitae. But we never formally offered her as an expert in | 19 | administrative settlement agreement, right? |
| 20 | this -- | 20 | A That's correct. |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Right. | 21 | Q The previous violation of the administrative |
| 22 | MR. CHU: So I'm going to accept that as saying | 22 | settlement agreement of 2010, was that the COC application |
| 23 | she's not an expert for any purposes in this case. | 23 | for certain non-road vehicles did not list adjustable |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: She was just a fact witness. | 24 | parameters, but certain carburetors removed and allowed |
| 25 | MR. CHU: Right. | 25 | certain, and then allowed adjustments, correct? |

A More or less.
Q And those all included in on-road vehicles?
MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm sorry. Can we speak a little more slowly, please? There's a little bit of an echo and --

MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. I'll move back a little, too. I'll just repeat that.

BY MS. TARIQ:
Q The previous violation in the 2010 administrative settlement agreement was that the COC applications for certain non-road vehicles did not list adjustable parameters. Correct?

A The violation was importation of thousands of uncertified vehicles with non-compliant carburetors.

Q Okay. And all those included non-road vehicles?
A Those were all non-road vehicles, yes.
Q And none of the engine family applications that were identified in the ASA are identified in this complaint?

A I don't believe those applications are identified in the, in -- sorry, in the complaint?

Q Yes, in this amended, in this complaint.
A Those vehicles are not in this complaint, no.
JUDGE BIRO: Ms. Tariq, can you enunciate just a little bit more?

MS. TARIQ: Yes. Sorry.
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Q Okay. And were all the vehicles subject to the adjustable parameter violations corrected pursuant to the subject vehicle corrective action plan in the ASA?

A As far as I know, yes.
Q And Taotao paid the Agency $\$ 260,000$ for that violation?

A Yes, it did.
Q And Taotao USA, Inc., and only Taotao USA, Inc., was a part of that administrative penalty agreement -administrative settlement agreement?

A Yes.
Q And do you know that, okay. Sorry.
And it is your understanding that you considered all the factors listed in the penalty policy under adjustment for history of non-compliance?

A I believe so.
Q And those factors are: one, how similar the previous violation was; how recent the previous violation was; the number of previous violations; the violator's efforts to remedy previous violations?

A Yes.
Q And those are the only four factors in the penalty policy?

A I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?
Q And those are the only four factors in the penalty
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```
JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry.
BY MS. TARIQ:
Q And the applications that are identified in this
matter did not have adjustable parameter related violations?
A The applications in which matter? The --
Q In this current --
A This current matter?
Q Yes.
A I don't recall.
Q Okay. And the adjustable parameter violations included in the administrative settlement agreement involved COC applications for model year 2009, possibly 2010 ?
A It was applications for 2009 and 2010 in the ASA. Yes.
Q The only prior violation that just, sorry, that your -- I think you already said this, sorry.
So the prior violation that your adjustment for history of compliance is based on, is that one violation of failure to state adjustable parameters?
A No. It's --
Q In vehicles. All the vehicles that failed to list adjustable parameters, correct?
A The history of non-compliance adjustment is based on the fact that there was a prior settlement with the company related to those violations. Yes.
```
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Q And mose are me ony iour ractors in tie penanty
policy for a history of non-compliance?
A I'd have to look at it to double check.
Q Okay, I believe it's CX22.
(Pause.)
A I see the description on Bates ending in 479.
(Pause.)
Q Those are the only four factors?
A It looks like it. Yes.
Q And is the maximum allowable increase 35 percent?
A No, I think it's actually up to 70 percent, if I
remember correctly. Yeah, if you go to the next page, Bates 480, in the third paragraph down, if there was more than one prior violation, you could adjust up to 70 percent.

Q And if the 2010 was one violation, one category of violation.

A Yeah, I suppose in this case we're counting it as one prior violation.

Q So 35 percent.
A Right.
Q Have you ever applied a 35 percent increase for history of non-compliance against a manufacturer in the 50 or so that you did before?

A I believe so. Yes.
Q And would that be where there's a prior violation but no efforts to remedy? The same kind of violation as the

|  | Page 812 |  | Page 814 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | previous violation, very recent? Would that be where you | 1 | Q Yet Taotao USA pursuant to this proposed penalty |
| 2 | would apply the 35 percent, because that's the maximum | 2 | would have to pay a 20 percent increase for history of non- |
| 3 | A I, I would, I don't recall the specifics, but. | 3 | compliance for the on-road vehicles that they manufactured. |
| 4 | Q Did you apply a 20 percent increase for issues of | 4 | A That's correct. |
| 5 | non-compliance on all vehicles in all the ten engine | 5 | Q All right, let me move on from that. |
| 6 | families in this case? | 6 | Okay, Ms. Isin, you have assessed the proposed |
| 7 | A Yes, I did. | 7 | penalty, you've given the maximum increase for failure to |
| 8 | Q So it was not just against Taotao USA who was part | 8 | remediate, -- let me rephrase that. |
| 9 | of the 2010 ASA agreement, correct? | 9 | The maximum increase for failure to remediate is |
| 10 | A Taotao USA was the certificate holder for all the | 10 | 30 percent in the penalty policy. |
| 11 | vehicles in this case, so. I think it's appropriate to | 11 | A I believe so, yes. |
| 12 | apply the 20 percent to all the vehicles in the case. | 12 | Q And you have assessed a 30 percent increase to all |
| 13 | Q Against Taotao USA. | 13 | engine families identified in this matter. |
| 14 | A Against Taotao USA. | 14 | A Yes. |
| 15 | Q Was a vehicle manufacturer identified in the COC, | 15 | Q And earlier we were talking about the stipulated |
| 16 | the 2009 COC application, Zhejiang Taotao Industry Co.? | 16 | penalty agreement. So you're aware that in 2012 the Agency |
| 17 | A I believe it was. | 17 | agreed to accept $\$ 160,000$ in stipulated damages for failure |
| 18 | Q And was Zhejiang Taotao, well is it true that | 18 | to timely submit catalytic test results for engine families |
| 19 | Zhejiang Taotao Industry Co. is not one of the manufacturers | 19 | in 2012. |
| 20 | listed in this complaint? | 20 | A Uh, say that just a bit -- catalyst test |
| 21 | A It's true that the name is different. I believe | 21 | results -- I don't know that there was in 2012 -- the |
| 22 | it's most likely the same company. It's a predecessor of | 22 | stipulated penalty agreement was in 2012. The failure to |
| 23 | these current ones. | 23 | submit the catalyst test reports occurred earlier than that. |
| 24 | MS. TARIQ: Objection. Non-responsive to, it's | 24 | Q Okay. And as part of the stipulated penalty |
| 25 | most like -- objection, non-responsive. | 25 | agreement, the Agency required that Taotao retain a |
|  | Page 813 |  | Page 815 |
| 1 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 1 | professional engineer to conduct catalyst tests and ensure |
| 2 | Q Is Zhejiang Taotao Industry listed in this | 2 | compliance, correct? |
| 3 | complaint as a respondent? | 3 | A It was that Taotao retain a professional engineer. |
| 4 | A No. | 4 | I don't recall that we specified what the purpose of that |
| 5 | Q So Taotao Group Ltd, and Junyun County industry | 5 | engineer was. |
| 6 | specified, were not part of the ASA agreement, nor were they | 6 | Q It would likely be to ensure compliance. |
| 7 | manufacturers in those 2009, 2010 COC applications. | 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | A To the best of my recollection, that's correct. | 8 | Q With the ASA agreement. |
| 9 | Q And this is the page that was up here when Mr. Chu | 9 | A With the compliance plan. |
| 10 | was talking earlier. And here, the total \$225,473.50 is | 10 | Q And do you recall that such an engineer was |
| 11 | assessed against Taotao USA as well as Taotao Group Co. Ltd. | 11 | retained? |
| 12 | A Yes. | 12 | A Can you repeat that? |
| 13 | Q Not just Taotao USA. | 13 | Q Do you recall if such an engineer was retained |
| 14 | A That's correct. | 14 | pursuant to the stipulated penalty agreement? |
| 15 | Q And the same Would go for Junyun County, the | 15 | A I don't believe so. I believe that Taotao USA |
| 16 | \$1,375,676.45? | 16 | hired Harrison Wolf. |
| 17 | A That's correct. I would note that we could have | 17 | Q And is Harrison Wolf not a professional engineer? |
| 18 | alleged separate penalties for each one of these, but we | 18 | A I believe they have one on staff. |
| 19 | chose to group them the way we did. | 19 | Q Is Margaret Goldstein the person that is on staff |
| 20 | Q Okay. And all the vehicles manufactured by Taotao | 20 | that is a professional engineer? |
| 21 | Group are on newer vehicles that are part of this complaint? | 21 | A I'm not, I don't think she is a professional |
| 22 | A That's correct. | 22 | engineer. I could be wrong, but, to the best of my |
| 23 | Q And once again, the 2010 administrative settlement | 23 | recollection. I haven't looked at these documents for a |
| 24 | agreement only included non-road vehicles. | 24 | while. |
| 25 | A Yes. | 25 | Q It was after the stipulated penalty agreement that |
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| 1 | they hied Harrison Wolf, retained Harrison Wolf. | 1 | four were imported. |
| 2 | Respondents. | 2 | A That I would need to double check. I don't know |
| 3 | A As far as I can recall, yes. | 3 | for sure. |
| 4 | Q And yesterday you said that you had not | 4 | Q Well was there engine, CTAOC, you said C is 2012. |
| 5 | recommended but suggested Harrison Wolf to Taotao USA. | 5 | So all vehicles would be imported by the end of 2012? |
| 6 | A I didn't say I suggested it. I said in the past | 6 | A In theory, but in practice, in my experience |
| 7 | other companies have used Harrison Wolf. | 7 | sometimes, you know, there's leftover inventory that gets |
| 8 | Q Okay. So if it is most like, it is likely that | 8 | imported later. |
| 9 | they hired Harrison Wolf of the stipulated penalty | 9 | Q Is there any evidence that they didn't follow the |
| 10 | agreement. | 10 | COC certificate and imported something after the certificate |
| 11 | A As far as I know, yes. | 11 | expired? |
| 12 | Q Did Harrison Wolf get a test plan approved by the | 12 | A The certificate expiration is most important for |
| 13 | agency for catalyst testing? | 13 | the manufacturer of the vehicle. As long as the vehicle is |
| 14 | A I believe so. | 14 | manufactured before the expiration of the certificate, it |
| 15 | Q And which lab provided the test plan? Do you | 15 | would be okay to import it later. |
| 16 | recall? | 16 | Q Do you know if any were imported later? |
| 17 | A I believe it was SGS. | 17 | A I don't recall. |
| 18 | Q Did Harrison Wolf submit a report for some or all | 18 | Q Okay. There was a test report, an annual progress |
| 19 | of the 2012 engine families? | 19 | report that was submitted by Jackie that was the second, |
| 20 | A They submitted a report for some. | 20 | that was the right after Harrison Wolf's progress report. |
| 21 | Q Did that test report include engine family | 21 | Do you remember that? |
| 22 | CTAOC.049MC1? | 22 | A No. |
| 23 | A I believe so. | 23 | Q I'm just going to find the exhibit number. |
| 24 | Q And is that count for in this action? | 24 | (Pause.) |
| 25 | A Yes, I believe so. | 25 | MS. TARIQ: I'm just going to move past that. I |
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| 1 | Q Ane when was that report submitted? Do you | 1 | can't find it. |
| 2 | recall? | 2 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 3 | A No, I don't recall the exact date. Sorry. | 3 | Q So it was after all the vehicles belonging to |
| 4 | Q Would you look at C, uh, Respondents, Complaint's | 4 | count four were produced. |
| 5 | CX77 please. | 5 | I'll go back -- |
| 6 | (Pause.) | 6 | A Thank you. |
| 7 | A I have it in front of me. | 7 | Q The catalytic converter was sent to ERG, it was |
| 8 | Q Does that show that it was submitted in December | 8 | tested by ERG in June of 2013. That was after all vehicles |
| 9 | of 2012? | 9 | belonging to count four had been produced. |
| 10 | A Yes. | 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | Q Okay. Going back to, I'm going to go back a | 11 | Q And you said sometimes they can be imported after |
| 12 | little to March of 2012. | 12 | the COC expires? |
| 13 | Customs inspectors removed the catalyst from a | 13 | A That's right. |
| 14 | vehicle identified as belonging to CTAOC count four -- | 14 | Q So is it likely that they were, is it likely that |
| 15 | A Yes. | 15 | they were, they had all been imported by June of 2013? |
| 16 | Q -- in March of 2012. | 16 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This |
| 17 | A Yes, that sounds right. | 17 | calls for speculation. |
| 18 | Q Was the catalyst collected in March of 2012 then | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Speculation, yeah. |
| 19 | tested in June of 2013? | 19 | Go ahead. |
| 20 | A That sounds like it's possible, yeah. | 20 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 21 | Q So the catalyst was sent to ERG to be tested over | 21 | Q Have you ever seen an incident where there |
| 22 | a year after Customs collected it and about six months after | 22 | wouldn't, a manufacturer would produce something and then it |
| 23 | Harrison Wolf submitted a report on count four? | 23 | would not be imported for six months after the expiration of |
| 24 | A Yes. | 24 | the certificate? |
| 25 | Q And it was after all vehicles belonging to count | 25 | A Sorry, can you repeat the question? |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q I'll just move on. | 1 | Harrison Wolf about this. I would have to look at that and, |
| 2 | Do you know when the Agency sent Taotao the notice | 2 | and get back into it to -- |
| 3 | of violation for this complaint? | 3 | Q Do you remember at all if there was an extension |
| 4 | A I believe it was in December of 2013, but I'd have | 4 | request? |
| 5 | to double check if you want me to be specific. | 5 | A I remember that the report was very late, so |
| 6 | Q It was December 24, 2013. | 6 | probably there were some extension requests. |
| 7 | A Okay. | 7 | Q So when do you believe the report should have been |
| 8 | Q CX092-- | 8 | sent by? |
| 9 | (Pause.) | 9 | A I'm sorry? |
| 10 | Q December 24, 2013, that is a year after all | 10 | Q The report on CTA, the count four, Should have |
| 11 | vehicles in count four had been produced. | 11 | been sent by? |
| 12 | A Yes. Roughly. | 12 | A I don't recall off the top of my head. |
| 13 | Q So by testing the catalytic contact through a test | 13 | Q 2011? |
| 14 | plan approved by the Agency conducted by a pre-approved | 14 | A I think probably summer of 2012 is when it was |
| 15 | laboratory, submitted to the Agency by the professional | 15 | due. |
| 16 | engineer retained due to the stipulated agreement, you still | 16 | Q Do you know how long it takes for SGS to test a |
| 17 | believe that Taotao did not do all that it was required to | 17 | catalytic converter? |
| 18 | do? Or lead to believe it was required to do by the ASA. | 18 | A I believe it varies, depending on how many samples |
| 19 | Pursuant to just count four. | 19 | they have and so forth. |
| 20 | A To count four? | 20 | Q Would you agree that it takes at least a few |
| 21 | Q Yes. | 21 | months? |
| 22 | A I would have to go back and look at some of the | 22 | A Not necessarily. No. |
| 23 | test reports. I don't recall by engine family what -- | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: What's the exhibit number of this |
| 24 | Q Well, count four -- Harrison Wolf submitted a | 24 | document? |
| 25 | catalytic converter report by SGS on count four. Do you | 25 | MS. TARIQ: CX, sorry. CX76. |
|  | Page 821 |  | Page 823 |
| 1 | agree? | 1 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 2 | A Yes. | 2 | Q Ms. Isin, can you just read the -- read the last |
| 3 | Q Okay. Do you know why count four, a vehicle from | 3 | line over here, or that email, the last -- |
| 4 | count four that was collected in 2012 was sent a year later | 4 | A Please let us know if an extension of the deadline |
| 5 | in 2013 to ERG? | 5 | to December 1, 2012 will be acceptable. |
| 6 | A I don't recall specifically. | 6 | Q Okay. And then would you please read your |
| 7 | Q And how many vehicles in count four are listed in | 7 | response, the second paragraph? Under thank you for your |
| 8 | the proposed penalty? | 8 | message. The paragraph after that. |
| 9 | A I don't recall off the top of my head, but if you | 9 | A It's kind of cut off by the -- |
| 10 | have the exhibit. | 10 | Q Oh, I'm sorry. |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: 21,275. | 11 | A -- screen. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. | 12 | "Also we will consider an extension to the |
| 13 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 13 | September 1st deadline, but in order to do that we need to |
| 14 | Q Do you still believe Taotao was negligent or vocal | 14 | know when we can expect to receive the report." |
| 15 | when you just talk about the vehicles in, the 21,275 | 15 | Q So, Ms. Isin, if an extension was granted to |
| 16 | vehicles belonging to count four? | 16 | December 2013, would you then say that Taotao was still |
| 17 | A Yeah, I believe so. I mean I have to, I would | 17 | negligent in -- willful and negligent at least, just talking |
| 18 | have to go through. I would note that the SGS report is for | 18 | about count four here. |
| 19 | a post importation vehicle. We had in our settlement | 19 | A Well, yeah, like I said, you know, there are still |
| 20 | agreement catalyst testing was required to be pre- | 20 | some other issues. This was a post-importation vehicle, |
| 21 | importation. Thee's, you know, a number of discrepancies | 21 | should have tested a pre-importation vehicle. |
| 22 | still. | 22 | Q And you said that the pre-importation vehicle |
| 23 | Q Did Harrison Wolf request an extension to the | 23 | test, the annual report would have been due when? According |
| 24 | deadline? | 24 | to the ASA agreement. |
| 25 | A I know there was communication back and forth with | 25 | A You know, I need to go back and look at the engine |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | families that were covered by each annual report. I don't | 1 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So what's the question you |
| 2 | know when the first time this engine family appeared was. | 2 | want to ask her? |
| 3 | Q Was there not -- in the ASA, were there not dates | 3 | MS. TARIQ: Well, was the report due around |
| 4 | saying when each report or annual report was due by? | 4 | December 2012? The catalytic test report. |
| 5 | A I don't recall. | 5 | THE WITNESS: It looks like, from that email it |
| 6 | Q Would you mind looking at CX67? | 6 | looks like it may have been, yes, just looking at that page. |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: CX67 did you say? | 7 | MS. TARIQ: If there was another extension granted |
| 8 | MS. TARIQ: Yes. CX67. | 8 | it would still be on or about that time. Somewhere in 2012. |
| 9 | (Pause.) | 9 | And then extensions were granted at least until September |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: It talks about annual progress | 10 | 1st. |
| 11 | reports. I don't see a date here. | 11 | I would say at least until September 1st. It says |
| 12 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 12 | "we will consider an extension to the September 1st |
| 13 | Q Ms. Isin, if you go back to CX76, and if you would | 13 | deadline." |
| 14 | just look at the emails from Ms. Goldstein, does it seem | 14 | THE WITNESS: On page 896 it says, "We'll allow an |
| 15 | like she's asking for a 90 day extension to submit the | 15 | extension until December 1st, but we would like you to work |
| 16 | report? | 16 | with Taotao to at least submit a portion of the report |
| 17 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object | 17 | before October 15th." |
| 18 | to the relevance of this line of questioning at this point. | 18 | I mean this is kind of a long chain. There's a |
| 19 | We're not here to relitigate the ASA. Ms. Tariq asked | 19 | lot of back and forth. So I don't know if we can simplify |
| 20 | whether or not Ms. Isin would still consider or reevaluate | 20 | it down to there was one extension. This was it. |
| 21 | the willfulness and negligence factor and she provided an | 21 | MS. TARIQ: Okay. We'll move on from there. |
| 22 | answer to that. | 22 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 23 | MS. TARIQ: I would just say that it's not just | 23 | Q But these extension requests were requested by the |
| $24$ | the negligence. The relevance would be showing that all | 24 | professional engineer hired by Taotao USA pursuant to the |
| 25 | vehicles belonging to count four -- basically Taotao did | 25 | stipulated settlement agreement who are making these |
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| 1 | what it was required to do pursuant to the ASA for count | 1 | requests. |
| 2 | four. I think that would take down the penalty, the | 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | proposed penalty -- significantly reduce the proposed | 3 | Q All right. Do you know if it's common for SGS or |
| 4 | penalty if they were not negligent, if they did what they | 4 | another lab to have backlogs? |
| 5 | were required to do pursuant to the ASA, and if there was no | 5 | A I -- I wouldn't know. |
| 6 | history of non-compliance because it was an on-road vehicle. | 6 | Q But you know if Taotao would have followed the ASA |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so the issue here is did she | 7 | completely it would take possibly six weeks at times to get |
| 8 | give a 90 day extension? | 8 | the catalytic converter test results? |
| 9 | MS. TARIQ: Well, Ms. Isin says that the reason | 9 | A I didn't know that. |
| 10 | she thinks that count four should be assessed the way that | 10 | Q Okay. |
| 11 | she has assessed it in the proposed penalty is because the | 11 | Ms. Isin, I want to have you look at CX6, 006. |
| 12 | report was due before December 2012 but was submitted on | 12 | A Sorry. 6006? Bates? Or -- Oh, C06. Okay. |
| 13 | December 2012. The line of questioning is trying to get to | 13 | (Pause.) |
| 14 | was well, did they ask for an extension because the approved | 14 | MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, this might be an instance |
| 15 | lab had a backlog? If the extension was granted, then | 15 | where we're going to be looking at CBI. |
| 16 | should Taotao be penalized for that? | 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Could we close the courtroom? I |
| 17 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Okay. Overruled. | 17 | don't think it's a question of asking anybody to leave |
| 18 | So can we look at EPA Exhibit 76 at page 896? | 18 | because there's nobody here. We've worn everybody else out. |
| 19 | Which seems to indicate that they were asking for an | 19 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 20 | extension, and then at the very top it says, from Margaret | 20 | Q Ms. Isin, if you would look at EPA 000198 on |
| 21 | Goldstein to I believe Ms. Isin, and it says we'll plan to | 21 | Exhibit 6. |
| 22 | get it to you by December 1st. Is that what you're | 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | referring to? | 23 | Q Do you see the catalytic converter described? |
| 24 | MS. TARIQ: Yes. And then below that, the email | 24 | A Yes, I do. |
| 25 | below says the September 1st deadline. | 25 | Q All right. Just try to remember that for just a |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | moment, and I'm going to move you to -- | 1 | this matter, which is that the catalytic converters on the |
| 2 | (Pause.) | 2 | production vehicles did not meet the design specification of |
| 3 | Q Now if you'd look at Exhibit 9, I know you have to | 3 | the catalytic converter and the COC application, you would |
| 4 | flip a little bit. I can put it up here. | 4 | agree that there's only one catalytic converter design |
| 5 | (Pause.) | 5 | specification in all three of those COC applications? Six, |
| 6 | Q Does that look like the same catalytic converter | 6 | nine, and ten? |
| 7 | design? | 7 | A Yes. |
| 8 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object | 8 | Q And all vehicles from six, nine and ten did not |
| 9 | to this. The papers all speak for themselves. This is all | 9 | match that one design specification? |
| 10 | on the record. These are argument that can be made in the | 10 | A Yes. |
| 11 | brief. If we're just going to be comparing part numbers | 11 | Q And catalytic converters were basically palladium |
| 12 | between all the COC applications. And further, we're told | 12 | catalytic converters? That was the testimony or the |
| 13 | there would be a few questions from Ms. Tariq, but it's been | 13 | evidence -- |
| 14 | almost 45 minutes now. It is starting to feel like a double | 14 | A Actually I think for count ten there was hardly |
| 15 | hit in terms of two bites of cross-examining Ms. Isin. | 15 | any precious metal at all. Even palladium was low. |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we're going to indulge Ms. | 16 | Q And there was only one test done on -- |
| 17 | Tariq just a little bit more. So overruled. | 17 | A No, -- |
| 18 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Thank you, Your Honor. | 18 | Q -- catalytic converter. |
| 19 | MS. TARIQ: Thank you. | 19 | A -- I believe there were two on count ten. To the |
| 20 | THE WITNESS: Sorry, your question? | 20 | best of my recollection. |
| 21 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 21 | Q There was two? |
| 22 | Q The question was is it true that this was the same | 22 | The uncertified vehicles in count six were tested |
| 23 | catalytic converter design that you saw in CX6? | 23 | at CEE pursuant to the test plan? In 2014? |
| 24 | A The design appears to be the same. The part | 24 | A Yes. |
| 25 | number does seem to be different. But, yeah. | 25 | Q And would you agree that there was three samples |
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| 1 | Q And then without I guess, just, are you aware of | 1 | of the vehicle that were tested at CEE? |
| 2 | CX10, you've looked at it before. Would you agree that that | 2 | A Yes. |
| 3 | would also have the same design, catalytic converter design? | 3 | Q And we already agreed that they were uncertified |
| 4 | CX10? | 4 | because the catalytic converter did not match the one design |
| 5 | A I'm just checking it real quick. | 5 | specification in that application? |
| 6 | (Pause.) | 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | A CX10, Bates number 332. | 7 | Q And all three vehicles passed the emission test at |
| 8 | Q I can put it up here if you want. | 8 | CEE. |
| 9 | A Yes, again, with the exception of the part number | 9 | A Well, they passed the low hour test with the |
| 10 | it looks to be the same. | 10 | deterioration factor. |
| 11 | Q And is it because 9 and 10 are carry-over | 11 | Q And the low hour test was the test that was |
| 12 | applications? | 12 | approved by the Agency. |
| 13 | A That's my understanding. | 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | Q If you would just please look at, I'll just put it | 14 | Q So, Ms. Isin, is it true that, well, so although |
| 15 | up here. CX10, EPA 000356. The VIN number on top. | 15 | the Agency does not have emission test data for nine and |
| 16 | A Oh, yes. | 16 | ten, they do have emission test data from count six. |
| 17 | Q 5815? | 17 | A That's correct. |
| 18 | A Yes. | 18 | Q And counts six, nine and ten, again, were approved |
| 19 | Q And is the test vehicle, test data vehicle from | 19 | using the same test data? |
| 20 | CX6, is that the same test data vehicle? 5815? | 20 | A The applications were? Yes. |
| 21 | A Yes. | 21 | Q All right. |
| 22 | Q So CX 6, 9 and 10 have the same catalytic | 22 | Ms. Isin, you did not group count nine and ten |
| 23 | converter design, and the same test data vehicle? | 23 | together when scaling in your proposed penalty. |
| 24 | A As far as the certification application goes, yes. | 24 | A I grouped nine and ten together, but not with one |
| 25 | Q Thank you. So as far as the violation goes in | 25 | through eight. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q You're right. One and eight were grouped | 1 | knew at that time. EPA certification office is responsible |
| 2 | together, and then nine and ten were grouped separately. | 2 | for approving and issuing certificates. |
| 3 | A Yes. | 3 | Q So your department. |
| 4 | Q Had you grouped them all together would the | 4 | A My department was the Air Enforcement Division at |
| 5 | penalty have come significantly, would that have reduced the | 5 | the time, not responsible for approving or -- |
| 6 | proposed penalty significantly? | 6 | Q Your department knew that the vehicles belonging |
| 7 | A It would have reduced the penalty. I'm not sure | 7 | to count six were in violation of the Clean Air Act. |
| 8 | by how much. Off the top of my head. | 8 | A Yes, the Air Enforcement Division was aware of |
| 9 | Q I'm sorry, I seem to have lost the proposed | 9 | that. |
| 10 | penalty. | 10 | Q And nobody from your department informed Mr. |
| 11 | (Pause.) | 11 | Jackson's department of this? |
| 12 | Q So why did you group nine and ten separate from | 12 | A I don't recall. |
| 13 | one and eight? | 13 | Q Is it common practice to not inform the other |
| 14 | A Because those violations were discovered after the | 14 | department and let violative engines come into the U.S.? |
| 15 | filing of our initial complaint, and so we, and they're, you | 15 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection to the form of that |
| 16 | know, -- | 16 | question, Your Honor. |
| 17 | Q So nine and ten were discovered after the 2013 | 17 | JUDGE BIRO: The Agency's practice? I don't know. |
| 18 | notice of violation. | 18 | Overruled, go ahead. |
| 19 | A Exactly. After the notice of violation, but also | 19 | THE WITNESS: It's common practice for the |
| 20 | the complaint. Yeah. | 20 | enforcement office and the certification office to |
| 21 | Q But in 2014 the Agency knew that count six were | 21 | communicate, but the decisions that both offices make are |
| 22 | uncertified vehicles, that count six did not meet the | 22 | separate. |
| 23 | catalytic converter design specification. | 23 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 24 | A Correct. | 24 | Q Do you suppose a company is capable of doing that, |
| 25 | Q And count nine, the vehicles belonging to count | 25 | could do that as well? Maybe one department knows that |
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| 1 | nine, that COC obligation was approved after the Agency | 1 | something's been found to violate and the other doesn't? |
| 2 | discovered that count six did not meet the design | 2 | And they submit vehicles? Is it possible? I mean it's |
| 3 | specification? | 3 | possible in the Agency's different departments. |
| 4 | A Most likely, yes. | 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, calls for |
| 5 | Q Would you agree that count six, count nine was | 5 | speculation. |
| 6 | approved, application of count nine was approved in 2014 and | 6 | JUDGE BIRO: Sustained. |
| 7 | application for count nine, ten, was approved in 2015? | 7 | MS. TARIQ: I'll move on. |
| 8 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. I mean the documents | 8 | (Pause.) |
| 9 | speak for themselves, and Mr. Jackson would have been the | 9 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 10 | appropriate witness to speak to this particular matter. | 10 | Q Ms. Isin, you said yesterday that Respondents |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead. | 11 | could have voluntarily done the emission tests on counts |
| 12 | Is there much more, Ms. Tariq? | 12 | nine and ten, correct? |
| 13 | MS. TARIQ: No. Almost at the end. | 13 | A Yes. |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: That sounds about right. | 14 | Q If they voluntarily did the test and provided the |
| 15 | (Pause.) | 15 | results to the Agency, and the results showed that the |
| 16 | MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry. | 16 | vehicles passed emissions, count nine and ten would also be |
| 17 | (Pause.) | 17 | assessed at moderated egregiousness? |
| 18 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 18 | A Assuming there were no other issues with the test. |
| 19 | Q The Agency is, the Agency approved the COC | 19 | Q And that's because the penalty policy says that if |
| 20 | application, carry-over COC application, in 2014 and 2013 | 20 | a company voluntarily provides test results to the Agency, |
| 21 | knowing that the application -- I'm sorry, 2014, 2015, | 21 | the Agency may reduce the egregiousness from major to |
| 22 | knowing that the 2013 application did not meet the design | 22 | moderate? |
| 23 | specification that was given in that application. The | 23 | A You're asking if the penalty policy says that? |
| 24 | vehicles in 2013. | 24 | Q Yes. |
| 25 | A I'm not aware of what the certification office | 25 | A I'm not sure off the top of my head. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q Is your testimony not about the penalty policy? I | 1 | action and they showed that all vehicles passed emission |
| 2 | mean I can show you the penalty policy, here -- | 2 | tests. There's no example in the penalty policy of what to |
| 3 | (Pause.) | 3 | do or what factor to apply in that circumstance. However, |
| 4 | Q Well, in that case you know what happens if | 4 | there is another multiplier and that's a minor level of |
| 5 | instead of voluntarily providing test results, the company, | 5 | egregiousness. Without anything in the penally policy that |
| 6 | the agency has tests, emission test information pursuant to | 6 | says what to do in an instance where you have emission |
| 7 | a test order? | 7 | results before the action is initiated, why would a minor |
| 8 | A I'm sorry? What's the question? | 8 | egregiousness multiplier not be appropriate? |
| 9 | Q In terms of egregiousness and what multiplier to | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: So, I'm really lost. |
| 10 | apply to vehicles, is there any example in the penalty | 10 | MS. TARIQ: It's a lot. |
| 11 | policy about how to apply that egregiousness factor when the | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Really lost. |
| 12 | Agency has information regarding the emissions of | 12 | But is the argument that because they had the |
| 13 | uncertified engines not because the company voluntarily | 13 | results pursuant to the required testing, pursuant to their |
| 14 | provided those test results, but because the Agency ordered | 14 | order, that it should be a minor evaluation? |
| 15 | them? | 15 | MS. TARIQ: Yes. |
| 16 | A I -- I don't recall. | 16 | JUDGE BIRO: And that's your question, why isn't |
| 17 | Q Would you agree that this -- | 17 | it? |
| 18 | (Pause.) | 18 | MS. TARIQ: Yes. |
| 19 | A Do you want me to read that? | 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay how about that. |
| 20 | Q Sure, yes, please. | 20 | THE WITNESS: Minor violations, as I explained |
| 21 | A "However, litigation teams should evaluate the | 21 | yesterday, minor violations are typically label violations, |
| 22 | probative value and utility of emissions testing conducted | 22 | they're violations about actual or potential harm. They're |
| 23 | subsequent to initiation of an enforcement action." | 23 | not certification violations. |
| 24 | Q And would you agree that the appropriate value and | 24 | BY MS. TARIQ: |
| 25 | utility of emission testing that is submitted pursuant to a | 25 | Q Are minor violations harm just to the regulatory |
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| 1 | test plan, by an approved test plan, well, you wouldn't have | 1 | scheme but that do not involve actual or potential |
| 2 | the probative value and utility mission testing concerned | 2 | emissions? |
| 3 | when a test plan has been approved and emission results have | 3 | A Those would be moderate. |
| 4 | been submitted that have passed emission standards. | 4 | Q And where are you getting that from? |
| 5 | A I'm sorry, can you repeat the question? | 5 | A From the penalty policy. |
| 6 | Q Yes. An example on that page basically says that | 6 | Q That says if there are no actual or potential |
| 7 | you can reclassify an egregious from major to moderate if | 7 | emissions you should apply the moderate? |
| 8 | the violator is able to demonstrate during settlement | 8 | A No. Moderate and major both have actual or |
| 9 | discussions that the vehicles or engine at issue have | 9 | potential harm. |
| 10 | emissions that do not exceed the certification emission | 10 | Q And in case there is no actual or potential harm |
| 11 | levels under the applicable certificate. | 11 | from excess emissions, what multiplier, what factor is |
| 12 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection. | 12 | applied? |
| 13 | MS. TARIQ: The only concern -- | 13 | A I suppose minor. |
| 14 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm going to object to the | 14 | Q All right. |
| 15 | relevance of this in this case. We've had testimony about | 15 | MS. TARIQ: I have this final line of questioning. |
| 16 | counts one through eight being moderate based on emission | 16 | Your Honor, I don't know if CX28 was ever admitted into |
| 17 | test results. Testimony about nine and ten and the basis | 17 | evidence. |
| 18 | for that characterization. | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: No. |
| 19 | MS. TARIQ: The relevance is that one and eight | 19 | MS. TARIQ: We would like to offer it into |
| 20 | have been assessed as moderate even though the only examples | 20 | evidence at this time, if there were any objections. |
| 21 | provided in the penalty policy are where there are no | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Are there any objections? |
| 22 | emission results available or emission results are provided | 22 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. |
| 23 | by the violator voluntarily after the initiation of the | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: CX-28 is admitted into the record. |
| 24 | action. Here, in this case, the emission results were | 24 | // |
| 25 | available to the Agency prior to the initiation of this | 25 | // |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | (The document referred to was | 1 | into everything you do for the next day and a half. Okay? |
| 2 | marked for identification as | 2 | All right. |
| 3 | Complainant's Exhibit No. 28 | 3 | We'll stand in recess. |
| 4 | and was received into | 4 | (Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the hearing in the |
| 5 | evidence.) | 5 | above-entitled matter was recessed, to reconvene at 2:02 |
| 6 | MS. TARIQ: I'm going to have just five questions, | 6 | p.m., this dame day, October 19, 2017.) |
| 7 | and they're leading questions. Very quick on this 28. | 7 | // |
| 8 | JUDGE BIRO: Get with it. I'm hungry. | 8 | // |
| 9 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 9 | // |
| 10 | Q In order to seek a penalty over \$320,000 the EPA, | 10 | // |
| 11 | the Agency has to, in an administrative setting, the EPA and | 11 | // |
| 12 | the DOJ have to make a joint determination -- | 12 | // |
| 13 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is | 13 | // |
| 14 | going to jurisdiction I'm not sure has been decided. | 14 | // |
| 15 | MS. TARIQ: It's not going. I'm not going to go | 15 | // |
| 16 | to the jurisdiction issue of the case, just the penalty. | 16 | // |
| 17 | JUDGE BIRO: Uh-huh. So what's the point? | 17 | // |
| 18 | MS. TARIQ: It's just the language of the, Ms. | 18 | // |
| 19 | Dworkin's letter that says that violations that harm the | 19 | // |
| 20 | regulatory scheme but do not cause excess emissions -- | 20 | // |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Uh-huh. | 21 | // |
| 22 | MS. TARIQ: I just wanted to ask Ms. Isin if her | 22 | // |
| 23 | calculations were based on actual and potential emissions or | 23 | // |
| 24 | were restricted to harm and regulatory scheme. | 24 | // |
| 25 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 25 | // |
|  | Page 841 |  | Page 843 |
| 1 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor -- | 1 | AFTERNOON SESSION |
| 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Please, let her finish. | 2 | (2:02 p.m.) |
| 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Withdrawn. | 3 | JUDGE BIRO: We're going back on the record. |
| 4 | JUDGE BIRO: Go ahead. | 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no redirect |
| 5 | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, you wanted to ask if | 5 | for Ms. Isin, and would ask that she be excused at this |
| 6 | these violations are restricted to harm to the regulatory | 6 | time. |
| 7 | scheme? | 7 | JUDGE BIRO: Actually, I would like to ask you a |
| 8 | BY MS. TARIQ: | 8 | few questions, if I may. |
| 9 | Q Your proposed penalty calculation, does that | 9 | THE WITNESS: Sure. |
| 10 | include actual and potential emissions or is it restricted | 10 | JUDGE BIRO: Get some background information. |
| 11 | to harm to the regulatory scheme? And does not consider | 11 | Ms. Isin, you indicated that there are a number of |
| 12 | emissions. | 12 | foreign companies that import into the United States |
| 13 | A My penalty calculation considers actual or | 13 | motorcycles and ATV vehicles. How many countries are |
| 14 | potential harm both to the, to the environment, as well as | 14 | imports of those types of items into our country? |
| 15 | to the regulatory scheme. | 15 | THE WITNESS: I don't know the number off the top |
| 16 | MS. TARIQ: All right. That's all, Your Honor. | 16 | of my head. The exact number. I would estimate it to be, |
| 17 | JUDGE BIRO: Is it? | 17 | you know, between 50 and 100. |
| 18 | MS. TARIQ: Yes. | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Fifty and 100 countries? |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 19 | THE WITNESS: I would estimate, yeah. |
| 20 | Okay, it's 1 o'clock. We're going to break for | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: And how many companies? |
| 21 | lunch until 2. Then we're going to come back for redirect. | 21 | THE WITNESS: Oh, companies. Hundreds. I don't |
| 22 | Thank you, Ms. Isin. Please don't discuss your | 22 | have an exact number. Probably, Cle Jackson could tell you |
| 23 | testimony with anybody while we're on break. | 23 | how many certificates -- certificate holders there are, and |
| 24 | We only have this courtroom through tomorrow, so | 24 | I would imagine there are at least as many importers. |
| 25 | that's when we have to be done, so we should factor that | 25 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And are some of those |

## companies in Asia?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
JUDGE BIRO: And you indicated that from China,
Taotao ranked I think you said between first and fourth?
THE WITNESS: First to third.
JUDGE BIRO: First to third. In number of vehicles imported.

THE WITNESS: In declared value.
JUDGE BIRO: Declared value. So not numbers. But amount to value.

THE WITNESS: It might be the same with number. I, but my analysis was with declared value.

JUDGE BIRO: Do you know how many total Chinese companies or how many -- I guess, how many companies import from China?

THE WITNESS: I don't know the exact number. I can tell you that imports of this product type from China are between three to fifteen percent of the total imports of this product type. Into the United States.

JUDGE BIRO: And the product types are motorbikes and ATVs. Is that one product type?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
Other places that we import motorbikes and ATVs
from, would that include India and Korea?
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THE WITNESS: I believe other top importer countries, or countries of origin are Mexico, Italy. You know, it varies year from year. I'm just kind of going off the top of my head, but I do recall that Mexico was on the list. Italy was on the list for at least one year. It sort of varies.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
Other than motorbikes and ATVs, what do catalysts, what other items that are covered by mobile source rules are catalysts contained in?

THE WITNESS: In light duty vehicles, the kind of vehicle that you would drive, a car. They are, you know -catalytic converters are also included in heavy-duty trucks. A different type of catalytic converter, but they're catalytic converters, nonetheless.

I guess those are the primary ones that I'm aware of. You know, heavy duty diesel as well as light duty passenger cars. Recreational vehicles, motorcycles. I mean, they're not all catalyst equipped, but many of them are.

JUDGE BIRO: When you were looking into the financial information for these three Respondents, did they all advise you, each of the three companies, that they were claiming an inability to pay?

THE WITNESS: The -- at the time we had those
discussions, Taotao USA was representing the manufacturers.
And when -- and so Taotao USA, Mr. Matao Cao told us he had
an inability to pay, I assumed it was on behalf of all of
them. Yeah, that's my assumption. They -- because they all submitted financial information.

JUDGE BIRO: Did you get any tax returns from any of the other entities who are Respondents in this case other than Taotao USA?

THE WITNESS: No tax returns from the Chinese companies. We got some financial statements. And we got a narrative explaining, you know, why they felt they couldn't continue in business.

JUDGE BIRO: But you didn't receive any financial tax returns? I mean -- not financial. Strike that.

You didn't receive any Chinese tax returns from the other two Chinese entities.

THE WITNESS: No.
JUDGE BIRO: And did you receive any documentation regarding -- corporate documentation, what in our country would be articles of incorporation or bylaws or other financial statements that are filed with the government in regard to a corporation in connection with those Chinese companies?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall receiving anything like that.

JUDGE BIRO: Of the 109,000 more or less vehicles that came to the U.S. ports, how many of them were transferred, sold, by Taotao USA to retail dealers?

THE WITNESS: To any dealer or --
JUDGE BIRO: Any dealer.
THE WITNESS: My understanding, all of them. I don't know of any vehicles left in inventory.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So all of those vehicles were sold to retail dealers who would then sell them to the public, is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's my understanding, yes.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And is there any reason to believe that those ATV vehicles and motorcycles are not out in the public domain?

THE WITNESS: There's no reason not to believe it.
JUDGE BIRO: There's no recall? There hasn't been --

THE WITNESS: There's been --
JUDGE BIRO: They have not been exported or --
THE WITNESS: That's one of the reasons why I added the 30 percent gravity for failure to remediate, because none of the vehicles were recalled or retrofitted or, you know, remediated in any way. All but -- yeah, only 66, to my knowledge, were exported outside of the United States.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | JUDGE BIRO: Now you negotiated the ASA, you | 1 | the general manager for Taotao USA? |
| 2 | indicated. Who did you negotiate that with? | 2 | A I don't feel comfortable saying it was the thrust. |
| 3 | THE WITNESS: So on EPA's side, Christopher | 3 | I'm, you know, it was a long time ago. Like I said, my |
| 4 | Thompson was the EPA attorney who negotiated that. I | 4 | knowledge is incomplete because the attorney handling the |
| 5 | assisted him. And we negotiated that with Taotao USA. I | 5 | case did most of the negotiations. |
| 6 | was not present at all the meetings, so my information is a | 6 | Q And as far as your understanding of what happened |
| 7 | little bit incomplete. But as far as I'm aware, it was Mr. | 7 | to the 2015, 2016 vehicles that were added later on, you're |
| 8 | Matao Cao and Mr. Hillman. From Taotao USA. | 8 | purely speculating as to what happened to them. Is that |
| 9 | JUDGE BIRO: There was no attorney representing | 9 | accurate? |
| 10 | them? | 10 | A Whether they were sold or not? That's what I'm |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: No. | 11 | speculating about? |
| 12 | JUDGE BIRO: Did Mr. Cao ask for the agreement to | 12 | Q Whether anything happened to them. |
| 13 | be translated for his benefit, because he could not | 13 | A Well, I believe that 66 of them were exported. |
| 14 | otherwise understand what he was being asked to agree to? | 14 | Q Right. But the notice was given to include those |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: No. We -- we didn't have any | 15 | vehicles, correct? |
| 16 | communication problems as -- from my perspective, during our | 16 | A Which notice? |
| 17 | interactions with Taotao USA in 2010. | 17 | Q There was an amended complaint that added those |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 18 | vehicles. Do you remember that? |
| 19 | All right. Those were all my questions. | 19 | A The vehicles in counts nine and ten. Yes. |
| 20 | Mr. Kulschinsky, do you have any follow-up | 20 | Q Right. And is it your understanding that that |
| 21 | questions to my questions? Okay. | 21 | complaint was received by representatives of Taotao USA? |
| 22 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. No follow-up | 22 | A Yes. |
| 23 | questions. | 23 | Q And is it your further belief that you have no |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Chu, do you have any follow-up | 24 | knowledge as to what happened to those vehicles at this |
| 25 | questions? | 25 | time? |
|  | Page 849 |  | Page 851 |
| 1 | MR. CHU: Just a couple. | 1 | A I assume -- I guess to answer the question, um, as |
| 2 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. That's fine. You can come to | 2 | accurately as possible, I would need to look at the |
| 3 | the stand again and ask a few questions. | 3 | information request that we sent and remind myself whether |
| 4 | CROSS-EXAMINATION (Cont'd) | 4 | -- oh, you're -- sorry, we're talking about counts nine and |
| 5 | BY MR. CHU: | 5 | ten. |
| 6 | Q Ms. Isin, you have seen the emails from Matao Cao, | 6 | Uh, yeah, as far as I know, to the best of my |
| 7 | right? | 7 | recollection, we received no information that they had been |
| 8 | A Which emails? | 8 | remediated or exported other than the 66 that we identified. |
| 9 | Q The ones that have been introduced already, the | 9 | MR. CHU: Thank you. I'd pass the witness, Your |
| 10 | communications with you and Taotao USA. | 10 | Honor. |
| 11 | A Yes. | 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Isin. |
| 12 | Q Would you say that all of his emails were clear | 12 | THE WITNESS: Thanks. |
| 13 | and concise? | 13 | (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) |
| 14 | A I think he got his point across. | 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Kulschinsky, would you like to |
| 15 | Q Right, so it was not perfect, right? | 15 | call your next witness? |
| 16 | A It was not $100 \%$ perfect, no. | 16 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no further |
| 17 | Q But you had no problem, neither you nor | 17 | witnesses. We just have copies of the two transcripts that |
| 18 | Christopher Thompson, speaking with Mike Hillman, the | 18 | were discussed this morning. I'd like to give them to the |
| 19 | general manager at Taotao USA. Is that correct? | 19 | court reporter, if I may. |
| 20 | A Correct. | 20 | (Pause.) |
| 21 | Q So do -- is it -- you believe that the general | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: And these are just Matao Cao's |
| 22 | manager handled those negotiations with Mr. Thompson. | 22 | depositions? |
| 23 | A To my knowledge Mr. Matao Cao was involved. | 23 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: We provided Mr. Cao's deposition |
| 24 | Q I understand, but is it also your understanding | 24 | this morning. This is Mr. Garibyan and Mr. Shefftz' |
| 25 | that the thrust of the negotiations was with Mike Hillman, | 25 | depositions. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. All right. |  | harms the regulatory scheme that we have in this case, Your |
| 2 | Is there any further evidence you'd like to | 2 | Honor. |
| 3 | introduce in the record? | 3 | JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. |
| 4 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, Your Honor. | 4 | Motion denied. You have already introduced |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Before we, before you rest, would you | 5 | evidence pre-dating contested issues of fact, for which |
| 6 | like us to go over the exhibits that have been admitted? | 6 | we're going to go through the whole process at hearing. |
| 7 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor. | 7 | Would you like to make an opening statement, or |
| 8 | JUDGE BIRO: You're good on that. | 8 | call your first witness? |
| 9 | I have as admitted into the record so far, | 9 | MR. CHU: I'll do both, Your Honor. |
| 10 | Complainant's Exhibits 1 through 10; 12 through 14; 19; 22 | 10 | May it please the Court, counsels. Your Honor, we |
| 11 | through 25; 30 and 31. Oh, and 28. | 11 | believe that this case here revolves around a simple |
| 12 | Should we start over? | 12 | application that the evidence will show, this certificate |
| 13 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I think | 13 | known as a certificate of conformity. And the evidence will |
| 14 | we Should start over. I think there were a few that I have | 14 | show that the laws that are referenced in that certificate |
| 15 | on my, on our list that were missed. | 15 | actually reference a 1981 statute which this Court is very |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: We'll start over again. | 16 | familiar with and has an opportunity to review. |
| 17 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Okay. | 17 | We believe that the Respondents are being |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Exhibits 1 through 10; 12 through 17; | 18 | subjected to language that totally disappeared in 2012, in |
| 19 | 19; 22 through $25 ; 28 ; 30$ and $31 ; 35 ; 42$ through $52 ; 61 ; 64$; | 19 | reference to what's called the design specification. That |
| 20 | 67; 69 through 74; 76 through 79; 81; 92 to $95 ; 98$ to 122 ; | 20 | language was purposely taken out of the 2012 regulations. |
| 21 | $140 ; 148 ; 155 ; 156 \mathrm{~A} ; 159 ; 161$ to 163; 167 and 168; 169 | 21 | But the COC certificates, of which the complaint is based |
| 22 | through 171; 183 through $188 ; 189 ; 190$ A; 191; 192; 194; 197 | 22 | upon, references the old language, not the new CFR that |
| 23 | through 203; 205 to 209; 213; 215; 216; 217; and 218. | 23 | purposefully took that language out. |
| 24 | And Respondent's Exhibits 1; 33; 38; and 39. | 24 | The evidence will show -- has shown, this is |
| 25 | Are we all in agreement? | 25 | opening including the beginning, that these catalysts and |
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| 1 | Ms. Tariq? | 1 | I've used the pancake example, that you can't make a 55 |
| 2 | MS. TARIQ: Yes, Your Honor. | 2 | pancake mix with ten parts almonds, five parts pistachio and |
| 3 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, with regards to | 3 | three parts pecans, and come out with pancakes that are even |
| 4 | Complainant's Exhibits, that matches our list. I have no | 4 | in the process; which is similar to the process that the |
| 5 | basis to dispute -- I believe that matches our count. | 5 | evidence shows had taken place here. This wash coal slurry |
| 6 | Thank you, Your Honor. | 6 | and metal particles. |
| 7 | JUDGE BIRO: That's great. | 7 | The evidence shows, clears showly (sic) because of |
| 8 | How about Bruce, you okay? | 8 | a causation factor, you cannot take samples of the wash coat |
| 9 | REPORTER: I will work out everything off the | 9 | and equate that to every vehicle not being proper. |
| 10 | record for these exhibits. | 10 | And the evidence shows that in 2012 the Margaret |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, all right. | 11 | Goldstein selection of not multiple vehicles, rather three |
| 12 | With that consensus -- | 12 | catalysts in her infinite wisdom in reading the ASA. |
| 13 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Complainant rests, Your Honor. | 13 | Knowing that the number of catalysts involved was really the |
| 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Thank you. | 14 | issue, not the number of vehicles, to lessen the amount of |
| 15 | Mr. Chu? | 15 | cost to the company, she, in agreement with the EPA, took |
| 16 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, we have a motion for | 16 | three catalysts and only three catalysts to be tested, |
| 17 | the floor. | 17 | rather than what they did later on, requiring 35 catalysts |
| 18 | We would ask for a directed verdict in favor of | 18 | to be tested. |
| 19 | the Respondents in this matter. One, as to the two Chinese | 19 | And the evidence shows clearly, which is already |
| 20 | companies they failed to establish any responsibility that | 20 | in the record, that of those vehicles, they were test |
| 21 | they would have under the circumstances in these alleged | 21 | results for the year 2012. And the model numbers, the |
| 22 | violations associated with vehicles imported by Taotao USA. | 22 | evidence will show, matches up. So you can't say 23,000 |
| 23 | Number two, we would move on a directed verdict, | 23 | vehicles automatically were not in conformity for damages |
| 24 | they have failed to supply any evidence as to causation as | 24 | purposes when all you have is a alleged test that was not |
| 25 | to damages and as to how the particular evidence they put on | 25 | part of the record here to establish the causation as to |

## annual checkup is an annual checkup.

a test that says that 2012 model was not.
So how can you include 23,000 ?
So the evidence will show the calculation, the methods are wrong. The evidence will show that there was full cooperation to the best of the ability of this foreign entity. There were no considerations taking (sic) there to try to work with a country like China who at that time was not as strong as it is today, but a up-and-coming place.

And the evidence will show that China, this be a role model here. And they did their best. They listened to the EPA. They went ahead and listened to the suggestions.

When they said something, they paid special attention. It wasn't a suggestion, it wasn't a lead, it wasn't a gift. They said some companies use this company, and they latched onto that. The evidence will show that they felt that was going to help with the situation.

The ASA, the evidence will show, is clearly poorly written. Absolutely bad. It doesn't tell when to begin, when to stop. We know when it was signed. It talks about the annual report. Well, annual report is a misnomer. An Chinese company, the Taotao USA company, said we wanted to
annual report can possibly be of any benefit. Rather than mixing years up. Because it requires you in the new model year to do a catalyst test of that new model year.

So when you submit your application, you have to go ahead and get that testing done.

The evidence will show through emails and communications with the EPA, they did not know that -Taotao USA did not know how to satisfy the EPA Air Enforcement Divisions' demands of a catalyst test. They were lost. They took Chinese companies that completely, the evidence will show, crushed, dissolved these catalysts to get down to the wash cost elimination, down to the precious metals, down to separating them, down to measuring the finite amount and the ratios. That was the whole thing.

But that was never acceptable. The evidence will show that the EPA said it's Chinese, not meaning that it's in Chinese, but it's Chinese and we just are not going to be able to accept these.

So they went ahead and followed Margaret
Goldstein, okay, and went ahead and used SGS, which in 2012,
three was okay. But all of a sudden, which is not the evidence, and I'm not submitting this evidence, but if the Court considers it, the test results contradicted their own test results on the same year, the model.

So the testing was a big issue. The evidence will
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So what is the time frame, time reference? Then you have to guess in that ASA as to what it is they want. It's signed in 2010, in June. So obviously we can't be talking about model years 2010 because that would have been something in 2009.

So potentially, possibly, we could be talking
about the 2011 model years which begin sometime months before 2011.

So the annual report, if you want to know the total number of vehicles for that model year, you would have to wait until sometime in 2011 when they stopped manufacturing the 2011 models and begin manufacturing 2012. Because upon renewal, or issuance of a 2012 certificate, the manufacture can begin, the manufacture of the 2012.

So it would appear that that reporting year is going to fluctuate, depending upon when the next year's certificates are approved so you can get the count of the vehicles. Because when you look at the ASA you will see, the evidence will show, that it says when a new vehicle or engine. It doesn't tell you what that means. That's why you have to go back to that paragraph in the beginning, and the evidence will show in the depositions we had to guide Ms. Isin to that to help find it. And it describes the model year.

So that's your only anchor to tell you when an
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show that in a paper authored -- at least with Ms. Isin's
name on it, okay? That the method acceptable for analyzing loads wasn't accepted until 2014 by the NEIC.

So up at this time, these catalyst tests that were being demanded to be performed had no standard acceptable in the industry or by the EPA or by EPA's enforcement. It's kind of like the horse before the cart in this situation, and that's what we have.

So the evidence will show clearly that my client did they best they could, got consultants in, got attorneys in, trying to identify and figure out what it was, because it became totally impossible. And we didn't really find out, the evidence will show, until we took the deposition of Cle Jackson.

Knowing what we knew about the process, that there's no way that you can get perfect amounts of precious metals in exact ratios, but rather that this is a aggregate process where you get enough precious metals that it will keep the emissions down, and that's what the evidence is going to show, that the emission standards were never, ever violated from Taotao USA in these vehicles.

And so it was -- it wasn't until that deposition this year where we were able to discover on the internet that the EPA was accepting tolerances. That this exact number that they were demanding, they said take the
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | catalyst, melt it down, do whatever you have to do, give us | 1 | MR. PALERMO: I'm not sure what Mr. Chu means by |
| 2 | what that unit has. But that unit will -- from that point | 2 | that. |
| 3 | on and for every year thereafter, will meet or match the -- | 3 | MR. CHU: I'd be happy to step back and allow |
| 4 | will match that requirement. Okay? | 4 | counsel to voir dire him. |
| 5 | But that's not the standard, and therefore the | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Well, maybe you can lay a foundation |
| 6 | evidence will show that as soon as s were able to, we | 6 | for that expertise, and we could then move forward. |
| 7 | immediately filed addendums to correct the description. And | 7 | MR. CHU: The question is not that they doubt the |
| 8 | as such, with that corrected description, as the evidence | 8 | expertise, he said that I don't think that -- basically, |
| 9 | will show, the EPA allows these kinds of amendments because | 9 | there is a classification of an expert. And my |
| 10 | it is a sensible policy to do that. | 10 | understanding of an expert is someone that has the ability |
| 11 | And as such, these things have all been done, the | 11 | to assist the Court to make decisions that normally, that's |
| 12 | evidence will show, and at the end my clients have been | 12 | not common knowledge. |
| 13 | wronged in the situation, and they've spent hundreds of | 13 | JUDGE BIRO: We don't normally qualify Agency |
| 14 | thousands of dollars unnecessarily on tests and hundreds of | 14 | staff, describe their penalty policy calculations as |
| 15 | thousands of dollars more on fees and expenses in the | 15 | technically experts. But Mr. Shefftz is not an Agency |
| 16 | defense of this action, Your Honor. | 16 | employee anymore. Or maybe he never was. |
| 17 | And we're ready to present. | 17 | MR. PALERMO: Never was. Yes. Correct. |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Thank you, Mr. Chu. | 18 | MR. CHU: Never was. |
| 19 | Would you call your first witness? | 19 | MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, this doesn't match what |
| 20 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. I would call Mr. | 20 | the Respondents have placed into the record, the pre-hearing |
| 21 | Shefftz. | 21 | exchange, as what they were offering Mr. Shefftz for in |
| 22 | JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Reporter, would you please swear | 22 | terms of his expertise. |
| 23 | the witness? | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: I'll tell you what he did offer him |
| 24 | // | 24 | for. |
| 25 | // | 25 | An independent consulting economist, and he's |
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| 1 | Whereupon, | 1 | going to testify about economic benefit component of the |
| 2 | JONATHAN SHEFFTZ | 2 | penalty policy. |
| 3 | having been first duly sworn, was called as a | 3 | Can we -- |
| 4 | witness herein, and was examined and testified as follows: | 4 | MR. PALERMO: I don't object to that. |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Please be seated. | 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Can we qualify him as an expert in |
| 6 | DIRECT EXAMINATION | 6 | the economic benefit component of the penalty policy, Mr . |
| 7 | BY MR. CHU: | 7 | Chu? Is that sufficient? |
| 8 | Q Please state your name for the record. | 8 | MR. CHU: I'm okay with that. |
| 9 | A First name is Jonathan. Middle initial S. Last | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we will qualify Mr. Shefftz as |
| 10 | name is Shefftz, spelled S-H-E-F-F-T-Z. | 10 | an expert economist and in the economic benefit component of |
| 11 | MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time I would ask | 11 | the penalty policy. |
| 12 | permission to ask the EPA whether or not they would accept | 12 | MR. CHU: As well as the, I guess without saying |
| 13 | this gentleman as a qualified expert before this Court. | 13 | it, the ability to pay components of the policy. |
| 14 | JUDGE BIRO: And what would you like to qualify | 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Palermo? |
| 15 | him in? | 15 | MR. PALERMO: I have no objection. |
| 16 | MR. CHU: AS an economist as well as a expert with | 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And ability to pay component |
| 17 | the penalty policy calculations. | 17 | of the penalty policy. |
| 18 | MR. PALERMO: I object to the characterization of | 18 | Okay. |
| 19 | penalty policy calculations. I have no problem -- | 19 | MR. CHU: Thank you. May I proceed? |
| 20 | JUDGE BIRO: You would agree to have Mr. Shefftz | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: Please proceed. |
| 21 | qualified as an expert as an economist? | 21 | BY MR. CHU: |
| 22 | MR. PALERMO: Correct. | 22 | Q Sir, you've had an opportunity to review data in |
| 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 23 | this case, have you not? |
| 24 | And in terms of an expert on penalty policy | 24 | A Yes, I have. |
| 25 | calculations? | 25 | Q And based upon your review of that data and your |

background and experience and expertise, would you please tell this Court your findings and your opinions based upon those findings?

A Sure. To help make sure, though, that I get the numbers exactly right, is my report here somewhere in these binders?

JUDGE BIRO: Do you have a white binder in front of you, Mr. Shefftz?
(Pause.)
THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm the first one. That's easy.
JUDGE BIRO: That's how special you are. BY MR. CHU:
Q If you will look at Exhibit 1, is that what you were looking for?

A Yes.
So my analysis has two components as described in the qualification discussion earlier. Economic benefit and ability to pay.

Under economic benefit I analyzed four different scenarios, or we could call it three different scenarios with a slight variation in the calculation of one of them, but four different economic benefit figures at least.

And then for ability to pay in my report I described an ABEL analysis run that I performed and since then I have read the reports and deposition testimony of
reactions, that EPA had not performed what I would consider to be an analysis of the economic benefit, but had simply applied a $\$ 15$ rule of thumb across each engine at issue in the case.

I looked up the penalty policy and it seemed clear to me that that was focused on cases where emissions controls were outright missing as opposed to this case where the issue is, at least as I understand it, the mismatch between what is on the COCs and what was found during the testing of the engines.

JUDGE BIRO: I don't mean to cut you off. THE WITNESS: Sure.
JUDGE BIRO: But the Agency has indicated they accept your fourth scenario for economic benefit.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Sure.
JUDGE BIRO: So whatever happened before about the rule of thumb, we can just move on.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
So then I set up my four scenarios and a tabular summary of the bottom line results appears on -- flipping through here -- on page -- on page 21. Sorry for the small font but I was trying to get this all to fit onto one page.

So the first scenario is my analysis of an approach whereby the violations at issue in this case are avoided by keeping essentially the catalytic converters the
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EPA's financial witness, Dr. James Carroll, and I have some opinions on his opinions.

So if we're just going to proceed in that narrative way, kind of free form.

JUDGE BIRO: Why don't you start with the economic benefit and then we'll talk about ability to pay after that.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
So I'm not sure how expansive I need to be here, given the free form format, but if I'm prattling on for too much and too long, I'll -- I'm certainly happy to tighten things up.

But I was first retained on this case regarding the issue of economic benefit. And given that usually in these, always until now in administrative hearings I've worked for EPA, I wanted to understand what analysis had been performed, since I would not agree to be retained by a Respondent in this case, especially if one of my former colleagues that I see was on the other side or some other qualified expert had performed an economic benefit analysis, and I, the only thing left for me to do would be to nit-pick on minor details that would make almost no difference in the results, perhaps even still within what is often considered a reasonable approximation, to use the typical phrase in these cases.

I discovered, much to my surprise and other
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same but changing the COCs.
Now perhaps some analysts would take the point that it's just a piece of paper, you're writing down numbers and there's no cost involved in having the COCs be something different.

However, my approach was -- in looking at this -was that hindsight can be $20 / 20$, but it seems to me, and granted I don't know exactly what goes into coming up with COCs, but this is not something that could have been done costlessly, but some additional level of effort and oversight, supervision, testing, et cetera, would have been necessary to ensure that the COCs match up with the catalytic converters, even if the catalytic converters were to have physically remained the same.

So to do that analysis, unfortunately I didn't have detailed information on what might have gone into that, so as a relatively rough proxy I used what you see on page -- flipping back now -- page 14.

I used employment cost information for environmental engineers, taking standard information from the Department of Labor.

Now this is an area of my analysis that could certainly be refined much further. Issues could include: Well, did this oversight and additional testing, et cetera, et cetera, need to occur in China where labor costs would be

1 lower, or instead in the United States?
Is it something that should have been done internally?

Is it something that should have been outsourced to other companies?

I don't know the answer to that, but I thought this was an important component of the analysis, so I wanted to at least have a rough proxy in there for what the economic benefit would look like for avoiding that additional level of effort, so to speak, over the years that seemed to be at issue in this case.

Then for scenarios two, three and four. These are all fairly similar to one another, both in approach an in results. Here it's keeping the COCs the same and instead altering the precious metals content to match up what was in the COCs.

Now on page, we're back on page 21 here. All the four different rows here are alternatives, not additive. However, the result in figure one is essentially subsumed, incorporated in the results for scenarios two, three and four. Because I'm taking the position here, based on my understanding of the case, that it wasn't just a matter of having different previous metals compositions in the catalytic converters, but ensuring that those compositions matched up with the COCs.
occurred had the catalytic converters in their tested compositions matched up with what was on the certificates of conformity.

And then I went through the usual exercise of calculating the after tax and its present value, just like in EPA's own BEN model.

In Table 4A, some of the figures resulted in cost savings for the different engine classes if the compositions had matched up with the certificates of conformity. This is because in some of the tests, although there were shortfalls in certain metals, there were actually excesses of other metals.

So in this table I simply let the savings offset the costs and therefore for some of these there's a negative economic benefit for certain counts.

In my scenario three by contract, which appears on page 17 , what I did here was any shortfalls are essentially rounded up to zero.

Now, why did I do that? Well, I'm not sure it really makes that much sense to do that. On the other hand, I thought that perhaps a scenario where some of these excess metals amounts are allowed to offset the shortfalls would not be looked upon positively by EPA. It's possible one could even take the view that maybe the manufacturer had additional amounts of the metals that it wouldn't be using
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So therefore, some level of effort, and therefore some cost would have been involved in that beyond just the cost differentials for the various precious metals.

So I wanted to take as comprehensive an approach as possible, even though it's roughly doubling the economic benefit results in scenarios two through four.

So with that overview of scenarios two through four, the different ways I went about it was -- flipping back now again to page 15 . First I did some research from publicly available sources on the commodity prices for the three different precious metals at issue in this case.

Then flipping to page 16 , which is a rather busy table. And I apologize for the small font, but I thought it preferable to cram it all into one page so at least it would all be there together. The different columns are for the different engine classes, the different counts in this case as I understand it.

And then I went through, and I took the concentrations for the three different precious metals and the different certificates of conformity.

I looked at the results in the EPA testing and then I came up with a shortfall or excess, and then I applied the precious metals prices, and for each engine class came up with a figure representing the additional cost in previous metals or sometimes the savings that would have
for anything else.
I'm not really sure that makes any sense, but I wanted to at least present what the results would be, if somehow those excess amounts of th precious metals were not allowed to be credited against the shortfalls of those metals.

The bottom line result, though, as we've seen in the other table, really isn't all that big relative to other differentials.

The next thing I did was I thought about an approach where instead of essentially building up metal by metal, gram by gram, or fraction thereof, a catalytic converter whose composition matched that of the COCs, instead what if simply a different supplier was used altogether.

Unfortunately I didn't have detailed invoices to support that analysis or at least not invoices that I could understand completely in English. However, I did receive a spreadsheet from Respondents that appeared to be showing that, or at least taking some sort of variation on the approach that I had in the previous two tables.

So on page 18 what you see is simply publicly available data on Chinese versus U.S. currency exchange rates since the spreadsheet that I received was in what appeared to be Chinese currency.

1 (Clearing throat.) Excuse me. Is there some water?

Then on page 19 in Table 6, that represents the results -- thanks. That represents the results of my economic benefit analysis using that spreadsheet.

Now I really can't tell you anything about that spreadsheet because I don't know anything else about it other than it had two columns that appeared to be representing the cost for the actual catalytic converters that were used in the vehicles at issue in this case, and the cost for catalytic converters that would have met the COC compositions.

JUDGE BIRO: What page are we looking at?
THE WITNESS: So I was looking now at page 19.
So Table 6, which follows a very similar format to my previous tables, except instead of having all the rows for building up the compliance catalytic converter composition by going through metal by metal and looking at the shortfall or the excess in the tests, instead it has cost per unit procured, cost per unit specified. Those are my words based on my understanding of the spreadsheet I received.

And you can see it has the kind of funny-looking Chinese currency symbol that Excel conveniently provided to me. And then I came up with a savings per engine class,
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apply a foreign exchange rate to it, and then go through the usual after-tax net present value calculations.

And once again, those results going through in total, across the two different manufacturers, are on page 21 .

So page 21, Table 7, that's bringing in the results from all the prior tables; going through the four different scenarios; and breaking it apart not by count, but just by counts one through four and counts five through ten, corresponding to the two different Chinese manufacturers, and then summing it all up. And also giving the monthly increase.

And conveniently enough since my calculations were performed for the initially scheduled hearing as of July and now it's three months later, to account for the passage of time since then there's a monthly increase in the italicized columns that can simply be multiplied by the number three, and then add it to the other columns.

So the figure that EPA used in its motion to reduce the penalty for something like that is column three. So that corresponds to my approach where I still incorporated my proxy for additional staffing or supervision, based on Department of Labor costs for a portion of an environmental engineer's time, and then added to that my calculations for changing the precious metals
composition of the catalytic converters so that they matched up with the certificates of conformity.

And specifically scenario three is the one where I essentially just set aside any savings that appear that they would have resulted from the compliance -- I'm sorry, from catalytic converter compositions that matched up with the COCs, given that some of the tests shows an excess of some metals.

You'll also notice that that rounded off $\$ 221,000$ figure which precisely here is the $\$ 220,731$. It's barely any different than row four, the $\$ 219,000$ figure which is based upon the, what I believe to be the Respondent's spreadsheet showing kind of, well, I'm not sure exactly how they came up, actually I'm not sure at all how they came up with their figures for the compliant versus the actual catalytic converters. But either way, it's somewhat of a moot point since the two figures are almost exactly the same.

Row two is the figure when the savings from excess amounts of metals are allowed to be offset against the shortfalls. Once again, it's really not that much of a difference. $\$ 194,000$ versus $\$ 220,000$.

So I think that's my summary of the economic benefit there. I'll pause if, you know --

JUDGE BIRO: Did you want to ask him any specific
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questions?
MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
Do you want to proceed with cross on that issue or should we just keep going and we'll do it all at one time?

MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, I'd prefer to do cross at the end.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. All right.
Thank you, Mr. Shefftz. Could you then discuss ability to pay issues?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry. You said all at one time? Okay. Sorry. For some reason I heard that the other way around.

So for ability to pay, as I said, I was retained, I was approached initially to opine on economic benefit. Once I was working on that I was also asked about ability to pay.

Although I don't mention in my report, I did testify in deposition. So I will talk very briefly about the two, relatively briefly, as briefly as I can, about the two Chinese manufacturers.

I heard the testimony earlier today about some of the information that EPA reviewed about the Chinese manufacturers.

On the one hand I found the documentation that was

1 provided to me to be very comprehensive. Everything

12 month period that doesnt corespa to acalear
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but it still does represent a whole year's worth of results.
I did some of my own analysis on those with an
ABEL-like spreadsheet on my own. But given that I did not have enough confidence that the financial statements represented what I would like them to represent, I did not include that in my report. And therefore, I really don't have an expert opinion regarding the ability of those two Chinese manufacturers to pay a penalty.

However, I did have comprehensive information on the American company, Taotao USA. And specifically I had the U.S. federal tax returns, which are something that's more straightforward, and -- as we all know.

So at the time when I wrote my report in June I was not aware of any ability to pay analysis that EPA had performed or at least that EPA had provided to Respondents, other than what I understood to be some citations to an interview of I think one of the Chinese manufacturers, just talking vaguely about how the company was very big and had a lot of employees or something like that.

And although I've used quotes like that sometimes in my own ability to pay analyses whether for EPA or for other clients, I would not base an entire ability to pay analysis on just that.

So I restricted my analysis only to the American company. And given that nothing else had been done at that
point I thought at least a first start Would be to run EPA's own ABEL model.

Now the ABEL model is not perfect, but it's still pretty good at what it does. I can't claim credit for the original analytical approach of the ABEL model, even though I developed the current Windows version of the model and continue to provide support to EPA on it.

However, for a case like this where as far as I could tell the only reasonable means of paying a penalty would be for Taotao USA to cover it via internally generated cash flow going into the future. ABEL seemed to be a pretty good fit. In other words, this was the type of company and the type of situation for which the ABEL model was designed.

So I was testifying in other contexts, typically I would not use the ABEL model per se, just because it is not very forthcoming in all of its details and calculations behind the scenes. The BEN model is that way. I designed it to be that way. The ABEL model has some very complicated statistical distribution calculations going on behind the scenes.

Often our kind of number one rule of thumb when I was at IAC or still have led presentations with staff since then is don't ever try to explain the entire ABEL model in Court. However, I felt that since the opposing audience here in a way was EPA that it would be okay to do that here.
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So without going into all the details, roughly the result was about $\$ 700,000$ in ability to pay at the statistical confidence level that EPA typically uses when presenting the BEN model.

So since then, I have read the reports of EPA's financial witness, Dr. James Carroll, as well as read his deposition transcript --

MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, at this point I'd like to object to Dr. -- or Mr. Shefftz testifying as an expert witness on the reports of Dr. Carroll, as those reports were prepared by an expert in financial corporate finance and accounting, and a foundation hasn't been laid as to whether Mr. Shefftz has the requisite expertise in those areas.

## JUDGE BIRO: What about that?

MR. CHU: Your Honor, I believe that since the financial expert was permitted to comment on Mr. Shefftz, I think it's only equally beneficial to the situation to the Court to hear what this expert has to say about that expert so that the Court can weight whatever way the Court wants to deal with the testimony.

He attacked Mr. Shefftz' work as well.
JUDGE BIRO: Mr. Shefftz, do you do any corporate tax work?

THE WITNESS: Corporate tax? Well, I mean I analyze corporate finances all the time as part of my work.

And indeed my economic benefit analysis here entails corporate financial analysis, and that's all part of my consulting practice. So.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay, overruled. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So the first issue is that although it's not in any of Dr. Carroll's -- either of Dr. Carroll's two reports -- in his deposition testimony he does discuss the ABEL computer model.

Now he didn't actually run the ABEL computer model, he relied on EPA's running of it. However, he essentially -- and I'm not trying to mischaracterize what he said here. I'm just trying to be as straightforward as possible while not having the transcript in front of me. But he essentially said the ABEL model was either not applicable here or not relevant here or not a good analytical tool. That was essentially the gist of what he was saying.

And his basis for that, as far as I could tell from the deposition testimony, was that when he -- or rather on his behalf alternative ABEL runs were performed using different measures of Taotao's book value, the ABEL results stayed the same.

Now there are two aspects to the ABEL analysis.
One is the ratio analysis, which does not figure directly
into the ability to pay results. Now that certainly had to
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have changed when the ABEL model was run with his different figures for assets and liabilities, but from the deposition transcript it sounded like he was focusing just on the bottom line ability to pay results.

That is certainly true, that ABEL would not change in its result based upon different figures for assets and liabilities because the ABEL result is analyzing cash flow. It's coming up with an approximation of cash flow by taking the taxable income for a company and adding back onto that various non-cash expenses, most prominently among those typically depreciation.

So rather than somehow invalidating ABEL's applicability to this case; it merely shows that yes, ABEL is focusing on cash flow, which I believe to be an appropriate means of analyzing a company in this situation and in general that's EPA's position too. That's why the ABEL model was created.

There can certainly be situations where the ABEL model is missing something and needs to be supplemented or modified in some way, whether it's inputs or some of it's financial parameters. But I have not seen anything here that would support such an essentially setting aside of the ABEL model.

Now I understand in one of Dr. Carroll's reports, his relatively brief two-page report, he points out a
discrepancy between the purchases that Taotao USA reports on its tax returns versus the value of imported goods declared to Customs officials.

I would agree with his opinion there, which I
believe is something like -- and we can turn to the report
here to get it exact -- but he says something like, he's unable to reach an opinion on that matter.

The same with me. I don't know if this is some discrepancy that is easily explained away, and it seems like he does not either.

Now if Dr. Carroll has somewhere been claiming that the tax returns are inaccurate with regard specifically to the net income, the taxable income that Taotao is reporting to the federal government, that's another matter altogether, which would require adjustments to the inputs of the ABEL model. But although I did not attend his testimony earlier in this hearing, my understanding is he is not alleging anything like that.

The next part of his analysis -- and can someone tell me what exhibit his is at so I can, his report is at, so that I can cite it specifically?

MS. TARIQ: I'm sorry, do you mean the amended report?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry?
MS. TARIQ: The amended report?
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THE WITNESS: The very first one where he made his adjustments to the balance sheet.

MS. TARIQ: CX-192, I believe.
THE WITNESS: So which --
JUDGE BIRO: It would be in a black volume.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
JUDGE BIRO: There are four volumes of Complainant's exhibits. It's probably the last volume.
(Pause.)
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. TARIQ: Binder 3 of 4 .
THE WITNESS: So turning in CX-192 to page 11, which also has the Bates stamp of 2586 , so this is under -I'm just waiting for them to get there.

So this is under heading F in bold, which is entitled Sources of Funds to Pay the Proposed Fine.

And the final sentence in the paragraph says, The following sources should be considered to obtain cash to pay the proposed fine.

The first one there is collection of loans made to shareholders.

So this is something that's a relatively modest -actually I should back up and say conceptually, that is something we often look at. In other words, the company has an asset that is a loan made to one of its owners, so that

```
could perhaps simply be called in.
In the most recent tax return, that's a relatively small amount, about \(\$ 76,000\). Conceptually, that might be something that should be added to my roughly \(\$ 700,000\) figure from the ABEL result. However I need to know more about that.
Specifically, the first question that Would come to mind is has the owner been foregoing any returns from the company, either in the form of dividends or salary or any other compensation to keep the company going, and instead, just accepting a loan for some period of time in lieu of that?
There might be other questions, too. I don't know anything about it at this point. But I just wanted to essentially bound the value of that since it's not very big. It's not insignificant, but it's a relatively small amount.
Then going out of order here just because conceptually I wanted to address it that way, number four is liquidation of other assets. This is a larger amount. I'm forgetting what it is off the top of my head. It was at least, actually I can flip through it right now. I might as well get it on the record.
(Pause.)
THE WITNESS: So after apologizing for my small fonts, this one's even smaller.
```
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On the next page which is Exhibit A under reported, 2015, the other assets are approximately $\$ 121,000$.

Now I have worked on cases before and analyzed other companies before where the company for some odd reason held assets that were entirely unrelated to its line of business.

One company I remember specifically was some sort of electronics manufacturer. It had millions of dollars in publicly held stock. For some odd reason, the owners were simply using the company, in addition to its actual productive enterprises, as a vehicle to hold their investment shares. In a situation like that I certainly said yes, all of this could be liquidated without affecting the company's ability to continue in business.

Here, I just don't know what the composition of those other assets are. So I can't comment at all as to whether or not they could be considered a source of cash to pay the penalty in this case.

The other three items I'll address together.
Number two, financing based on account receivables; three, financing based on inventories; five, loan based on equity.

So in my $=$ ability to pay analyses in general, I do often talk about the ability to finance the penalty. Ultimately, though, when you take out any sort of debt you
have to pay it back, or at least that's certainly the expectation on the lender's part.

Could Taotao pay back a loan based on liquidating all its inventories or some portion of them? Yes, but that Would certainly also affect its ability to continue in business, since its business is importing these vehicles and then selling them. So although it could be a source of collateral being used to secure a loan, it's not really a source of paying a penalty unless we're talking about shutting down and liquidating the business.

Same on financing based on accounts receivable. These are monies that are coming in based on past sales. And that's how the company stays in business is by getting money for what it sold previously.

So in some ways I'm saying yes, that money should be used to pay the penalty when I produce my ABEL result since ultimately ABEL is talking about money coming in from the sales of these vehicles. But it's not like this is really a separate category than internally generated cash flow as represented in the ABEL model.

For a loan based on equity, in some ways that's similar to the previous ones. Equity is assets minus liabilities, so these assets have to be something that's either being regenerated through cash flow or that are somehow not related to the ability to continue in business.
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More expansively, in this report Dr. Carroll comes up with a calculation for equity that's summarized, conveniently enough, on the same page that we're looking at now, in Section E. Summary of Changes in Net Worth.

This is, and maybe there's a distinction that only I care about. This is a book measure of, this is book value for the company's net worth. It is not market value.

When we're talking about a company that's publicly traded, we have a good idea of what the company is worth because it's publicly traded. And the stock market, through millions of individual investors, comes up essentially with a valuation for that company.

Taotao USA is not publicly traded. On its tax returns, the company does have a net worth which Dr. Carroll has here in the first line, equity reported on tax return. He comes up with two adjustments for that. One is based on including accounts receivable which appears to be missing from the tax returns.

Now if there was some sensible goal in trying to come up with a more complete balance sheet for the company, and we just wanted to have some rough idea of what it would be if the company's accounts receivable looked like other companies in this industry, that might be a reasonable approach of doing so.

However, the two main problems are, having a

|  | Page 888 |  | Page 890 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | bigger net worth based on the book value does not mean | 1 | paying its suppliers that it's essentially been written off |
| 2 | somehow the company has a greater ability to pay a penalty, | 2 | as a debt by its suppliers. |
| 3 | because that's just a number on paper. It doesn't represent | 3 | Instead, Dr. Carroll concludes that these accounts |
| 4 | actual cash the company has that can pay a penalty. | 4 | payable are not merely monies owed by Taotao USA to its |
| 5 | And number two, his source for accounts | 5 | Chinese suppliers, but rather it's a form of equity that |
| 6 | receivable, although I do use the RMA publication for other | 6 | Taotao has. |
| 7 | purposes, I would not use it to determine a company's | 7 | I really don't understand how he's concluding |
| 8 | financial health. Because it's essentially just saying in | 8 | that. It appears to be some scenario under which Taotao USA |
| 9 | that case that the company's financial health is typical | 9 | is not in debt to its Chinese suppliers, but is partially |
| 10 | financial health, at least for some of its components, as | 10 | owed by them. That strikes me as entirely speculative and |
| 11 | other companies in its industry. Whereas the whole point is | 11 | not supported by any of the -- anything in the documentary |
| 12 | not to just speculate on what the company might look like if | 12 | record in this case. |
| 13 | it was like other companies in its industry, but to know | 13 | Moreover, even if it is true, I don't see how that |
| 14 | specifically what is the financial condition of this actual | 14 | affects ability to pay. How does that represent where |
| 15 | company in reality. | 15 | Taotao USA is actually going to come up with cash to pay a |
| 16 | The other adjustment he makes is even more | 16 | penalty? There seems to be a very big disconnect to me |
| 17 | speculative. He looks at the accounts payable for Taotao | 17 | there between this somewhat interesting analytical exercise |
| 18 | USA and notes that it is quite high. | 18 | in accounting versus an actual source of funds to pay a |
| 19 | Now when I see something like that I can have many | 19 | penalty. |
| 20 | reactions to it. One very obvious reaction is accounts | 20 | So I think that's the longest I've ever talked |
| 21 | payable, that's what the company owes to its suppliers. If | 21 | continuously on the record, and I'll switch it over to |
| 22 | it's very high, that could mean multiple things. Especially | 22 | counsel to ask me either direct or cross. |
| 23 | it could mean the company is having trouble paying its | 23 | MR. CHU: We would pass the witness at this time. |
| 24 | suppliers in a prompt way and that the bills are essentially | 24 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 25 | piling up over time. | 25 | // |
|  | Page 889 |  | Page 891 |
| 1 | I don't know specifically if that's the case here. | 1 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 2 | But that is certainly one very strong possibility. | 2 | BY MR. PALERMO: |
| 3 | Another could be that these numbers are simply an | 3 | Q Hello, Mr. Shefftz. |
| 4 | accounting convention carried over from prior years and they | 4 | A Hello again. |
| 5 | have no real financial meaning anymore. However, I did look | 5 | Q I want to take us back to the economic benefit |
| 6 | at the composition of the accounts receivable broken -- | 6 | section of your testimony. |
| 7 | sorry, accounts payable, broken out by how aged it is, and | 7 | A Sure. |
| 8 | indeed it was split out among several categories as I would | 8 | Q Shall we go to your report, sir? |
| 9 | expect, for something that really represents monies that a | 9 | A Yep. |
| 10 | company owes to its suppliers. | 10 | Q Would that help you? |
| 11 | Moreover, although -- and I can't remember here if | 11 | (Pause.) |
| 12 | it's in one of Dr. Carroll's reports or if instead it was in | 12 | Q Okay, you testified regarding using a proxy for |
| 13 | his deposition testimony, but he talks about how it has been | 13 | additional staffing or consultants as part of your economic |
| 14 | very high over time. However, and we can flip ahead right | 14 | benefit analysis, correct? |
| 15 | here, maybe there's a larger print version of it, but this | 15 | A Yes. |
| 16 | is the one that's easiest to get to. | 16 | Q And it was, you used a proxy of a quarter |
| 17 | If you look in Appendix A in the first set of | 17 | engineer. Could you explain that? |
| 18 | columns that are reported for 2012 through 2015, the line | 18 | A Yes. So on page -- |
| 19 | for accounts payable, you can see that it's pretty similar | 19 | (Pause.) |
| 20 | from 2012 to 2013, but then it drops considerably to 2014, | 20 | A It's on page 14. Table 2 provides the data and |
| 21 | then stays roughly the same by 2015. | 21 | the calculations for that. |
| 22 | In fact, it drops by about $\$ 2.3$ million from 2013 | 22 | And so -- I don't know if you want me to explain, |
| 23 | to 2014, which indicates to me in the absence of any other | 23 | or do you just want to stop there? |
| 24 | information that this is something that's being paid off. | 24 | Q If you can explain what a quarter engineer means. |
| 25 | Or it could be that Taotao USA is having so much trouble | 25 | A Sure, I mean, so, well, I mean the basis for it? |

1 The basis for why I used it, or strictly speaking what --

Q Roughly, it's not a full-time engineer, but it's an engineer working a quarter of his or her time on the compliance?

A So for this I'm not saying necessarily that there should be someone showing up for work at Taotao USA exactly ten hours every week.

Instead, I'm trying to come up with some measure of some additional amount beyond just the precious metals cost differentials in my scenario three, representing additional oversight or supervision for ensuring that the catalytic converters actually match up with what's on the COCs.

Because in so many of the cases I work on, especially when instead of coming up with the compliance costs on my own like I have, EPA simply says here are these discrete costs coming from an environmental engineer or some sort of enforcement officer that would have been necessary to prevent the violations in this case. Since I was building this up entirely on my own and had more leeway to take what I felt was a more comprehensive approach, I didn't want to just stop at the kind of bottom line or rather bare bones precious metals concentrations.

I wanted to add in there some measure of additional supervision and oversight or consulting that
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would have been necessary to ensure that those precious metals concentrations matched up with the COCs.

Now whether that would have been say more money paid to -- Harrison Wolf, did I get that backwards? Wolf and Harrison, whatever the consulting firm that I've seen pop up in some information on the public docket and the email I glanced at this morning on the television screen there from the peanut gallery. Or whether it could be more supervision on behalf of the Chinese manufacturers. I don't know. But I just wanted to come up with some amount that could be used as a proxy for what may have been necessary.

And often there's no one right answer to these things. When we're talking about cases where there are specific pieces of equipment that needed to be purchased or in the component of my analysis here we're talking about pieces of metal, quite literally. Very small pieces of metal, but something very tangible like that, my experience is that when -- compliance costs are more of the nature of best practices or whether it's BMPs if I'm remembering the buzz word correctly, that's not strictly speaking what I'm modeling here.

But when it gets kind of into softer things like that where there's no strict cutoff, there can be a much wider range of opinion on what the necessary costs would have been. But I wanted to ensure that at least something
was here and it wasn't omitted entirely which is so often the situation when I'm working for EPA and EPA is providing me with kind of the bare bones compliance cost estimates.

Q Did you consider any information to decide whether this quarter engineer was appropriate? Proxy was appropriate?

A I tried, I requested copied -- or I asked if there were any readily available invoices for consultants that actually had been retained, because one approach I thought of was to look at what had been done in this area, and therefore, apply some multiple of that to say that more of the same should have been done.

However, that was not readily available. So somewhat arbitrarily I did take a quarter time, but then I also arbitrarily continued it all the way through for four years worth, even though my understanding is, at least my recollection is that I don't think that the imports of these engines occurred over an entire four-year period, although maybe I'm remembering that wrong right now. But I wanted to be sure a relatively long period was covered.

Q Did you consider a quality control program to ensure production vehicles matched the vehicle design that was described in the Respondent's certificates of conformity applications?

A Essentially what I'm using here is, I'm using that

1 catalytic converters were used?

A Well, so -- although I'm not giving a yes or no answer, I think this will be more helpful.

What I'm doing here is that that table we were just looking at previously, I'm kind of having that perform double duty.

I'm using that for what it would have cost to ensure that COCs were done differently to match the actual engines, to match the actual catalytic converters that were used. And I'm using that same amount for having said the catalytic converters had more expensive metals compositions to match the COCs. Still, I'm saying some additional level of staffing, consulting, supervision, oversight, et cetera, would have been necessary, and I'm using that same proxy.

So in some alternative universe where this analysis was even more elaborate than it already is, it -we could -- I could have, I might have come up with a scenario where number one, additional staffing and/or consulting would have been tailored specifically for someone just coming up with different COCs.

And then for scenarios two through four, the component of that in addition to the different catalytic converters would have been something slightly different. In other words, more of a quality control approach ensuring, and testing, ensuring that the engines that came in matched
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the COCs that had already been specified.
But at this level, given that I lacked that
ability to refine it further, I used that same table both
for the entirety of my calculation in scenario one, and then as a kind of subsumed component or an incorporated component in the economic benefit figures of rows two, three and four.

Q So you're saying that the same amount of time in personnel for doing the additional paperwork in scenario one and carrying out the quality control program to ensure the catalytic converters matched the COC applications, that you were getting the right catalytic converters from the suppliers, that you were ensuring the suppliers knew what the requirements were for such catalytic converters? You're saying it's the same amount of time and resources?

A I'm using the same rough proxy for both.
So in other words, or to explain it further, when I went through scenario one, at least conceptually in my head; I thought okay, if the COCs were to be different to match up the actual composition of the catalytic converters.

Although some analyst might take the approach that well, that's just writing down different numbers on a piece of paper, my feeling was to ensure that's actually the case, it would not be costless. So therefore I came up with the economic benefit result of about 105,000 .

And then instead of saying that scenario one
versus scenarios two, three and four are entirely alternative and disregarding those additional costs and including only the cost differentials for the metals compositions and the catalytic converters, I wanted to take a more comprehensive and indeed a more aggressive approach or a more upwardly-biased approach, and one that is actually contrary to my client's financial interest, but I felt I had the latitude to do the most accurate approach that I felt was justified here.

So I increased the economic benefit, taking not just the kind of piecemeal or bare bones approach of the more expensive catalytic converters, but still retaining in my economic benefit figures for scenarios two, three and four, some notion of a proxy for additional staffing, consulting, supervision, et cetera.

Q Did you consider additional testing that would need to be done to comply?

A Conceptually I considered it, but I did not have any information at the time on what those tests -- or what the tests that had been performed did cost, and what additional tests would have cost.

Q Do you know if Taotao USA is in compliance with certificate of conformity regulations at this time?

MR. CHU: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion and relevancy as to this witness.
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JUDGE BIRO: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I have no idea. BY MR. PALERMO:
Q Has Taotao USA communicated to you regarding any improvements in its procedures to ensure compliance since 2012?

A Taotao USA's communication with me has been limited to signing a retainer agreement.

Q Going over to ABEL, your ABEL analysis.
You specifically described in your report that your ability to pay analysis for this matter was limited, right?

A Yes. As I -- and as I described in my testimony earlier, I did explore some other things, but well, what I testified about earlier today.

Q You only used Taotao USA's tax return data for your analysis, correct?

A Well, my analysis was using the ABEL model and that's keyed off tax returns. It can use financial statements in the alternative, someone who understands financial statements and understands the ABEL model, but I did not have those so I used the tax returns.

Q You didn't undertake an investigation as to whether the numbers in Taotao USA's tax returns were reliable?

Q Did you ever question whether some of the numbers were accurate? Or an accurate reflection of the company's business?

A Well, the receivables, the accounts receivables, I said earlier, it certainly makes sense in Dr. Carroll's reports that they appear to be missing entirely. It would be very odd for a company like that to have exactly zero accounts receivable. So to that extent, I questioned that aspect of it.

I did look through to see if there is anything that really stood out and made me wonder. However, looking through it, generally the relationships between the numbers matched up with a company that is importing engines -- I'm sorry -- importing vehicles from a foreign supplier, warehousing them, and then selling them to various other retailers and then receiving payment for it.

In other words it didn't seem -- sometimes I'll look through tax returns and there will be travel and entertainment expenses that just seem way out of proportion, or expenses that either in their magnitude or their type just don't seem to make any sense at all. Nothing like that stood out to me by looking at the tax returns.

I did find Dr. Carroll's relatively short two-page report interesting about the discrepancy between what's on
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the tax returns and what's declared to Customs to be interesting. But as he said, I wasn't able to conclude anything from it either.

And I think as I explained to you in my deposition testimony I wasn't sure whether it's something like if you just looked at personal recreational gear, stuff that I resell to people, if someone were to go and look at the declaration I made of value on my shipping invoices you'd find a big disconnect. But that's because if you put down $\$ 50$ in USPS priority mail, you get the insurance for free. If you put down more than that, you have to pay for it. So, you know, in that context it's not representing a complete accounting record for me.

I have no idea if there's some sort of discrepancy like that in the Customs records or instead if it's something else. But Dr. Carroll brought it up in his report and essentially reached the same I don't know conclusion that I did too.

MR. PALERMO: Your Honor, could I have a brief sidebar with my counsel?

JUDGE BIRO: Of course.
(Pause.)
BY MR. PALERMO:
Q Mr. Shefftz, earlier you testified you had looked at some financial records of the Chinese manufacturers in
this case.
A Yes.
Q JCXI and the Taotao Group, were those, are you familiar with those names?

A Yes.
Q In your deposition you had indicated that you had taken data from those records and placed them in a spreadsheet, do you recall that?

MR. CHU: Your Honor, I'm going to ask that counsel identify the line and page number if he's attempting to use the deposition at this time.

JUDGE BIRO: Overruled. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes, and since we're kind of in
general cutting to the chase here I can just explain -- I can just essentially repeat the gist of that testimony if you want.

## BY MR. PALERMO:

Q Well, do you recall telling us that in your calculation which was an ABEL analysis, right, or ABEL-like analysis.

A Right. I mean I can just explain it and then you can ask -- I just wanted to hurry things up if you want, and -- unless you want to --

Q I already heard your testimony about it, I just have a short few follow-up questions.
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A Okay.
Just to explain, it's a spreadsheet --
Q No, I -- I -- do not -- there's not a question pending, sir.

A Okay.
Q You had indicated to us that the results of that calculation showed that one of the companies could pay part of a $\$ 3.2$ million penalty and the other result from those calculations showed that the other company could pay the entire amount of that $\$ 3.2$ million penalty, is that right?

A I don't think that's quite right.
One company could pay the entire amount I put in, and one company could pay the other. But if I'm remembering correctly, the $\$ 3.2$ million penalty is split between the two different Chinese companies, and each Chinese company is jointly and severally liable for its roughly half of the penalty. But I don't, maybe I'm remembering incorrectly, correct me if I'm wrong. But I thought that neither company was liable for the entire $\$ 3.2$ million.

Q But there was some indication of ability to pay at least part of that overall penalty by each company based on the information you had, correct?

A Yes. Based on the information I have, with all
the caveats about it, when I put it through a spreadsheet that essentially replicates the ABEL model and just using

|  | Page 904 |  | Page 906 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | the cash flow figure from the financial statements instead | 1 | My understanding was you found liability after |
| 2 | of ABEL's approximation of the cash flow from the U.S. tax | 2 | they submitted the additional supplemental reports. And |
| 3 | returns, and given the choice of Chinese versus U.S. | 3 | when I read I believe page 16 or 17, there was something in |
| 4 | currency exchange rates and the decision of which year to | 4 | there about we could challenge that, which we have not, but |
| 5 | use, that was my result. One company could afford to pay | 5 | I think in that there's something -- and we're not doing |
| 6 | the entire amount of the proposed penalty; and one company | 6 | this to challenge it. You allowed the supplemental reports |
| 7 | could pay only a portion. | 7 | and then said something to the effect that if we wanted to |
| 8 | MR. PALERMO: No further questions, Your Honor. | 8 | address that, which was too late at that time, we could, but |
| 9 | MR. CHU: No further questions for this witness, | 9 | I didn't know how we could do that under the circumstances. |
| 10 | Your Honor. May he be excused? | 10 | This is not an attempt to challenge that, it's |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Yes, he may. | 11 | just saying that when the Court looks at the totality of the |
| 12 | Thank you, Mr. Shefftz. | 12 | circumstances for the damage calculations, to take in mind |
| 13 | (Whereupon, the witness was excused.) | 13 | the particular CFRs that come into play when analyzing what |
| 14 | MR. CHU: Your Honor, at this time we would ask | 14 | the evidence shows the COC applications used in the language |
| 15 | the Court to take judicial notice of the 1981 | 15 | about design specification that's no longer in the |
| 16 | 40 CFR 86.437-78, and for the benefit of the Court I have a | 16 | particular CFRs pertinent to this situation and the analysis |
| 17 | copy of that. | 17 | of the civil penalties, if any. |
| 18 | JUDGE BIRO: What is it that you want me to take | 18 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 19 | administrative notice of? | 19 | MR. CHU: And Your Honor, the next presentation is |
| 20 | MR. CHU: Permission to approach? | 20 | just requesting admission of certain exhibits. |
| 21 | JUDGE BIRO: What do you want me to take | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 22 | administrative notice of exactly? | 22 | MR. KLEPP: Your Honor, may I be heard? |
| 23 | MR. CHU: It's the 1981 version of the -- | 23 | Just a point of order. I see a lot of writing on |
| 24 | JUDGE BIRO: CFR? | 24 | the back of the paper, and I'm not sure what it says. So -- |
| 25 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, I'd just given | 25 | JUDGE BIRO: On these? Oh. Do you want to give |
|  | Page 905 |  | Page 907 |
| 1 | a -- you said give me a copy or show me something, and I'll | 1 | me a copy that's clean? |
| 2 | take notice of it. | 2 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 3 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 3 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 4 | MR. CHU: And Your Honor, we'd also ask that the | 4 | MR. KLEPP: Also I just want to raise the |
| 5 | Court take notice of the 40 CFR 86.427-7A, that is the | 5 | objection, we have -- this seems not at all related to |
| 6 | current through August 23, 2017, which also was the version | 6 | penalty. |
| 7 | in 2012. | 7 | JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry? |
| 8 | May I, Your Honor? | 8 | MR. KLEPP: Not at all related to penalty, Your |
| 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. | 9 | Honor. |
| 10 | So this has been marked for some other purpose. I | 10 | JUDGE BIRO: I think that I've already ruled on |
| 11 | presume it's Exhibits 3 and 4? What with -- | 11 | this design specification issue, I feel like innumerable |
| 12 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor, but this, I'd ask you | 12 | times, but it could be that I'm tired. |
| 13 | to ignore the markings. This is just to support the request | 13 | But I'll take it into consideration to the extent |
| 14 | to take administrative notice of these statutes. These | 14 | that it's relevant in my decision on penalty, because I can |
| 15 | CFRs. | 15 | always look to the CFRs. |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: So you want me to take judicial | 16 | MR. KLEPP: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 17 | notice of 40 CFR 86.437-78, from 1981, and this is from -- | 17 | MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, I would just like to, at |
| 18 | MR. CHU: It's current to this present time -- | 18 | this time, to offer Respondent's Exhibit 10, 18, 23, 26, and |
| 19 | JUDGE BIRO: 2017. | 19 | 27. |
| 20 | MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor. And those were the | 20 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. |
| 21 | same CFRs that were utilized in 2012. | 21 | Exhibit 10 is an email from Margaret of Harrison |
| 22 | JUDGE BIRO: Isn't this an issue that we addressed | 22 | Wolf dated July 25, 2012 to Jackie Wang. |
| 23 | in our accelerated decision? | 23 | Do you have anybody's response to this document? |
| 24 | MR. CHU: I'm not sure if it was necessarily -- it | 24 | (Pause.) |
| 25 | was, it would be an issue on the accelerated decision. | 25 | JUDGE BIRO: So that's a no. Okay, let's move on. |



MS. TARIQ: The rest of it includes just invoices from Harrison Wolf and additional emails.

And then we do have a business records affidavit, Exhibit 27, that authenticates all these documents.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, first we'd like clarification about -- is this all Respondents' current Exhibit 10 in the binder that we have as a number of different types of documents? They all bear that stamp.

JUDGE BIRO: Can you come up here? I can't really hear you very well.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Maybe this is comfortable -- if we're side by side we can understand what we're discussing literally on the same page.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
So Exhibit 10. What are we doing here?
MS. TARIQ: Offering Exhibit 10 into evidence. It includes -- so this was all part of the pre-hearing exchange but it was listed on the pre-hearing exchange as RX -- and let me just -- I believe it was RX-6, RX-7, and the last portion of it is just, I believe, the same as CX-77. But it was listed in the pre-hearing exchange. I'm just going to find the number that was -- that it was listed at.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay, so these documents were a part of the pre-hearing exchange.
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MS. TARIQ: Yes.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay, that's great. So do you have a
witness to sponsor them?
MS. TARIQ: We just have the Exhibit 27, the records affidavit.

JUDGE BIRO: And do you have some authority in the
rules to let me admit business records based on that certificate?
(Pause.)
MS. TARIQ: I believe Ms. Isin's on these emails.
She might be copied on these. I'm not sure, if it's just the one email --

JUDGE BIRO: Does the Agency have an objection to their admission?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we have no objection to -- let me check.

JUDGE BIRO: Why don't you check among yourselves.
(Pause.)
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, I think we have no objection to the email that was discussed, which appears to be from --

JUDGE BIRO: That's page one of Exhibit 10.
MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor.
I believe one and two we have no -- pages one and two we'd have no objection.

The next, page three through seven appear to be invoices from Harrison Wolf Consulting. I think those we would have an objection to.

JUDGE BIRO: I'm sorry, you don't have any objection --

MR. KULSCHINSKY: No, we would have an objection to those based both on relevance and foundation.

## JUDGE BIRO: Okay.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Pages 8 through 46, just appear to be duplicative of Complainant's Exhibit 77. No objection other than that it appears duplicative.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
And is that all of Exhibit 10?
MR. KULSCHINSKY: That appears to be everything that's marked as Exhibit 10 in the binder.

MS. TARIQ: Your Honor, just about relevance, these are just monies paid by Taotao to get in compliance.

JUDGE BIRO: I agree. It might be relevant, but you don't have anybody to authenticate it.

They're not Taotao's documents. They might have been received by Taotao but I don't know that. You don't even have somebody here to, that could be available to authenticate it, and you don't have anybody who could be cross-examined.

So no.

I will admit Exhibit 10, pages 1 and 2, and I'm not going to admit the rest. It's either duplicative or you don't have an authenticating witness.
(The document referred to was marked for identification as Respondent's Exhibit No. 10, and pages one and two were received in evidence.)
JUDGE BIRO: What's the next exhibit?
MS. TARIQ: Exhibit 18.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay. And what is this?
MS. TARIQ: Test reports. There -- all the test reports that were submitted as CX-2 -- 15 ? Sixteen, what?
(The document referred to
was marked for identification
as Respondent's Exhibit No.
18.)

MR. KULSCHINSKY: I believe it came to 215 .
MS. TARIQ: Except that they include two additional test reports. I guess all of these were kind of based on the business records affidavit over here. So if that's the -- if you object, then --

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we would object.
Again, either these are already in the record and were
authenticated as having them provided to the Agency. The

|  | Page 912 |  | Page 914 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | additional test reports that are intermingled with this, we | 1 | to Mr. Jackson the first day. I'm not sure if they were |
| 2 | don't believe were provided to the Agency before this | 2 | admitted into evidence or not. So. |
| 3 | litigation began. And we'd object to relevance among other | 3 | (The document referred to |
| 4 | matters. | 4 | was marked for identification |
| 5 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So we're not going to admit | 5 | as Respondent's Exhibit No. |
| 6 | 18. | 6 | 26.) |
| 7 | Wait, just to make sure. None of this you agree | 7 | MR. CHU: It's one of theirs, isn't it? It's |
| 8 | to, is that it? | 8 | identified as -- |
| 9 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor. That's | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Claimant's Exhibit 26? I don't have |
| 10 | correct. | 10 | it as admitted into the record, and we went over, I think, |
| 11 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, we're not going to admit RX-18. | 11 | all of the exhibits for the Respondent which the only ones I |
| 12 | What's the next one? | 12 | know so far were 1 and 33. |
| 13 | MS. TARIQ: Exhibit 23. These are invoices paid | 13 | MS. TARIQ: So we would like to offer Exhibit 26. |
| 14 | to CEE. Our expert Larry Swinke (phonetic) would have come | 14 | JUDGE BIRO: Do you have an objection? |
| 15 | and authenticated these, but we agreed that he would not | 15 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 16 | come and testify. I guess, then, it's just up to | 16 | We would object to this exhibit. It's, I think as |
| 17 | Complainants now, if you object to it, because he's not | 17 | was discussed on the record, it appears to have been made |
| 18 | here. | 18 | for litigation. Again, on relevance and lack of foundation, |
| 19 | (The document referred to | 19 | and that it wasn't provided to the Agency until late in this |
| 20 | was marked for identification | 20 | litigation. |
| 21 | as Respondent's Exhibit No. | 21 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay. We're not -- |
| 22 | 23.) | 22 | MR. CHU: Your Honor, we can prove it up by |
| 23 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, I think we would | 23 | calling one of the Agency attorneys that received it. |
| 24 | object both on relevance and Complainant's understanding | 24 | JUDGE BIRO: We're not putting an Agency attorney |
| 25 | with regard to Mr. Swinke was -- | 25 | on the stand. |
|  | Page 913 |  | Page 915 |
| 1 | JUDGE BIRO: With regard to who? | 1 | MR. CHU: It was a document that was testified and |
| 2 | MR. KULSCHINSKY: Respondents' potential witness, | 2 | used in the direct examination. |
| 3 | Larry Swinke. There was a discussion where we agreed that | 3 | JUDGE BIRO: Well then, you should have |
| 4 | the low-hour CEE test reports that were provided in | 4 | authenticated and admitted it then. |
| 5 | Complainant's pre-hearing exchange would be stipulated to be | 5 | Okay, we're not going to admit Exhibit 26. |
| 6 | admissible, and would be -- then there would be no need to | 6 | MS. TARIQ: The last one, Your Honor, was just the |
| 7 | call Mr. Swinke. | 7 | records affidavits, the business record affidavits. So I'm |
| 8 | That was Complainant's understanding of that. I | 8 | guessing it's not if the other ones aren't -- |
| 9 | don't recall that these particular CEE invoices were | 9 | JUDGE BIRO: Yeah, you know. If you had some |
| 10 | discussed as part of that conversation. And so we would | 10 | other person from the company, that might be really great, |
| 11 | object to their admission, and further object to their | 11 | but you don't have anybody from the company. |
| 12 | relevance. | 12 | MR. CHU: On the 26, Your Honor, I'll call myself |
| 13 | MS. TARIQ: I mean, just that these invoices were | 13 | to testify as to that document that was sent by me, that was |
| 14 | what -- the monies paid pursuant to the test order. But | 14 | signed. |
| 15 | other than that -- | 15 | JUDGE BIRO: We do not put attorneys on the stand. |
| 16 | JUDGE BIRO: Okay, well you don't have anybody to | 16 | MR. CHU: I understand -- |
| 17 | authenticate them, so Exhibit 23 is not going to be | 17 | JUDGE BIRO: You cannot testify in your own case. |
| 18 | admitted. | 18 | You cannot be a witness in your own case. |
| 19 | You know, that's why people do stipulations before | 19 | MR. CHU: As to a correspondence? I understand, |
| 20 | hearing. That's why it's really good if you want to get | 20 | Your Honor, I'm just offering because that's -- I believe |
| 21 | things in, and we can have saved so much time if we had | 21 | that's a letter signed by me to the EPA on behalf of my |
| 22 | stipulated to exhibits on both sides. | 22 | client. |
| 23 | But okay, how about 26 ? | 23 | JUDGE BIRO: Yeah, I understand. But it wasn't |
| 24 | MS. TARIQ: That's one of the exhibits, the | 24 | submitted in the course of this litigation. |
| 25 | addendums that Mr. Chu was referring to when he was speaking | 25 | MR. CHU: They received it. |

JUDGE BIRO: It wasn't a pleading filed in this case.

MR. CHU: Yes, I understand that. Okay, and as I said, I didn't want to violate any contact rules by sending, having that request sent from my office to their client, EPA. So I sent it directly to the EPA --

JUDGE BIRO: Well you should have had them stipulate to it before we got here.

MR. KULSCHINSKY: Your Honor, we don't dispute that this was included in a supplement to Respondent's prehearing exchange.

JUDGE BIRO: It was --
MR. KULSCHINSKY: That it was provided to us in that format. So it --

JUDGE BIRO: So do you not object to it going into the record?

MR. KULSCHINSKY: I believe we do object to it going into the record just based on its relevance, general lack of probative value, and it's unreliable. It doesn't demonstrate anything other than that counsel was able to prepare a letter requesting this and provided it to us as an exhibit in this litigation.

So we just object to its inclusion.
(Pause.)
MR. CHU: Your Honor, I must be mistaken on the
document. I thought it was talking about the letter we had talked about, and I'm going to take a minute to look for that, I'm talking about something else. They're talking about this. I'm talking about the letter that we talked about on the addendum, the request, the so-called amendment. But let me try and find that letter.

I think that one may be in.
(Pause.)
JUDGE BIRO: Already I'm confused again. (Pause.)
MR. CHU: I'm tired, Your Honor.
So this was not on my letterhead, but it was sent to the EPA and we had the business affidavit. So what I'll say is this: We'll brief that topic the Court asked about, saying show me some authority that a business affidavit suffices to offer these type of documents as part of the business records of the company.

And so that is in one of the exhibits that business record statement. So we'll just --

JUDGE BIRO: But public records are selfauthenticating. If you have certified copies. But otherwise, business records require somebody.

MR. CHU: Right, and that's what I'm saying. WE had a statement from the company and that's what she was referring to, as to --

JUDGE BIRO: No, you need more than just a statement from the company. You need somebody from the company.

MR. CHU: I understand, Your Honor.
I'm just saying this is what I normally use to prove up records from the company, is this type of document, but I hear what the Court is saying. I get it. I'm just saying -- and then you said show me something that allows that. We'll bring that up in the briefing.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay. Why don't we do that. You can argue for the admissibility of these records again in your briefing, and I'll take it under consideration.

MR. CHU: Yes, Your Honor.
I'm not arguing with the Court, I'm saying I understand.

JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
All right.
Is there any other witness you want to call, Mr. Chu?

MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
Are there any other documents you wish to put into evidence?

MR. CHU: No, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay. So for the Respondents I have
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Respondents Exhibit 1, Respondents Exhibit 33. We've marked
as Respondents Exhibit 38 is the deposition of Ms. Isin.
Respondents Exhibit 39, the deposition of Mr. Jackson.
Respondent's Exhibit 10, pages 1 to 2 we've admitted. And I think those are all the Respondents' exhibits.

MR. CHU: Yes, I believe so, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay.
Do you rest?
MR. CHU: So Respondents will rest, Your Honor.
JUDGE BIRO: Would you like to take a break, Mr. Kulschinsky, Klepp?

MR. KLEPP: I think we're okay on numbers.
Your Honor, we don't need a break. I think we're ready to complete --

JUDGE BIRO: No rebuttal?
MR. KLEPP: No.
JUDGE BIRO: Okay. All right. Thank you.
I don't really feel that we need closing arguments because you're going to have an opportunity to file posthearing briefs once you get the transcript which will hopefully be in the next 30 days or so. And once we get that transcript we'll send you a copy and we'll send out a briefing order and set the time for that. If, you know, then you need additional time, you can ask for it.
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| Cont'd 849:4 | 819:7 820:25 | 722:23 728:25 | costs 867:25 | County 688:4 |
| contact 710:4 | 822:17 827:8 | 729:13 731:7 | 870:14 873:23 | 782:19,24 |
| 804:4 820:13 | 827:23 828:6 | 734:12 740:4 | 892:16,17 | 785:15 786:16 |
| 916:4 | 828:23 829:3 | 742:10 743:2 | 893:18,24 | 789:4,18 790:5 |
| contacted 716:1 | 829:23 830:3,4 | 751:1761:13 | 898:2 | 790:9,13 792:8 |
| contain 692:21 | 830:18 831:4 | 766:19 768:18 | couching 763:23 | 813:5,15 921:5 |
| contained | 832:23 845:14 | 772:18 773:7 | counsel 773:12 | couple 729:6,10 |
| 845:10 921:10 | 871:13 872:17 | 782:20 785:2 | 862:4 890:22 | 758:16 849:1 |
| content 708:14 | 874:6 | 786:20 787:15 | 901:20 902:10 | course 696:2 |
| 730:12 868:15 | converters | 799:16 800:9 | 916:20 | 901:21 915:24 |
| contested | 726:15 830:1 | 807:17,20,25 | counsels 854:10 | court 688:12 |
| 731:15 854:5 | 830:11,12 | 808:12 809:22 | count 765:21 | 693:6 695:5 |
| context 765:9 | 845:13,15 | 812:9 813:8,14 | 766:23,25 | 696:25 697:21 |
| 797:12 901:12 | 866:25 867:13 | 813:17,22 | 767:1768:14 | 698:23 709:20 |
| contexts 878:14 | 867:13 868:24 | 814:4 815:2 | 816:24 817:14 | 712:7,23 |
| continue 730:3 | 870:1 872:9,11 | 831:17 832:24 | 817:23,25 | 713:23 714:19 |
| 762:8 846:12 | 874:1,16 | 835:12 847:10 | 819:4,9 820:11 | 715:15 726:21 |
| 878:7 885:14 | 892:12 896:1,9 | 849:19,20 | 820:19,20,24 | 732:25 733:1 |
| 886:5,25 | 896:11,23 | 850:15 856:1 | 820:25 821:3,4 | 738:20 739:23 |
| continued | 897:10,11,13 | 860:7 861:22 | 821:7,16 | 746:18 751:15 |
| 894:15 | 897:19 898:4 | 862:17 891:14 | 822:10 823:18 | 752:3 754:11 |
| Continuing | 898:12 | 899:17 903:18 | 824:25 825:1 | 754:16 761:24 |
| 806:24 | cooperation | 903:22 912:10 | 825:10 830:14 | 768:19 774:10 |
| continuously | 754:21 856:7 | corrected 810:2 | 830:19,22 | 777:13 782:7,8 |
| 890:21 | copied 894:7 | 860:8 | 831:16,22 | 785:17 786:10 |
| contract 870:16 | 909:11 | corrective 810:3 | 832:21,22,25 | 786:11 787:10 |
| contractor | copies 697:12,17 | correctly 717:25 | 832:25 833:2,5 | 787:21 789:2,7 |
| 743:7 | 783:2 851:17 | 756:25 811:11 | 833:5,6,7 | 789:16,17 |
| contradicted | 917:21 | 893:20 903:14 | 834:7 835:16 | 790:10 792:18 |
| 858:23 | coprecipitation | correspond | 853:5 857:17 | 797:21,23 |
| contrary 768:19 | 730:7,9 | 876:25 | 873:8 | 801:15 806:16 |
| 898:7 | copy 697:17,20 | correspondence | counter 774:5 | 851:19 854:10 |
| contributing | 904:17 905:1 | 744:7 915:19 | counting 811:16 | 854:15 858:23 |
| 701:12 | 907:1 919:22 | corresponding | countries | 861:13 862:11 |
| control 894:21 | core 728:22 | 873:10 876:20 | 843:13,18 | 864:2 878:24 |
| 896:24 897:9 | 876:13 | corresponds | 845:2,2 | 879:18,19,19 |
| controls 866:7 | corporate | 735:12,13 | country 779:11 | 904:15,16 |
| conveniently | 846:19 879:11 | 873:21 | 843:14 846:19 | 905:5 906:11 |
| 872:24 873:13 | 879:22,24,25 | cost 855:15 | 856:9 | 917:14 918:7 |
| 887:3 | 880:2 | 858:12 867:4 | counts 765:14 | 918:14 |
| convention | corporation | 867:19 869:2,3 | 766:22 767:10 | Court's 736:21 |
| 803:24 889:4 | 846:22 921:17 | 869:24 870:7 | 768:12 769:15 | 806:12 |
| conversation | correct 701:2,18 | 872:9,11,20,20 | 770:17 771:19 | courtesy 695:7 |
| 700:12 708:1 | 703:7 706:1,13 | 892:10 894:3 | 781:22 785:1 | courtroom |
| 709:2,3 792:24 | 707:20 709:7,8 | 895:2,4,12 | 785:11,14 | 691:13 724:8 |


| 725:2 827:16 | 766:6 784:10 | 829:19,20,23 | 905:25 907:14 | 695:13,20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 841:24 | 817:13,22 | 831:15,16,19 | 920:1 | 696:1,17 697:3 |
| cover 876:7 | 882:3 901:1,15 | 863:22,25 | decisions 834:21 | 697:4,23,24 |
| 878:10 | cut 823:9 866:11 | 871:23 891:20 | 862:11 | 701:15,17 |
| covered 725:7 | cutoff 893:23 | 899:16 902:7 | declaration | 722:17 736:13 |
| 742:11 807:1 | cutting 902:14 | date 701:22 | 901:8 | 851:23 859:13 |
| 824:1 845:9 | CX 793:6 | 717:25 718:21 | declared 766:9 | 859:22 864:25 |
| 876:18 894:20 | 822:25 829:22 | 719:21 732:13 | 844:8,9,12 | 875:19 879:7 |
| cram 869:14 | CX-192 883:3 | 732:14,15 | 882:2 901:1 | 880:7,19 881:2 |
| created 881:17 | 883:12 | 750:11,19 | defense 860:16 | 889:13 901:4 |
| credit 878:4 | CX-2 911:13 | 817:3 824:11 | defined 764:16 | 902:6,11 919:2 |
| credited 871:5 | CX-28 839:23 | 921:6,15 | 764:20 | 919:3 |
| credits 722:12 | CX-77 908:21 | dated 907:22 | definition 737:3 | depositions |
| 722:19 | CX069 754:17 | dates 720:5 | 737:16,25 | 694:4 695:4,12 |
| cross 689:2 | CX092-- 820:8 | 824:3 | 738:2 | 697:13 698:8 |
| 694:20 806:22 | CX10 829:2,4,7 | day 707:10,10 | definitional | 699:8 851:22 |
| 806:23,24 | 829:15 | 729:17 824:15 | 736:15 | 851:25 857:22 |
| 875:4,6 890:22 | CX19 794:2,9 | 825:8 842:1,6 | degree 709:7 | depreciation |
| cross-examina... | 794:13,19 | 914:1 | 799:23 | 881:11 |
| 694:10 699:3 | CX213 769:11 | days 707:10 | demand 745:6 | depth 734:9 |
| 723:1 849:4 | CX215 754:9 | 716:1 787:9 | 760:24 781:9 | describe 712:7 |
| 891:1 | CX22 811:3 | 919:21 | demanded | 712:22 713:11 |
| cross-examined | CX28 839:16 | DC 718:19 | 859:5 | 717:24 718:2 |
| 910:24 | CX6 827:11 | 775:6,9 800:17 | demanding | 739:3 745:11 |
| cross-examini... | 828:23 829:20 | deadline 821:24 | 859:25 | 862:14 |
| 828:15 | CX67 824:6,7,8 | 823:4,13 | demands 760:21 | described |
| crush 729:18 | CX72 747:4,5 | 825:25 826:13 | 761:5 858:9 | 705:15 709:10 |
| crushed 858:11 | CX76 822:25 | deal 798:18 | demonstrate | 714:14 716:14 |
| crushing 729:22 | 824:13 | 879:20 | 837:8 916:20 | 728:10 731:24 |
| CTA 822:10 | CX77 817:5 | dealer 847: | denied 854:4 | 732:1 736:9 |
| CTAOC 817:14 |  | dealers 847:3,9 | department | 739:1 827:23 |
| 818:4 | D | dealing 748:17 | 702:21 723:11 | 864:16,24 |
| CTAOC.049... | D.C 688:8,20 | 748:22 749:4 | 795:15 798:10 | 894:23 899:10 |
| 816:22 | 921:7,18 | 749:10 | 834:3,4,6,10 | 899:13 |
| culprit 798:25 | Daction 791:11 | deals 712:4 | 834:11,14,25 | describes |
| 799:18 | 791:13 792:3 | debt 885:25 | 867:21 873:23 | 705:20 711:17 |
| cultural 803:23 | 792:11,22 | 890:2,9 | departments | 736:18 737:1 |
| currency 871:23 | 793:13,21 | December 817:8 | 835:3 | 857:23 |
| 871:25 872:24 | Dallas 688:24 | 820:4,6,10 | depending | describing |
| 904:4 | 709:10,13 | 823:5,16 | 822:18 857:16 | 706:6,8,9 |
| current 715:4 | damage 906:12 | 825:12,13,22 | depends 718:1 | 712:13 |
| 773:21,23 | damages 814:17 | 826:4,15 | 720:15 765:9 | description |
| 803:20 809:6,7 | 853:25 855:23 | decency 803:23 | 797:11 | 763:25 811:5 |
| 812:23 878:6 | 856:1 | decide 704:21 | depicted 741:11 | 860:7,8 |
| 905:6,18 908:7 | dame 842:6 | 786:11 894:4 | depo 726:21 | design 828:7,23 |
| curriculum | dance 699:11 | decided 693:6 | deposition | 828:24 829:3,3 |
| 805:18 | 733:16 | 767:8 771:19 | 692:12,20,24 | 829:23 830:2,4 |
| Customs 716:21 | data 712:14,15 | 786:1 840:14 | 693:23,23,25 | 830:9 831:4 |
| 717:21 718:12 | 770:24 771:18 | decision 744:21 | 694:16,22,25 | 832:23 833:2 |
| 719:8,11 721:8 | 784:9,10,16 | 904:4 905:23 | 694:25 695:2,9 | 833:22 854:19 |


| 894:22 906:15 | 869:11,15,16 | 882:1,9 900:25 | Dixon 695:22 | doubt 735:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 907:11 | 869:16,19,20 | 901:14 | 696:9 697:15 | 774:25 862:7 |
| designated | 870:8 871:14 | discrete 892:17 | DLJ 770:7 | Dr 694:5 865:1 |
| 737:21 765:3 | 873:4,8,10 | discuss 787:22 | docket 688:4 | 879:6,9,10 |
| designates 733:3 | 874:11 880:21 | 799:19 841:22 | 893:6 921:3 | 880:6,6 881:24 |
| designed 878:13 | 881:1,6 896:20 | 875:9 880:7 | document 692:6 | 882:11 887:1 |
| 878:17 | 896:22,23 | discussed 770:1 | 695:15 696:12 | 887:14 889:12 |
| detailed 867:16 | 897:18,21 | 851:18 909:20 | 696:21 711:5 | 890:3 900:6,24 |
| 871:16 | 903:15 908:9 | 913:10 914:17 | 738:10 745:9 | 901:16 |
| details 709:3 | differentials | discussing 803:4 | 749:14 769:3 | draft 795:25 |
| 715:19 865:21 | 869:3 871:9 | 908:13 | 794:16 795:25 | drafted 700:19 |
| 878:16 879:1 | 892:10 898:3 | discussion 746:5 | 822:24 840:1 | 796:1 |
| deterioration | differently | 792:17 805:15 | 907:23 911:4 | drafting 711:7 |
| 831:10 | 896:8 | 864:17 913:3 | 911:14 912:19 | 796:1 |
| determination | difficult 772:20 | discussions | 914:3 915:1,13 | drill 745:21,23 |
| 786:11 840:12 | 773:1 | 771:10 779:8 | 917:1 918:6 | drinks 724:10 |
| determine | difficulty 736:12 | 837:9 846:1 | documentary | drive 775:10,13 |
| 727:15 784:9 | digit 733:2 | displacement | 890:11 | 845:12 |
| 888:7 | dire 689:2 862: | 738:5 | documentation | drops 889:20,22 |
| determined | direct 689:2 | dispute 853:5 | 776:19 846:18 | due 820:16 |
| 730:13 788:8 | 691:19 733:19 | 916:9 | 846:19 875:25 | 822:15 823:23 |
| determines | 737:10 806:21 | disregarding | documents | 824:4 825:12 |
| 765:2 | 861:6 890:22 | 898:2 | 697:5 700:19 | 826:3 |
| determining | 915:2 | disruptive | 700:20 728:10 | duly 698:16 |
| 770:20 | directed 853:18 | 706:24 | 743:12 745:5 | 861:3 |
| develop 734:9 | 853:23 | dissolution | 779:22 791:1 | duplicate 782:9 |
| 773:4 | direction 695:25 | 730:5 | 815:23 833:8 | duplicative |
| developed 878:6 | directly 719:4 | dissolve 731:1 | 908:4,9,24 | 910:10,11 |
| development | 880:24 916:6 | dissolved 728:21 | 910:20 917:16 | 911:2 |
| 773:7 | disagree 729:23 | 728:22 729:21 | 918:22 | duty 845:11,17 |
| diesel 845:17 | 735:7 751:12 | 730:1,6,9,18 | doing 693:12 | 845:17 896:6 |
| difference | 760:23 770:12 | 858:11 | 695:8 700:1 | Dworkin's |
| 720:18,22 | disappeared | dissolving | 741:6 744:4 | 840:19 |
| 729:21 865:21 | 854:18 | 729:22 | 752:24 753:3 |  |
| 874:22 | Discipline 755:2 | distinction | 768:9 791:5 | E |
| differences | disconnect | 887:5 | 797:14 801:7 | E 689:1 690:1 |
| 703:23 704:17 | 890:16 901:9 | distribution | 834:24 887:24 | 843:1,1 887:4 |
| different 703:22 | discover 694:22 | 878:19 | 896:4 897:8 | earlier 747:13 |
| 703:24,25 | 796:16 859:23 | disturb 757:11 | 906:5 908:16 | 765:2 813:10 |
| 705:17 710:11 | discovered | disturbing | DOJ 840:12 | 814:15,23 |
| 712:20 729:25 | 832:14,17 | 795:7 | dollar 772:4 | 864:17 875:22 |
| 734:5 735:16 | 833:2 865:25 | divided 785:1 | dollars 860:14 | 882:17 899:14 |
| 739:19 752:13 | discovery | 789:10,11 | 860:15 885:8 | 899:15 900:6 |
| 779:2,4,5 | 694:23 804:20 | dividends 884:9 | domain 847:14 | 901:24 |
| 785:8 793:24 | discrepancies | division 702:8,9 | Donald 706:16 | early 720:13 |
| 812:21 828:25 | 745:16,18 | 702:15,24 | 743:16 | earthquake |
| 835:3 845:14 | 746:13,19 | 703:11,13 | double 811:2 | 745:21,23 |
| 864:19,20,22 | 821:21 | 720:13 727:11 | 818:2 820:5 | 750:7 |
| 867:5 868:18 | discrepancy | 795:12 834:4,8 | 828:14 896:6 | easiest 889:16 |
| 868:23 869:8 | 735:18 748:13 | Divisions' 858:9 | doubling 869:5 | easily 882:9 |


| East 688:7 | elaborate | 841:12 859:19 | 785:25 808:17 | 900:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| easy 864:10 | 896:16 | 866:6 | 812:5 814:13 | entire 738:2 |
| echo 808:4 | electronics | employee | 814:18 816:19 | 877:22 878:23 |
| economic | 885:8 | 862:16 | 816:21 818:4 | 894:18 903:10 |
| 691:22 774:11 | element 752:17 | employees | 820:23 823:25 | 903:12,19 |
| 863:1,6,10 | 753:6 | 800:12,14 | 824:2 837:9 | 904:6 |
| 864:17,19,22 | elements 876:13 | 877:19 | 857:20 866:3 | entirely 723:24 |
| 865:5,13,19 | eliminate | employment | 869:16,23 | 885:5 890:10 |
| 866:2,14 868:9 | 709:25 | 867:19 | 870:8 872:25 | 892:20 894:1 |
| 869:5 870:15 | elimination | employs 759:8 | engineer 728:24 | 898:1 900:7 |
| 872:5 874:23 | 858:12 | endeavor | 729:2,20 815:1 | entirety 897:4 |
| 875:15 880:1 | email 744:7,17 | 773:10 | 815:3,5,10,13 | entities 787:21 |
| 891:5,13 897:6 | 744:19 754:10 | ended 876:24 | 815:17,20,22 | 793:12 803:22 |
| 897:24 898:10 | 756:4,5,8 | enforce 703:9 | 820:16 826:24 | 846:7,16 |
| 898:13 | 823:3 825:24 | enforcement | 891:17,24 | entitled 883:16 |
| economist | 826:5 893:7 | 688:19 701:9 | 892:2,3,17 | entity 743:6 |
| 861:16,21 | 907:21 909:12 | 702:9,10,15,19 | 894:5 | 787:11 856:8 |
| 862:25 863:10 | 909:20 | 702:24 703:11 | engineer's | entry 718:20 |
| ED 688:17 | emails 708:7 | 703:13 704:12 | 873:24 | enunciate |
| education | 710:3 731:18 | 704:12,13,14 | engineering | 808:23 |
| 706:13 720:25 | 744:15 749:3 | 720:13 727:10 | 720:23 728:24 | environment |
| effect 906:7 | 751:25 752:5 | 727:11 795:12 | 729:3 730:15 | 841:14 |
| effectively 801:1 | 753:25 761:9 | 796:6,12,12,15 | engineers | environmental |
| efficiently 723:2 | 761:13,14,18 | 796:18 799:8 | 798:10 867:20 | 688:1,18 |
| effort 744:16 | 761:24 824:14 | 803:23 834:4,8 | engines 737:19 | 700:24 729:2 |
| 867:10 868:10 | 849:6,8,12 | 834:20 836:23 | 795:7 834:14 | 801:5 867:20 |
| 869:1 | 858:6 908:2 | 858:9 859:6 | 836:13 866:10 | 873:24 892:17 |
| efforts 810:20 | 909:10 | 892:18 | 894:18 896:9 | 921:12 |
| 811:25 | embedded | Enforcement's | 896:25 900:14 | EPA 688:7 |
| egregious 767:8 | 807:14 | 721:4 | English 728:17 | 700:5 707:5 |
| 770:8,21 837:7 | Emily 798:15 | enforces 703:13 | 748:9 759:22 | 714:7 715:13 |
| egregiousness | emission 722:18 | engine 714:1 | 760:3,6 798:10 | 719:11 722:12 |
| 748:6 767:10 | 755:7 768:8 | 715:14 716:4 | 798:16 871:18 | 724:16 731:19 |
| 770:14,22 | 769:19,24 | 733:9,10 | English-speak... | 737:19 743:4 |
| 835:17,21 | 770:16,18,20 | 735:12 736:2,4 | 753:4 | 745:19 747:10 |
| 836:9,11 838:5 | 770:23 771:11 | 736:8 737:3,16 | enrichment | 748:18 749:15 |
| 838:8 | 795:8 831:7,15 | 737:18,20 | 730:7 | 754:12 757:20 |
| eight 765:15 | 831:16 835:11 | 738:21,24 | ensure 716:2 | 757:23 760:17 |
| 831:25 832:1 | 836:6,25 837:3 | 739:1,5,7,8,10 | 815:1,6 867:12 | 760:22 774:3,4 |
| 832:13 837:16 | 837:4,10,16,22 | 739:12,12,15 | 893:1,25 | 776:5 788:8 |
| 837:19 | 837:22,24 | 739:19,23,24 | 894:22 896:8 | 793:7 796:25 |
| EIS 717:9 | 838:1,6 859:20 | 739:25 741:1,1 | 897:9,22 899:5 | 797:6,25 798:6 |
| either 710:13 | emissions 768:4 | 741:2,3,4,7,11 | ensuring 868:24 | 798:9 800:9,12 |
| 759:18 778:10 | 768:15 770:3,8 | 741:13,17,18 | 892:11 896:24 | 800:14 802:7,7 |
| 792:9 874:16 | 770:15 771:3 | 741:18,19,23 | 896:25 897:12 | 802:17,21 |
| 880:6,14 | 771:15 835:16 | 741:23,24 | entails 880:1 | 805:13 825:18 |
| 882:10 884:9 | 836:12,22 | 742:4,6,6,14 | enter 693:15 | 827:20 829:15 |
| 886:24 890:22 | 837:10 839:2,7 | 748:11,12 | enterprises | 834:1 840:10 |
| 900:21 901:3 | 839:11 840:20 | 765:19,25 | 885:11 | 840:11 848:4 |
| 911:2,24 | 840:23 841:10 | 769:4,6,20,25 | entertainment | 855:15 856:14 |
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| 858:7,8,16 | establish 753:24 | 804:10 | 904:13 | expectation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 859:6,24 860:9 | 853:20 855:25 | evil 721:17 | executed 753:11 | 886:2 |
| 861:12 865:15 | established | evolved 727:18 | exercise 870:4 | expenses 860:15 |
| 866:1 869:21 | 719:19 753:23 | exact 725:15 | 890:17 | 881:10 900:20 |
| 870:23 873:19 | estimate 843:16 | 763:7 791:25 | exhibit 692:1,4 | 900:21 |
| 875:23 877:14 | 843:19 895:12 | 817:3 843:16 | 692:8,25 | expensive |
| 877:15,21 | estimates 894:3 | 843:22 844:16 | 695:10,14,17 | 896:11 898:12 |
| 878:7,25 879:3 | et 799:20 867:11 | 859:17,24 | 695:21 696:7 | experience |
| 892:16 894:2,2 | 867:24,25 | 882:6 | 696:11,14,16 | 731:3 739:2 |
| 895:6 915:21 | 896:13 898:15 | exactly 702:18 | 696:20,23 | 806:4 818:6 |
| 916:6,6 917:13 | evaluate 836:21 | 703:20 705:15 | 697:7 720:5 | 864:1 893:17 |
| EPA's 714:7 | evaluating | 717:15 746:19 | 727:24 728:2,8 | experiences |
| 744:16 755:7 | 727:17 | 746:21 791:22 | 733:21 741:7 | 706:23 |
| 763:24 777:4 | evaluation | 832:19 864:5 | 746:24 747:10 | expert 691:10 |
| 795:10 848:3 | 838:14 | 867:8 874:13 | 747:16 751:16 | 691:21 773:17 |
| 859:6 865:1 | evening 920:11 | 874:17 876:18 | 758:12 763:15 | 804:22 805:4,5 |
| 870:6 878:1 | event 702:5 | 892:6 895:1 | 765:24 766:18 | 805:6,7,9,15 |
| 879:5 880:10 | 710:1 | 900:8 904:22 | 793:3,5 794:2 | 805:19,23 |
| 881:16 | events 708:11 | examination | 794:21,23 | 861:13,16,21 |
| equally 879:17 | everybody | 806:22 861:6 | 818:23 821:10 | 861:24 862:9 |
| equate 855:9 | 697:18 827:18 | 915:2 | 822:23 825:18 | 862:10 863:5 |
| equipment | everyday 703:1 | examine 694:20 | 827:21 828:3 | 863:10 865:19 |
| 893:14 | evidence 691:25 | 781:13 | 840:3 864:13 | 877:7 879:9,11 |
| equipped | 692:10,13 | examined | 882:20 885:1 | 879:16,18,18 |
| 845:19 | 695:18 696:15 | 698:17 861:4 | 907:18,21 | 912:14 |
| equity $885: 22$ | 696:24 697:9 | example 748:5 | 908:4,8,16,17 | expertise 862:6 |
| 886:21,22 | 741:10,10 | 836:10 837:6 | 909:4,22 | 862:8,22 864:1 |
| 887:2,15 890:5 | 771:15 773:19 | 838:2 855:1 | 910:10,13,15 | 879:13 |
| ERG 817:21 | 773:20,25 | 895:5 | 911:1,6,9,10 | experts 862:15 |
| 819:7,8 821:5 | 774:13 783:20 | examples | 911:16 912:13 | expiration |
| errata 698:1,3 | 790:11,17,18 | 837:20 | 912:21 913:17 | 818:12,14 |
| error 743:9,14 | 790:22 794:24 | exceed 837:10 | 914:5,9,13,16 | 819:23 |
| especially | 804:9,10 818:9 | Excel 872:24 | 915:5 916:22 | expired 818:11 |
| 865:17 888:22 | 830:13 839:17 | exception 829:9 | 919:1,1,2,3,4 | expires 819:12 |
| 892:15 | 839:20 840:5 | excerpts 761:23 | exhibits 690:2,9 | explain 714:19 |
| espresso 725:7,8 | 852:2 853:24 | excess 800:11 | 744:6 781:19 | 715:17 730:14 |
| 725:10,12 | 853:25 854:5 | 839:11 840:20 | 852:6,10,18,24 | 745:16 878:23 |
| Esquire 688:17 | 854:12,13,24 | 869:22 870:21 | 853:4,10 883:8 | 891:17,22,24 |
| 688:17,18,22 | 855:5,7,10,19 | 871:4 872:19 | 905:11 906:20 | 897:16 902:14 |
| 688:23 | 855:22 856:2,5 | 874:7,19 | 913:22,24 | 902:21 903:2 |
| essentially | 856:6,11,19,21 | excesses 870:11 | 914:11 917:18 | explained |
| 866:25 868:19 | 857:19,22 | exchange | 919:5 | 838:20 882:9 |
| 870:17 871:11 | 858:6,11,15,22 | 862:21 871:23 | exist 803:16 | 901:4 |
| 874:4 880:11 | 858:22,25 | 873:1 904:4 | existed 796:15 | explaining |
| 880:14,16 | 859:9,13,19 | 908:18,19,22 | expansive 865:8 | 846:11 |
| 881:22 884:15 | 860:6,8,12 | 908:25 913:5 | expansively | explore 899:14 |
| 887:11 888:8 | 906:14 908:17 | 916:11 | 887:1 | exported 847:19 |
| 888:24 890:1 | 911:8 914:2 | Excuse 872:1 | expect 725:11 | 847:24 850:13 |
| 894:25 901:17 | 918:23 921:9 | excused 843:5 | 725:14 823:14 | 851:8 |
| 902:15 903:25 | evidentiary | 851:13 904:10 | 889:9 | exporting 773:8 |


| extension | facts 741:10 | far 699:6 704:18 | finance 879:11 | fiscal 876:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 821:23 822:3,6 | fail 779:20 | 721:7 735:25 | 885:24 | fit 866:22 |
| 823:4,12,15 | failed 745:19 | 754:23 756:2 | finances 879:25 | 878:12 |
| 824:15 825:8 | 784:10 803:8 | 768:25 779:15 | financial 845:22 | five 697:17 |
| 825:14,15,20 | 809:21 853:20 | 782:11 810:4 | 846:5,10,13,14 | 780:9 785:14 |
| 826:7,12,15,20 | 853:24 | 816:3,11 | 846:21 865:1 | 840:6 855:2 |
| 826:23 | failure 809:19 | 829:24,25 | 876:5,6 877:4 | 873:9 885:21 |
| extensions 826:9 | 814:7,9,17,22 | 848:7 850:6 | 879:6,11,16 | flip 828:4 |
| extensive 726:2 | 847:21 | 851:6 852:9 | 880:2 881:21 | 884:21 889:14 |
| extent 725:16 | fairly 868:13 | 878:8 880:18 | 888:8,9,10,14 | flipped 763:11 |
| 731:8 800:6 | Fairness 773:18 | 914:12 | 889:5 898:7 | flipping 746:25 |
| 900:9 907:13 | fall 748:4 | farm 748:25 | 899:19,21 | 866:20 867:18 |
| extract 784:10 | falling 747:24 | fast 710:17 | 901:25 904:1 | 869:8,12 |
| 784:12 785:19 | 748:1,2 | faster 728:15 | financing | floor 853:17 |
| extracted 730:2 | familiar 691:11 | 737:11 | 885:20,21 | flow 878:11 |
| extracting | 691:12 699:13 | favor 853:18 | 886:11 | 881:7,8,14 |
| 730:21 | 699:15 704:8 | federal 692:15 | find 711:15 | 886:20,24 |
| extractions | 704:16,20 | 692:16 877:11 | 723:3 731:19 | 904:1,2 |
| 775:3 | 722:4 725:7 | 882:14 | 737:8 756:8 | flows 876:14 |
|  | 756:18,21 | feel 699:10 | 762:9 789:17 | fluctuate 857:16 |
| F | 803:6 854:16 | 711:5 828:14 | 794:11 800:16 | focus 720:12,15 |
| F 736:22 843:1 | 902:4 | 850:2 907:11 | 818:23 819:1 | 720:18 783:8 |
| 883:15 | familiarity | 919:18 | 857:23 859:12 | 788:1 |
| face 709:4,4,5,5 | 734:10 | feeling 897:22 | 895:16 900:24 | focused 785:17 |
| 718:2 778:3 | families 714:1 | fees 860:15 | 901:9 908:23 | 866:6 |
| facilities 709:9 | 715:14 739:10 | felt 846:11 | 917:6 | focusing 881:3 |
| 757:24 801:9 | 739:13,15 | 856:20 878:24 | findings 864:2,3 | 881:14 |
| facility 727:25 | 741:24 765:19 | 892:21 898:7,8 | fine 717:18 | follow 723:21 |
| 728:9 757:20 | 765:25 769:4,7 | fifteen $844: 18$ | 738:18 752:16 | 747:9,11 818:9 |
| fact 700:23 | 769:10 812:6 | Fifty 843:18 | 754:21 800:16 | follow-up |
| 710:25 727:9 | 814:13,18 | figure 859:11 | 849:2 883:16 | 801:21 848:20 |
| 749:10 750:24 | 816:19 824:1 | 868:19 869:24 | 883:19 | 848:22,24 |
| 750:24 752:22 | family 716:4 | 873:19 874:10 | finish 691:19 | 902:25 |
| 753:9 768:3 | 733:9,10 | 874:11,19 | 738:1,3 841:2 | followed 778:5 |
| 770:1 775:1 | 735:13,25 | 880:24 884:4 | finished 776:10 | 827:6 858:19 |
| 777:24 798:9 | 736:2,5,8 | 904:1 | finite 858:14 | following |
| 798:18,20 | 737:20 738:21 | figured 802:5 | firm 893:5 | 714:21 736:11 |
| 805:12,24 | 738:25 739:1,6 | figures 864:22 | first 718:23 | 736:12 762:23 |
| 809:24 854:5 | 739:7,8,12,19 | 870:7 874:15 | 728:14,19 | 776:25 883:18 |
| 889:22 | 739:23,24,25 | 874:17 881:2,6 | 745:14 759:18 | follows 698:17 |
| factor 752:20 | 741:1,2,3,4,7 | 897:6 898:13 | 776:6 824:2 | 861:4 872:15 |
| 753:6 767:8,14 | 741:11,13,17 | file 795:13,18 | 844:4,5,6 | font 866:22 |
| 767:20,21 | 741:18,18,19 | 919:19 | 854:8 860:19 | 869:13 |
| 770:21 824:21 | 741:23,23 | filed 803:20 | 861:3,9 864:10 | fonts $884: 25$ |
| 831:10 836:11 | 742:4,6,6,14 | 846:21 860:7 | 865:12 866:23 | food 724:10 |
| 838:3 839:11 | 748:11,12 | 916:1 | 869:9 878:1 | force 772:4 |
| 841:25 855:8 | 769:20,25 | filing 832:15 | 880:5 883:1,20 | foregoing 884:8 |
| factors 800:22 | 785:25 808:17 | filled 745:24 | 884:7 887:15 | foreign 722:11 |
| 810:14,17,22 | 816:21 820:23 | final 698:9 | 889:17 908:6 | 843:12 856:7 |
| 810:25 811:7 | 824:2 | 839:15 883:17 | 914:1 | 873:1 900:15 |


| forgetting | 822:10 823:18 | G 688:17 | 713:20 715:22 | 806:14 807:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 884:20 | 824:25 825:2 | gallery 893:8 | 716:19 717:3 | 817:11,11 |
| form 698:9 | 825:10 864:19 | Garibyan 696:1 | 718:18 724:21 | 818:23,25 |
| 699:21 703:17 | 864:22 866:19 | 851:24 | 724:22 725:24 | 824:17 827:15 |
| 731:6759:17 | 868:12,18,21 | Garibyan's | 733:17,18 | 828:1,8,11,16 |
| 772:7 791:7 | 869:6,8 873:7 | 697:3 | 743:6744:21 | 837:14 840:6 |
| 795:16 798:3 | 873:9 874:11 | gear 901:6 | 745:2 746:6,21 | 840:14,15,15 |
| 799:2 802:11 | 883:7 884:18 | general 780:20 | 748:7 749:3 | 841:20,21 |
| 834:15 865:4,9 | 894:15 895:15 | 849:19,21 | 752:5 753:23 | 843:3 845:3 |
| 884:9 890:5 | 896:21 897:6 | 850:1 881:16 | 755:6 756:15 | 854:6 856:20 |
| formally 720:25 | 898:1,14 | 885:23 902:14 | 768:1769:11 | 857:16 858:17 |
| 805:19 | four-year | 916:18 | 773:4 775:3,23 | 859:20 863:1 |
| format 730:21 | 894:18 | generally | 776:15 778:6 | 865:3 872:18 |
| 730:23 731:6 | fourth 844:4 | 900:13 | 799:11 811:11 | 873:3,7 875:5 |
| 865:9 872:15 | 866:14 | generated | 813:15 817:11 | 878:11,19 |
| 916:14 | fraction 871:12 | 878:10 886:19 | 819:5,19 | 879:1 884:10 |
| formed 691:21 | fragments | generating | 820:22 821:18 | 884:17 890:15 |
| former 865:17 | 738:10 | 773:22 | 823:25 824:13 | 899:9 902:9 |
| formulate | frame 857:1 | gentleman | 833:11 834:18 | 908:22 911:2 |
| 694:23 714:17 | free 711:5 865:4 | 710:13 861:13 | 840:15 841:4 | 912:5,11 |
| forth 733:23 | 865:9 901:10 | George 774:12 | 852:6 854:6 | 913:17 915:5 |
| 744:8 746:25 | Freeway 688:24 | getting 698:8 | 857:21 858:5 | 916:15,18 |
| 821:25 822:19 | front 711:6 | 719:12 734:22 | 873:1 880:4 | 917:2 919:19 |
| 826:19 | 724:8 742:12 | 743:18 756:6 | 891:8 901:7 | Gold-- 758:2 |
| forthcoming | 754:15 817:7 | 760:13 776:16 | 902:12 | Goldstein |
| 878:16 | 864:7 880:13 | 839:4 886:13 | goal 887:19 | 756:18,19,20 |
| fortunate | Fuhrman | 897:11 | goes 725:23 | 756:23 758:3 |
| 706:12 | 736:22 | gift 856:18 | 752:18 753:5 | 761:1,18 |
| forums 700:24 | full $856: 7$ | gist 880:16 | 800:22 804:2 | 815:19 824:14 |
| forward 744:22 | 876:19 | 902:15 | 805:16 829:24 | 825:21 855:11 |
| 745:2 862:6 | full-time 892:2 | give 697:17,20 | 829:25 867:8 | 858:20 |
| found 708:16 | fully $806: 20$ | 751:10 825:8 | going 691:23 | good 691:3,5,6 |
| 756:2 758:4,9 | 921:10 | 851:18 860:1 | 693:22 694:14 | 691:16 698:24 |
| 758:13 835:1 | fun 757:16 | 905:1 906:25 | 695:5,13,24 | 698:25 699:1,2 |
| 866:9 875:25 | functions | given 695:5 | 696:9,10,25 | 699:24 706:12 |
| 906:1 | 703:15 | 704:18 750:25 | 697:16 713:19 | 721:25 737:22 |
| foundation | funds $883: 16$ | 814:7 833:23 | 718:4,21 | 738:15 746:23 |
| 862:5 879:12 | 890:18 | 850:14 865:9 | 724:22 725:1 | 755:11 762:5 |
| 910:7 914:18 | funny-looking | 865:13 874:7 | 731:25 738:18 | 763:12,12,21 |
| four 714:16 | 872:23 | 877:3,25 897:2 | 741:4 750:15 | 766:16 768:9 |
| 737:15,17 | further 698:20 | 904:3,25 | 752:15 756:4 | 789:24 807:9 |
| 781:22 785:11 | 731:6 806:22 | giving 873:11 | 756:13,15 | 807:10 852:8 |
| 786:6,19 788:4 | 828:12 850:23 | 896:2 | 760:12 762:1 | 878:4,12 |
| 810:22,25 | 851:16 852:2 | glad 711:22 | 765:13,14 | 880:15 887:9 |
| 811:7 817:14 | 867:23 897:3 | glanced 893:7 | 781:10 783:7 | 913:20 920:11 |
| 817:23 818:1 | 897:16 904:8,9 | glass 745:24 | 787:12,22 | goods 882:2 |
| 819:4,9 820:11 | 913:11 | go 694:4 700:2 | 789:5 790:17 | gotten 694:20 |
| 820:19,20,24 | future 878:11 | 703:19 704:6 | 791:25 795:3 | government |
| 820:25 821:3,4 |  | 712:19,25 | 802:10,20 | 791:1 846:21 |
| 821:7,16 | G | 713:1,4,4,7,19 | 804:2,3 805:22 | 882:14 |


| gram 871:12,12 | H 690:1 | 835:25 843:16 | 774:1 | 698:4,10,21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| grammatical | Hague 803:24 | 845:4 884:20 | helps 732:11 | 699:21,23 |
| 760:3 | 804:3,3,12,12 | 897:18 | Heritage 921:17 | 703:17 704:3 |
| grammatically | half 766:1 842:1 | heading 883:15 | hied 816:1 | 706:18 713:21 |
| 759:17 | 903:16 | headquarters | high 721:9 767:8 | 713:24 714:23 |
| granted 734:4 | hand 870:20 | 702:8 718:18 | 767:14,23 | 721:18 723:3 |
| 823:15 825:15 | 875:25 | Headstart | 888:18,22 | 723:14 724:2 |
| 826:7,9 867:8 | handed 747:17 | 707:11,17 | 889:14 | 724:19,23 |
| gravity 725:23 | handled 849:22 | health 774:10 | highest 767:20 | 725:21 736:21 |
| 800:22,23 | handling 850:4 | 888:8,9,10 | 767:21 770:3 | 737:24 741:9 |
| 807:16 847:21 | hands 755:14 | hear 691:23 | 772:4,12 | 744:1 752:11 |
| great 699:5 | happen 787:12 | 713:2 771:17 | Hillman 744:8 | 753:6 754:5 |
| 747:2 774:2 | happened | 783:12 785:23 | 748:21 749:4 | 755:4 756:13 |
| 853:7 909:2 | 735:15 761:11 | 798:23 879:18 | 749:11,21 | 758:19,24 |
| 915:10 | 761:12 850:6,8 | 908:11 918:7 | 753:4 848:8 | 759:9,23 762:5 |
| greater 888:2 | 850:12,24 | 920:6 | 849:18,25 | 762:12 764:3 |
| group 688:4 | 866:16 | heard 695:4 | hindsight 867:7 | 767:2,15 |
| 739:4 769:1 | happening | 700:4 718:11 | Hinglish 759:22 | 772:22 773:11 |
| 773:3 776:2 | 743:17 | 729:16 747:24 | hired 761:2 | 773:13 774:21 |
| 777:5 779:16 | happens 836:4 | 756:25 759:21 | 815:16 816:9 | 777:8,17,20 |
| 779:20 781:3,5 | happy $711: 11$ | 759:24 766:24 | 826:24 | 778:1783:18 |
| 781:6,7 782:8 | 785:3 862:3 | 771:14 772:14 | hiring 761:6 | 784:20,25 |
| 782:9,18,22,23 | 865:10 | 875:12,22 | historical | 785:5,24 |
| 783:1,5,8,15 | hard 806:11 | 902:24 906:22 | 771:22 | 786:24 788:5 |
| 783:23 784:7 | harm 723:12,19 | hearing 697:18 | history 768:4 | 788:13 789:5 |
| 784:19 785:12 | 723:21 838:22 | 777:16 842:4 | 770:24 771:1 | 790:19 791:7 |
| 785:17 786:15 | 838:25 839:9 | 854:6 873:14 | 771:10,15 | 793:4 794:5,14 |
| 787:13,14 | 839:10 840:19 | 882:17 913:20 | 803:19 807:16 | 794:15 797:8 |
| 788:2,19,20 | 840:24 841:6 | 916:11 919:20 | 809:18,23 | 798:2,12 799:2 |
| 789:3,12,20 | 841:11,14 | 920:13 921:6 | 810:15 811:1 | 799:9 800:20 |
| 790:1,1,8,8,14 | harms 854:1 | 921:11 | 811:21 814:2 | 800:24 801:24 |
| 792:7 813:5,11 | Harrison 755:15 | hearings 865:14 | 825:6 | 802:12 803:14 |
| 813:19,21 | 755:18,24 | heavy $845: 17$ | hit 772:3,12 | 804:9 805:13 |
| 831:22 832:12 | 756:7,17 758:1 | heavy-duty | 803:21 828:15 | 806:3,7,11 |
| 902:3 921:4 | 815:16,17 | 845:13 | hitter 806:18 | 807:3,6,8,10 |
| grouped 831:24 | 816:1,1,5,7,9 | held 776:21 | hold 776:6 777:4 | 819:16 824:17 |
| 832:1,2,4 | 816:12,18 | 777:10 780:7 | 885:11 | 827:14 828:8 |
| groups 755:15 | 817:23 818:20 | 786:16,19 | holder 785:22 | 828:18 834:16 |
| 791:4 | 820:24 821:23 | 885:5,9 | 812:10 | 835:4 839:16 |
| guess 694:8 | 822:1 893:4,5 | hello 691:15 | holders 843:23 | 839:22 840:13 |
| 829:1 844:14 | 907:21 908:2 | 698:13 891:3,4 | holding 777:4 | 841:1,16 843:4 |
| 845:16 851:1 | 910:2 | help 708:24 | honest 704:7 | 848:22 851:10 |
| 857:2 863:12 | HAWKINS | 714:17 739:3 | honestly 756:1 | 851:16 852:4,7 |
| 911:20 912:16 | 789:5 | 744:5 751:9 | Honor 691:5,9 | 852:13 853:2,3 |
| guessing 915:8 | head 697:14 | 761:2 769:11 | 691:16,19 | 853:6,13,16 |
| guide 857:22 | 710:15 733:12 | 792:24 856:20 | 692:2,23 | 854:2,9,10 |
| guilt 704:22 | 765:22 767:6 | 857:23 864:4 | 693:14,21 | 860:16,20 |
| guys $774: 9$ | 779:23 781:16 | 891:10 | 694:3,14,17,21 | 861:11 862:19 |
|  | 784:17 821:9 | helpful 896:3 | 695:19,24 | 875:2,6 879:8 |
| H | 822:12 832:8 | helping 707:12 | 697:11,19 | 879:15 901:19 |


| 902:9 904:8,10 | idea 887:9,21 | 787:10 905:13 | incident 819:21 | 790:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 904:14,25 | 899:2 901:14 | Ignoring 772:1 | include 716:14 | indication |
| 905:4,8,12,20 | ideas 714:13 | illegal 799:6,7 | 749:9 761:4 | 903:20 |
| 906:19,22 | identical 740:24 | 799:12,16 | 816:21 841:10 | individual |
| 907:2,9,16,17 | 740:25 | imagine 843:24 | 844:25 850:14 | 710:20 781:9 |
| 908:6 909:15 | identification | imagined 717:6 | 856:4 867:23 | 783:11 887:11 |
| 909:19,23 | 692:7 695:16 | immediately | 876:13 877:6 | individually |
| 910:16 911:23 | 696:13,22 | 860:7 | 911:19 | 783:16,24 |
| 912:9,23 | 697:6 721:11 | implies 772:1 | included 711:10 | individuals |
| 914:15,22 | 721:24 840:2 | import 818:15 | 715:12 754:14 | 723:21 732:4 |
| 915:6,12,20 | 911:5,15 | 843:12 844:14 | 808:2,15 | 798:20 |
| 916:9,25 | 912:20 914:4 | 844:24 | 809:11 813:24 | indulge 828:16 |
| 917:11 918:4 | identifications | important 736:1 | 845:13 916:10 | indulgence |
| 918:13,20,24 | 747:10 | 763:25 764:5,9 | includes 768:17 | 736:22 806:13 |
| 919:6,9,13 | identified 690:2 | 765:7 818:12 | 908:1,18 | industries 773:4 |
| 920:3,8 | 690:9 712:24 | 868:7 | including | industry 688:4 |
| hopefully 723:2 | 714:2,6 715:20 | importation | 793:21 854:25 | 789:4 790:6,13 |
| 919:21 | 715:21 721:8 | 808:13 821:19 | 887:17 898:3 | 792:8 812:16 |
| hoping 801:14 | 726:9 734:17 | 821:21 | inclusion 916:23 | 812:19 813:2,5 |
| horse 859:7 | 739:11 741:1,7 | importations | income 876:13 | 859:6 887:23 |
| horsepower | 746:14,14,19 | 766:15 | 881:9 882:13 | 888:11,13 |
| 738:5 | 747:20,21 | imported 818:1 | 882:13 | 921:5 |
| hot 774:2 | 752:1 762:2 | 818:5,8,10,16 | incomplete | infinite 855:12 |
| hour 766:1 | 763:9 765:25 | 819:11,15,23 | 848:7 850:4 | inform 834:13 |
| 768:11 831:9 | 769:2 779:7,17 | 844:7 853:22 | incorporated | information |
| 831:11 | 786:1794:22 | 882:2 | 868:20 873:22 | 714:3 716:5 |
| hours 736:23 | 796:3 797:25 | importer 721:8 | 897:5 | 745:15 766:5,6 |
| 892:7 | 808:18,18,19 | 734:24 785:22 | incorporation | 771:23 779:18 |
| house 797:18,21 | 809:3 812:15 | 787:4,7,14 | 846:20 | 784:12,18 |
| 797:22 | 814:13 817:14 | 845:1 | incorrect 759:17 | 790:12 791:16 |
| Huh 920:4 | 851:8 914:8 | importers 722:8 | incorrectly | 800:6 836:6,12 |
| humongous | identifier | 755:2 843:24 | 782:8 903:17 | 843:10 845:22 |
| 746:2 | 732:23 | importing 721:9 | increase 811:9 | 846:5 848:6 |
| hundred 717:17 | identifiers | 886:6 900:14 | 811:20 812:4 | 851:3,7 867:16 |
| 729:7,10 792:3 | 734:10 736:1 | 900:15 | 814:2,7,9,12 | 867:19,20 |
| hundreds | 739:11 742:3 | imports 766:9 | 873:12,16 | 875:23 877:9 |
| 843:21 860:13 | 783:2 | 843:14 844:17 | increased | 889:24 893:6 |
| 860:14 | identify 693:4 | 844:18 894:17 | 807:15 898:10 | 894:4 898:19 |
| hungry 840:8 | 693:24 712:19 | impose 786:11 | independent | 903:22,23 |
| hurry 902:22 | 713:18,24 | impossible | 862:25 | informed 732:4 |
| hydrochloric | 714:20 722:3 | 859:12 | India 844:25 | 834:10 |
| 728:21 | 733:1 740:2,3 | improvements | indicate 709:14 | initial 832:15 |
| hypothetical | 741:6 743:1 | 899:5 | 709:16 733:7 | 861:9 |
| 742:5 805:5 | 752:7,22 769:2 | inability 845:24 | 742:4 825:19 | initially $721: 10$ |
| Hypothetically | 769:6 859:11 | 846:3 | indicated 710:4 | 749:6 873:14 |
| 804:22 | 902:10 | inaccurate | 843:11 844:3 | 875:15 |
|  | identifying | 735:8 736:5 | 848:2 866:13 | initiated 716:21 |
| . 5 | 779:18 | 782:11 882:12 | 902:6 903:6 | 838:7 |
| i.e 738:5 | ignore 768:4 | inappropriate | indicates 889:23 | initiation 836:23 |
| IAC 878:22 | 771:22,25 | 712:17 | indicating | 837:23,25 |


| initiative 719:7 | 878:10 886:19 | 719:4,9 732:8 | Italy 845:2,5 | 692:4 693:1,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 719:10 | international | 749:17 778:25 | items 712:19 | 693:12,18,22 |
| inner 728:21 | 799:24 | 785:25 796:1 | 843:14 845:9 | 694:6,12,18 |
| innocence | internet 783:1 | 809:11 849:23 | 885:19 | 695:11,20 |
| 704:22 | 789:25 790:5 | 855:13 867:4 | iterative 744:14 | 696:2,5,7,10 |
| innumerable | 859:23 | 869:2 |  | 696:16,19 |
| 907:11 | interpretation | involves 699:25 | J | 697:2,10,12,16 |
| inputs 881:20 | 743:20 | involving | Jackie 710:5,7 | 697:22 698:2,6 |
| 882:15 | interpreters | 722:18 | 710:16 731:18 | 698:11,13,18 |
| insignificant | 801:17,23 | irrelevant 778:3 | 755:13 756:6 | 698:22,24 |
| 884:16 | 802:2 | 799:10 | 818:19 907:22 | 700:2 703:4,19 |
| inspect 716:6 | interview | Isin 689:4 | Jackson 694:5 | 704:6 706:19 |
| inspected | 877:17 | 691:19,20 | 696:18,19 | 713:17,20 |
| 748:11,14,15 | introduce | 694:5 696:17 | 707:7 729:16 | 715:1 716:19 |
| 754:24 | 691:10 693:8 | 698:5,15,19,21 | 740:2 755:9 | 721:19 722:25 |
| inspection | 852:3 | 699:1,5 762:10 | 768:8 771:1,5 | 723:16 724:5 |
| 709:17,19 | introduced | 807:14 814:6 | 794:16 795:2 | 724:21,25 |
| 715:22,24,25 | 710:4 849:9 | 823:2,15 | 798:21 833:9 | 725:4,24 |
| 716:1 717:23 | 854:4 | 824:13,20 | 843:22 859:14 | 737:10 739:23 |
| 719:3,4,9 | introduction | 825:9,21 | 914:1 919:3 | 741:14 744:2 |
| 748:8 754:19 | 756:6 | 827:11,20 | Jackson's | 745:22 746:2,6 |
| inspections | invalidating | 828:15 831:14 | 834:11 | 752:11,16,21 |
| 703:24 | 881:12 | 831:22 835:10 | James 865:1 | 753:8,13,16,19 |
| inspectors | inventories | 840:22 841:22 | 879:6 | 753:21 754:1,4 |
| 817:13 | 885:21 886:4 | 843:5,11 849:6 | January 745:4,6 | 755:5 756:10 |
| instance 734:17 | inventory 715:4 | 851:11 857:23 | 745:11,12 | 756:12 757:15 |
| 827:14 838:6 | 716:4 818:7 | 919:2 | 746:17,20 | 758:20 759:11 |
| Institute 728:25 | 847:7 | Isin's 695:20 | 747:6,7 748:24 | 759:24 762:10 |
| institution 755:3 | investigating | 696:10 859:1 | 752:6 761:8 | 762:13,16,20 |
| institutions | 726:5 | 909:10 | JCXI 789:13 | 764:4 766:23 |
| 800:17 | investigation | issuance 857:13 | 902:3 | 767:1,17 |
| instructions | 701:10 715:19 | issue 718:25 | Jersey 757:17 | 769:15 770:11 |
| 762:23 | 716:14 718:6 | 787:25 788:1 | job 699:6 703:9 | 771:6772:24 |
| insurance | 718:12,23,24 | 790:2 825:7 | 704:24 768:9 | 773:14,19 |
| 901:10 | 719:3 899:23 | 837:9 840:16 | 772:3 | 774:5,13,23 |
| intend 692:13 | investigations | 855:14 858:25 | Johnny 706:16 | 775:20,22 |
| 693:4 | 722:8 | 865:13 866:3,8 | 743:16 801:10 | 776:15,18,21 |
| interactions | investment | 866:24 868:11 | Johnson 688:24 | 776:23 777:9 |
| 801:17 848:17 | 885:12 | 869:11 872:10 | join 692:2 | 777:15,18 |
| interest 692:22 | investors 887:11 | 875:4 880:5 | 795:15 | 778:5 780:3,5 |
| 790:12 898:7 | invoice 766:7 | 905:22,25 | joined 795:11 | 780:7,11,19,23 |
| interesting | invoices 871:16 | 907:11 | 796:17 | 781:15 783:9 |
| 890:17 900:25 | 871:17 894:8 | issues 694:1 | joint 786:25 | 783:21 784:24 |
| 901:2 | 901:8 908:1 | 698:8 708:18 | 787:4,6,17 | 785:1,4,11,14 |
| intermediary | 910:2 912:13 | 747:20,21 | 840:12 | 786:5,8,18,21 |
| 753:5 | 913:9,13 | 812:4 823:20 | jointly 903:16 | 786:25 787:6 |
| intermingled | involve 732:7 | 835:18 854:5 | Jonathan 689:5 | 787:13,17,23 |
| 912:1 | 839:1 | 867:23 875:10 | 691:11 861:2,9 | 787:25 788:3,6 |
| internal 895:6,8 | involved 700:14 | issuing 834:2 | Judge 688:14 | 788:11,14,22 |
| internally 868:3 | 708:11 710:25 | italicized 873:16 | 691:3,7,12,17 | 789:9,17 |


| 790:20 791:9 | 879:22 880:4 | Justice 723:11 | 746:19,24 | 885:15 888:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 793:3,5 794:8 | 883:5,7 890:24 | justified 898:9 | 749:16,21 | 889:1 891:22 |
| 794:11,13,19 | 895:18 899:1 |  | 751:8 753:14 | 893:10 895:1 |
| 795:18 797:4 | 901:21 902:12 | K | 753:24 754:13 | 898:22 901:12 |
| 797:10 798:4 | 904:11,18,21 | keep 738:24 | 754:14 755:6,8 | 901:17 906:9 |
| 798:14 799:4 | 904:24 905:3,9 | 807:11 859:19 | 755:9,14 756:1 | 910:21 913:19 |
| 799:11 800:23 | 905:16,19,22 | 875:5 884:10 | 756:3,22 757:2 | 914:12 915:9 |
| 801:4,12,16,22 | 906:18,21,25 | keeping 866:25 | 757:3,5,8,9,25 | 919:23 |
| 802:13 803:12 | 907:3,7,10,20 | 868:14 | 758:1,5,8,13 | knowing 833:21 |
| 803:15 804:7 | 907:25 908:5 | kept 764:11 | 758:22 759:4 | 833:22 855:13 |
| 804:11 805:6 | 908:10,15,24 | key 796:12 | 759:13 761:6 | 859:15 |
| 805:11,21,24 | 909:2,6,13,17 | keyed 899:19 | 762:11 764:14 | knowledge |
| 806:1,4,8,15 | 909:22 910:4,8 | kid 706:15 | 766:4,18 | 722:1726:24 |
| 806:17,24 | 910:12,18 | kids 743:24 | 773:16 774:3 | 731:8 847:24 |
| 807:2,7,9,12 | 911:9,11 912:5 | kilowatts 738:6 | 774:24,24 | 849:23 850:4 |
| 808:23 809:1 | 912:11 913:1 | kind 699:11 | 775:16,17,22 | 850:24 862:12 |
| 819:18 821:11 | 913:16 914:9 | 701:12 742:11 | 776:4 778:21 | known 706:11 |
| 822:23 824:7 | 914:14,21,24 | 747:1 748:25 | 779:15 781:15 | 734:18 739:10 |
| 825:7,17 826:1 | 915:3,9,15,17 | 749:25 763:22 | 781:16 782:11 | 739:12 854:13 |
| 827:16 828:16 | 915:23 916:1,7 | 802:19 811:25 | 785:5 786:7,21 | knows 747:3 |
| 833:11 834:17 | 916:12,15 | 823:9 826:18 | 787:20 794:3 | 774:25 834:25 |
| 835:6 838:9,11 | 917:9,20 918:1 | 845:3,11 859:7 | 795:11,21,24 | Korea 722:8 |
| 838:16,19 | 918:10,16,21 | 865:4 872:23 | 796:1,8,10,13 | 844:25 |
| 839:18,21,23 | 918:25 919:7 | 874:13 878:21 | 797:7,12 | Korean 722:4 |
| 840:8,17,21,25 | 919:10,15,17 | 892:22 893:22 | 798:14,22 | Kulchinsky |
| 841:2,4,17,19 | 920:4,7,11 | 894:3 896:5 | 801:2,20 | 691:15 |
| 843:3,7,10,18 | Judges 688:1 | 897:5 898:11 | 804:13,21 | Kulschinsky |
| 843:20,25 | 921:13 | 902:13 911:20 | 806:4,19 807:1 | 688:17 691:5 |
| 844:3,6,9,13 | judging 753:9 | kinds 860:9 | 810:4,12 | 691:16,18 |
| 844:20,23 | judgment 786:2 | Klepp 688:17 | 814:21 816:11 | 692:11 693:14 |
| 845:7,21 846:6 | judicial 777:13 | 906:22 907:4,8 | 818:2,7,16 | 694:8 695:19 |
| 846:13,18 | 904:15 905:16 | 907:16 919:11 | 820:2 821:3,21 | 695:24 697:3 |
| 847:1,5,8,12 | July 752:24 | 919:12,16 | 821:25 822:16 | 697:11,19,24 |
| 847:16,19 | 873:14 907:22 | 920:8 | 823:4,14,19,25 | 698:5,10,20 |
| 848:1,9,12,18 | June 708:20,24 | knew 706:10 | 824:2 826:19 | 699:21 703:3 |
| 848:24 849:2 | 719:21 720:3 | 796:9,15 | 827:3,5,6,9 | 703:17 704:3 |
| 851:11,14,21 | 744:23 817:19 | 832:21 834:1,6 | 828:3 832:16 | 706:18 714:23 |
| 852:1,5,8,16 | 819:8,15 857:3 | 859:15 897:12 | 834:17 836:4 | 714:25 716:16 |
| 852:18 853:7 | 877:13 | know 694:1 | 839:16 843:15 | 721:18 722:24 |
| 853:11,14 | Junyun 688:4 | 703:24,25 | 843:17 844:13 | 723:14 724:2 |
| 854:3 860:18 | 776:2 781:6 | 704:5 706:20 | 844:16 845:3 | 724:19 725:21 |
| 860:22 861:5 | 782:19,24 | 710:14 714:18 | 845:12,17 | 727:3 737:24 |
| 861:14,20,23 | 785:15 786:16 | 718:2 721:13 | 846:11 847:7 | 738:2 741:9 |
| 862:5,13,23 | 789:3,18 790:5 | 722:6,15 | 847:23 850:3 | 744:1 755:4 |
| 863:5,9,14,16 | 790:9,12 792:8 | 725:19 727:6 | 851:6 856:23 | 757:4,14 |
| 863:20 864:7 | 798:25 813:5 | 731:7,10 | 857:9 858:7,8 | 758:19,24 |
| 864:11 865:5 | 813:15 921:5 | 732:14 733:12 | 867:8 868:6 | 759:9,23 762:5 |
| 866:11,13,16 | jurisdiction | 734:7,8 735:15 | 872:7 874:24 | 763:12 764:3 |
| 872:13 874:25 | 787:21 840:14 | 735:20 740:14 | 877:12 882:8 | 767:15 770:9 |
| 875:3,8 879:14 | 840:16 | 743:11 745:22 | 884:5,13 | 771:4 772:7,22 |


| 773:11 774:21 | laid 879:12 | legal 724:3 | 775:16,17 | live 694:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 776:9,11 777:7 | language 759:18 | 770:9 777:7 | lieu $884: 11$ | 775:23 |
| 778:1 780:1,4 | 768:16 803:6 | 780:4 786:13 | light 845:11,17 | lived 775:9 |
| 781:8783:18 | 804:5 840:18 | 787:10,11 | limited 800:5,6 | loads 859:3 |
| 784:20,22 | 854:18,20,22 | 797:2 898:24 | 899:8,11 | loan 883:25 |
| 785:24 788:12 | 854:23 906:14 | lender's 886:2 | line 693:4,8,9 | 884:11 885:22 |
| 790:19 791:7 | languages | lessen 855:14 | 716:17 718:5 | 886:3,8,21 |
| 794:5,14 | 759:19 | let's 693:8 | 725:22 795:3 | loans 883:20 |
| 795:16 797:2,8 | largely 805:16 | 713:20 725:4 | 823:3 824:18 | locate 762:6 |
| 798:2,12 799:2 | larger 884:19 | 726:1 727:24 | 825:13 839:15 | located 759:12 |
| 799:9 800:20 | 889:15 | 744:4 750:12 | 866:20 871:7 | 789:18 |
| 802:11 803:10 | Larry 912:14 | 765:11 768:1 | 881:4 885:5 | LOCATION |
| 805:2,13 806:7 | 913:3 | 782:1785:19 | 887:15 889:18 | 921:7 |
| 806:20 807:3,6 | latched 856:19 | 907:25 | 892:22 902:10 | long 702:11 |
| 808:3 819:16 | late 822:5 906:8 | letter 745:11,12 | lines 728:15 | 708:16 716:15 |
| 824:17 828:8 | 914:19 | 745:14 746:17 | liquid 730:8 | 717:21 718:12 |
| 828:18 833:8 | latitude 898:8 | 747:5,6,12,13 | liquidated | 718:19 719:3 |
| 834:15 835:4 | Laughing | 748:8,19 | 885:13 | 754:7,14 |
| 837:12,14 | 753:15 | 749:25 750:11 | liquidating | 772:20 773:1 |
| 839:22 840:13 | Laughter | 750:20,24 | 886:3,10 | 818:13 822:16 |
| 841:1,3 843:4 | 745:25 746:4 | 751:9,18,23,24 | liquidation | 826:18 850:3 |
| 848:20,22 | 762:24 | 752:6 770:7 | 884:19 | 865:10 894:20 |
| 851:14,16,23 | law 688:1,14,23 | 796:13 840:19 | list 715:4,7,17 | longer 906:15 |
| 852:4,7,13,17 | 703:9 704:11 | 876:9 915:21 | 716:3 754:14 | longest 890:20 |
| 853:3,13 908:6 | 777:11 799:20 | 916:21 917:1,4 | 807:23 808:11 | look 705:14 |
| 908:12 909:15 | 921:13 | 917:6 | 809:21 845:5,5 | 711:4,9,11 |
| 909:19,23 | laws 703:24 | letterhead | 852:15 853:4 | 727:24 728:2 |
| 910:6,9,14 | 803:15 854:14 | 917:12 | 895:15 | 728:13 732:12 |
| 911:18,23 | lawyers 720:4 | letters 744:15 | listed 741:17,19 | 733:13,14 |
| 912:9,23 913:2 | 781:19 | 746:20,22 | 793:12 807:11 | 737:13,15 |
| 914:15 916:9 | lay 801:3 862:5 | 747:8 761:7,15 | 810:14 812:20 | 746:22 747:9 |
| 916:13,17 | laying 695:3 | 803:15 | 813:2 821:7 | 747:14 752:5 |
| 919:11 | layman's 730:19 | level 725:14 | 908:19,22,23 | 756:4 761:22 |
|  | lead 723:2 | 754:21 838:4 | listened 856:14 | 765:23,24 |
| L | 736:15 820:18 | 867:10 868:10 | 856:14 | 766:17 774:2 |
| L 688:13 921:18 | 856:17 | 869:1 879:3 | listening 707:6 | 777:16 779:22 |
| lab 731:19 759:6 | leading 840:7 | 896:12 897:2 | lists 715:12 | 811:2 817:4 |
| 816:15 825:15 | learn 755:3,6 | levels 770:3 | literally 745:24 | 820:22 822:1 |
| 827:4 | leave 827:17 | 837:11 | 893:16 908:14 | 823:25 824:14 |
| label 747:20 | led 878:22 | liabilities 786:13 | literary 720:24 | 825:18 827:11 |
| 838:21 | Lee 736:22 | 804:1 881:2,7 | litigation 836:21 | 827:20 828:3,6 |
| labeled 769:10 | 792:18,19 | 886:23 | 912:3 914:18 | 829:14 851:2 |
| labels 748:4,10 | 793:14 | liability 776:12 | 914:20 915:24 | 856:2 857:18 |
| labor 867:21,25 | Lee's 793:18 | 787:1,18 906:1 | 916:22 | 864:13 868:9 |
| 873:23 | leeway 892:20 | liable 777:10 | little 699:17 | 883:24 888:12 |
| laboratory | left 715:8 748:25 | 780:7 786:17 | 737:11 760:8,9 | 889:5,17 |
| 820:15 | 749:1 803:11 | 786:19 903:16 | 766:1 788:11 | 894:10 900:11 |
| lack 914:18 | 847:7 865:20 | 903:19 | 808:4,4,6,24 | 900:19 901:7 |
| 916:19 | left-hand 769:2 | license 728:23 | 817:12 828:4 | 907:15 917:2 |
| lacked 897:2 | leftover 818:7 | 729:1 775:10 | 828:17 848:7 | looked 719:22 |


| 748:10 777:18 | M | 779:25 780:8 | 830:9 831:4 | 913:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 815:23 829:2 | M-A-L 721:14 | 780:14,16 | 860:3,4 862:19 | meaning 705:17 |
| 866:5 869:21 | ma'am 697:15 | 786:1 803:21 | 867:12 868:15 | 712:20 745:3 |
| 870:23 887:22 | 715:23 719:1 | 812:19 813:7 | 892:12 896:8,9 | 767:11 858:16 |
| 901:6,24 | 725:9 745:13 | 846:1 873:4,10 | 896:12 897:19 | 889:5 |
| looking 711:16 | 802:3 | 875:21,24 | matched 868:25 | means 712:19 |
| 711:25 727:11 | madness 725:18 | 877:8,17 893:9 | 870:2,9 871:13 | 717:10 730:15 |
| 728:12,19 | magnitude | 901:25 | 874:1,6 893:2 | 730:19,21 |
| 736:24 740:8 | 767:7 900:21 | manufactures | 894:22 895:24 | 737:18 761:11 |
| 742:3 745:5 | mail 901:10 | 773:21 780:9,9 | 895:25 896:25 | 785:6,7 857:20 |
| 764:25 769:17 | main 723:1 | manufacturing | 897:10 900:14 | 862:1 878:9 |
| 824:6 826:6 | 729:11 887:25 | 773:8,10,20 | matches 853:4,5 | 881:15 891:24 |
| 827:15 845:21 | major 767:11,21 | 780:12 857:12 | 855:22 | meant 705:24 |
| 864:14 867:6 | 798:25 799:24 | 857:12 | matching | 717:13,15 |
| 872:13,14,18 | 835:21 837:7 | March 745:7 | 744:13 | 741:18 750:6 |
| 887:3 895:23 | 839:8 | 817:12,16,18 | material 725:15 | measure 887:6 |
| 896:5 900:12 | making 797:15 | 876:24 | mathematically | 892:8,24 |
| 900:23 | 826:25 | Margaret | 786:6 | measured |
| looks 704:1 | malefactor | 756:17,19 | matter 688:2 | 730:10 |
| 711:25 730:17 | 721:11 | 758:1 760:12 | 692:11,16 | measures |
| 732:21 738:13 | malfeasance | 760:20 761:1 | 694:11 735:15 | 880:21 |
| 742:13 811:8 | 721:16 | 761:17 815:19 | 776:13 786:4 | measuring |
| 826:5,6 829:10 | Malificent | 825:20 855:10 | 805:17 809:4,5 | 858:13 |
| 888:17 906:11 | 721:16 | 858:19 907:21 | 809:7 814:13 | meet 779:20,21 |
| loose 727:24 | management | mark 688:18 | 830:1 833:10 | 795:8 830:2 |
| losing 707:10 | 876:10,10 | 695:13 696:19 | 842:5 853:19 | 832:22 833:2 |
| lost 747:1 | manager 849:19 | 736:22 | 868:22 882:7 | 833:22 860:3 |
| 802:19 832:9 | 849:22 850:1 | marked 691:25 | 882:14 899:11 | meetings 848:6 |
| 838:9,11 | manufacture | 692:7 695:16 | 920:14 | melt 860:1 |
| 858:10 | 773:5 779:25 | 696:13,22 | matters 691:7 | memory 708:25 |
| lot 703:23 | 787:3 857:14 | 697:6 840:2 | 694:22 912:4 | 711:9 751:9 |
| 708:11 735:21 | 857:14 | 905:10 910:15 | maximum 811:9 | 792:25 |
| 744:15 798:18 | manufactured | 911:5,15 | 812:2 814:7,9 | mention 710:25 |
| 798:19 800:16 | 780:13,13 | 912:20 914:4 | mean 706:3 | 715:11 730:25 |
| 800:18 807:5 | 785:21 787:3 | 919:1 | 707:15 717:8 | 748:3 875:18 |
| 826:19 838:10 | 788:18 789:3 | market 887:7,10 | 718:2 720:15 | mentioned |
| 876:2 877:19 | 813:20 814:3 | markings | 721:13,14 | 705:4 722:10 |
| 906:23 | 818:14 | 905:13 | 724:21 725:17 | 722:17 732:19 |
| lots 774:3 | manufacturer | mass 738:4 | 738:16,24 | 735:19 747:7 |
| loved 895:2 | 734:24 737:20 | master's 729:2 | 751:10,11 | 748:5 790:7 |
| low 768:11 | 737:21 764:16 | 729:12 | 760:5,6 764:14 | 793:12 803:25 |
| 830:15 831:9 | 765:3 785:2,21 | Matao 692:12 | 785:4 821:17 | merely $881: 13$ |
| 831:11 | 787:3,5,7,14 | 708:3 709:21 | 826:18 833:8 | 890:4 |
| low-hour 913:4 | 788:3 811:21 | 709:24 710:8 | 835:2 836:2 | message 774:4 |
| lower 868:1 | 812:15 818:13 | 731:18 792:2 | 845:19 846:14 | 823:8 |
| lumping 787:9 | 819:22 870:24 | 797:15 846:2 | 866:11 879:24 | met 688:11 |
| lunch 841:21 | 885:8 | 848:8 849:6,23 | 882:22 888:1 | 710:11 771:11 |
| luxury 734:15 | manufacturers | 851:21 | 888:22,23 | 771:11 872:11 |
| Lyndon 688:24 | 734:15 742:1 | Matao's 693:23 | 891:25,25 | metal 730:8,11 |
|  | 777:24 778:8 | match 748:12 | 902:21 904:25 | 830:15 855:6 |


| 871:11,12 | minor 748:5 | 768:25 809:12 | 807:10 851:18 | names 779:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 872:18,18 | 838:4,7,14,20 | 855:21 856:3 | 851:24 893:7 | 902:4 |
| 893:16,17 | 838:21,25 | 856:13 857:4,7 | Morrison | narrative |
| metals 730:2,16 | 839:13 865:21 | 857:10,24 | 719:14 | 846:11 865:4 |
| 730:17,22 | minors 799:24 | 858:2,3,24 | motion 853:16 | narrower |
| 731:5 858:13 | minus 886:22 | 870:6 878:2,3 | 854:4 873:19 | 693:24,24 |
| 859:17,18 | minute 756:4 | 878:5,6,13,15 | motorbikes | national 701:9 |
| 868:15,23 | 917:2 | 878:17,18,23 | 844:20,24 | 802:8 804:17 |
| 869:3,11,19,23 | minutes 741:22 | 879:4 880:8,10 | 845:8 | nationalities |
| 869:25 870:11 | 828:14 | 880:14 881:1 | motorcycles | 779:5 |
| 870:12,22,25 | Mischaracteri... | 881:17,19,23 | 843:13 845:18 | nature 893:18 |
| 871:4,6 873:25 | 723:15 | 882:16 886:20 | 847:13 | necessarily |
| 874:8,20 892:9 | mischaracterize | 899:18,21 | move 691:24 | 706:24 727:23 |
| 892:23 893:2 | 880:11 | 903:25 | 725:4 728:15 | 796:8 801:13 |
| 896:11 898:3 | Mischaracteri... | modeling | 737:11 752:13 | 822:22 892:5 |
| method 712:7 | 771:4 | 893:21 | 752:14,14 | 905:24 |
| 725:18 727:15 | misinterpreta... | models 711:17 | 753:7 754:4 | necessary |
| 727:21 728:6 | 740:7 | 857:12 | 756:14 765:13 | 727:14 773:9 |
| 728:11,16 | mismatch 866:8 | moderate | 788:10,23 | 785:10 802:4 |
| 731:9,10,16 | misnomer | 710:20 835:22 | 808:6 814:5 | 867:12 892:18 |
| 732:8 859:2 | 705:12 856:24 | 837:7,16,20 | 818:25 820:1 | 893:1,11,24 |
| methodology | missed 714:11 | 839:3,7,8 | 826:21 828:1 | 896:14 |
| 715:19 716:9 | 717:5 852:15 | moderated | 835:7 853:23 | need 694:12 |
| methods 713:11 | missing 786:9 | 835:17 | 862:6 866:17 | 711:9 743:7 |
| 713:23 714:13 | 866:7 881:19 | modest 883:22 | 907:25 | 774:8781:21 |
| 714:19,21 | 887:17 900:7 | modified 881:20 | multiple 855:11 | 791:21,24,25 |
| 715:9,16 | mission 837:2 | moment 745:23 | 888:22 894:11 | 818:2 823:13 |
| 727:18 729:25 | mistake 706:3,6 | 828:1 | multiplied | 823:25 851:2 |
| 856:6 | 750:3 794:18 | money 774:3 | 873:17 | 865:8 867:25 |
| Mexico 845:2,4 | mistaken 916:25 | 886:14,15,17 | multiplier | 884:5 898:17 |
| mid-January | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { m i x }} 720: 5730: 6$ | 893:3 | 767:11 836:9 | 913:6 918:1,2 |
| 745:17 747:8 | 855:2 | monies 886:12 | 838:4,8 839:11 | 919:13,18,24 |
| middle 776:16 | mixed 717:12 | 889:9 890:4 | N | needed 893:14 |
| 861:9 | 730:8 | 910:17 913:14 | N | 895:23 |
| Mike 744:8 | mixing 858:2 | month 702:16 | N 689:1,1 843:1 | needs 744:18 |
| 748:21 749:4 | mobile 702:10 | 702:18 752:24 | 843:1,1 | 881:19 |
| 749:11 753:4 | 703:24 845:9 | 876:25 | N.W 688:19 | negative 870:14 |
| 849:18,25 | model 732:20,21 | monthly 873:11 | 921:18 | negligence |
| miles 729:7,10 | 733:3,7 734:12 | 873:16 | nailed 802:10 | 705:5,6,8,10 |
| military 755:1 | 734:18,20 | months 735:20 | name 701:12 | 705:10,11,17 |
| million 776:7,8 | 735:5,10,12,13 | 743:12 817:22 | 702:5 709:11 | 705:18,20,21 |
| 889:22 903:8 | 735:16,17,23 | 819:23 822:21 | 726:11,19 | 705:25 752:19 |
| 903:10,14,19 | 736:8,18 737:2 | 857:7 873:15 | 755:24 758:16 | 752:19 765:14 |
| millions 885:8 | 737:3,5,16,18 | 876:19,24 | 760:13 766:10 | 824:21,24 |
| 887:11 | 737:21 738:11 | 919:25 | 766:13 792:3 | negligent 753:6 |
| mind 705:22 | 738:13,22 | $\boldsymbol{m o o t} 874: 17$ | 793:18,19 | 763:3,4 821:14 |
| 717:10 824:6 | 739:19 740:4 | morning 691:3,5 | 812:21 859:2 | 823:17,17 |
| 884:8 906:12 | 763:5,25 764:5 | 691:6,10,16 | 861:8,9,10 | 825:4 |
| mine 732:2 | 764:13,14,15 | 698:24,25 | named 766:14 | negotiate 749:14 |
| 742:17 | 764:20 765:2 | 699:1,2 807:9 | 792:18 793:11 | 848:2 |


| negotiated | non-cash 881:10 | 765:20 766:6,8 | 913:11,11 | occurred 719:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 848:1,4,5 | non-compliance | 766:16,18,21 | 914:16 916:15 | 814:23 870:1 |
| negotiations | 726:18 807:16 | 767:23 781:25 | 916:17,23 | 894:18 |
| 772:16,18 | 809:23 810:15 | 784:3,6,8,13 | objecting | October 688:10 |
| 849:22,25 | 811:1,21 812:5 | 784:14 785:20 | 693:19 | 826:17 842:6 |
| 850:5 | 825:6 | 785:24 788:4 | objection 694:6 | 921:6,15 |
| NEIC 701:6,23 | non-compliant | 789:12,13 | 694:8 699:21 | odd 885:4,9 |
| 702:2,3,5 | 808:14 | 793:3,5,7 | 703:3,17 704:3 | 900:8 |
| 727:21 859:3 | non-responsive | 810:19 818:23 | 706:18 721:18 | OEM 734:3 |
| NEIS 701:2,3 | 793:16 812:24 | 821:21 822:23 | 723:14 724:2 | offer 691:24 |
| neither 849:17 | 812:25 | 828:25 829:7,9 | 724:19 725:21 | 692:12,22 |
| 903:18 | non-road | 829:15 843:11 | 741:9 744:1 | 695:25 755:9 |
| net 873:2 882:13 | 807:23 808:11 | 843:15,16,22 | 751:4 755:4 | 794:7,17 |
| 887:4,7,14 | 808:15,16 | 844:6,11,16 | 757:4,14 | 805:18 839:19 |
| 888:1 | 813:24 | 853:23 855:13 | 758:19,24 | 862:23 907:18 |
| never 70 | Nope 794:8 | 855:14 857:10 | 759:9,23 | 914:13 917:16 |
| 706:23,25 | normal 702:25 | 859:25 873:17 | 767:15 770:9 | offered 752:2 |
| 725:11 731:15 | normally 799:19 | 878:21 884:18 | 771:4 772:7,22 | 761:24 790:16 |
| 731:25 744:19 | 862:11,13 | 885:20 888:3,5 | 773:11 776:9 | 794:2,16 |
| 746:14 749:23 | 918:5 | 896:18 902:10 | 778:1 780:1 | 805:11,14,19 |
| 757:16 772:14 | Northern | 908:8,23 | 781:14 783:18 | offering 773:25 |
| 783:15 800:8 | 729:15 | numbers 720 | 784:20 791:7 | 862:21 908:17 |
| 805:16,19 | Nos 697: | 734:4,10 | 794:5,13 | 915:20 |
| 858:15 859:20 | note 813:1 | 746:24 782:1 | 795:16 797:2,8 | office 688:1,19 |
| 862:16,17,18 | 821:18 | 786:2 828:11 | 798:2,12 799:2 | 702:22 714:8 |
| 895:7,9 | notes 709: | 844:9 855:21 | 799:9 800:20 | 796:18 833:25 |
| new 854:22 | 876:11 888:18 | 864:5 867:3 | 802:11 805:2 | 834:1,20,20 |
| 857:19 858:2 | 921:10 | 889:3 897:21 | 812:24,25 | 916:5 921:12 |
| newer 813:21 | notice 688 | 899:24 900:2 | 819:16 833:8 | officer 692:18 |
| nice 776:7 | 699:16 775:18 | 900:13 919:12 | 834:15 837:12 | 703:2,16 704:1 |
| nicer 807:5 | 777:13 803:16 | numerous | 840:13 863:15 | 704:21 892:18 |
| nine 736:22 | 803:24 804:11 | 744:14,15 | 898:24 907:5 | officers 703:6 |
| 765:15 766:23 | 820:2 832:18 | nut $725: 12,12$ | 909:13,15,20 | 704:16,20 |
| 766:25 767:10 | 832:19 850:14 | nuts 725:7,8 | 909:25 910:3,5 | offices 688:23 |
| 768:12,14 | 850:16 874:9 | NW 688:8 | 910:6,10 | 34:21 |
| 769:6,15 | 904:15,19,22 |  | 914:14 | officials 882:3 |
| 770:17 771:19 | 905:2,5,14,17 | 0 | objections 693:5 | offset $870: 13,22$ |
| 830:6,8 831:15 | noticed 759:19 | O 689:1 | 693:16 839:20 | 874:20 |
| 831:18,22,24 | 760:2 | 843:1 | 839:21 | oh 693:12 |
| 832:2,12,17,25 | notices 743:5 | lock 8 | obligated | 733:22 743:7 |
| 833:1,5,6,7 | 803:5 804:16 | oath 736:4 | 779:21 | 762:21 783:12 |
| 835:12,16 | notion 898:14 | object 692:23 | obligation 833:1 | 792:12 793:18 |
| 837:17 850:19 | number 692:21 | 716:16 750:15 | obliged 801:5 | 796:16 823:10 |
| 851:4 | 693:4 695:21 | 781:8,13 783: | observed 731:9 | 827:12 829:16 |
| nit-pick 865:20 | 696:8 711:24 | 789:6 824:17 | obtain 883:18 | 843:21 851:4 |
| noble 730:7,11 | 726:25 732:24 | 828:8 837:14 | obvious 888:20 | 852:11 864:10 |
| non- 750:15 | 733:1 734:11 | 861:18 863:4 | obviously 796:6 | 875:11 906:25 |
| 814:2 | 735:12 741:8 | 879:9 911:22 | 857:3 | okay 691:14 |
| non-American | 742:20 744:6 | 911:23 912:3 | occasion 722:7 | 692:4 693:18 |
| 759:7 | 758:12 763:7,9 | 912:17,24 | occur 867:25 | 693:22 694:6 |


| 695:11 696:5 | 782:1,3,6,20 | 915:5 916:3 | organic 725:16 | owns 790:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 697:2,16 698:6 | 783:17 784:2 | 918:10,16,21 | origin 845:2 |  |
| 698:6,11,18,22 | 786:8,18 | 918:25 919:7 | original 697:20 | P |
| 699:13 700:8 | 787:13,17,19 | 919:12,17 | 878:5 | p.m 842:4,6 |
| 700:14 701:11 | 787:19,23 | 920:7 | outreach 707:12 | 843:2 920:13 |
| 701:15,17,22 | 788:6,22 789:2 | old 702:22 | outright 866:7 | page 693:4 |
| 702:7 703:6 | 789:24 790:11 | 854:22 | outside 699:17 | 732:10,12 |
| 707:5 708:2 | 790:22 791:11 | omitted 894:1 | 724:8 847:24 | 733:5,6 735:11 |
| 709:6 711:22 | 791:12 796:6 | on-road 808:2 | 895:9 | 736:17 737:4 |
| 711:23 712:6 | 796:24 797:21 | 814:3 825:6 | outsourced | 739:24 769:16 |
| 713:19,19,20 | 798:25 799:23 | once 694:23 | 868:4 | 779:18 790:8 |
| 713:21 715:2,2 | 804:22 805:9 | 813:23 873:3 | overall 903:21 | 790:24 791:17 |
| 717:18 718:8 | 806:8,15,16,18 | 874:21 875:16 | overhead | 811:11 813:9 |
| 718:18 719:19 | 807:7 808:15 | 919:20,21 | 760:10 | 825:18 826:6 |
| 720:7,12,18,23 | 809:10 810:1 | one's 884:25 | overruled 700:2 | 826:14 837:6 |
| 720:25 721:2 | 810:12 811:3 | ones 747:24 | 703:19 704:6 | 866:21,21,22 |
| 721:21 723:12 | 813:20 814:6 | 752:6 763:11 | 706:19 716:19 | 867:17,18 |
| 724:7,16,24 | 814:24 816:8 | 786:16 812:23 | 723:16 724:5 | 868:17,17 |
| 725:4,6,6,11 | 817:11 818:15 | 845:16 849:9 | 724:21 741:14 | 869:9,12,14 |
| 726:15,23 | 818:18 820:7 | 886:22 914:11 | 755:5 759:11 | 870:17 871:22 |
| 727:24 729:16 | 821:3 823:6 | 915:8 | 759:24 764:4 | 872:3,13,14 |
| 729:20,20 | 825:7,17,17 | open 711:12 | 770:11 772:24 | 873:5,6 883:12 |
| 733:8,25 734:1 | 826:1,21 | opening 854:7 | 778:5 789:9 | 885:1 887:3 |
| 734:11,11 | 827:10,12 | 854:25 | 795:18 797:10 | 891:18,20 |
| 736:2,19 737:1 | 828:16 838:19 | opine 875:15 | 798:14 799:11 | 895:16,18,20 |
| 737:8738:19 | 840:25 841:19 | opinion 735:24 | 802:13 825:17 | 902:10 906:3 |
| 739:15,16,17 | 841:20 842:1 | 744:16 751:19 | 828:17 833:11 | 908:14 909:22 |
| 740:2,18 741:4 | 843:25 844:23 | 790:1799:15 | 834:18 880:4 | 910:1 |
| 742:20 743:21 | 845:7 847:8,12 | 799:17 877:7 | 899:1 902:12 | pages 690:11 |
| 746:8,18,24 | 848:18,21 | 882:4,7 893:24 | overseas 717:19 | 806:10 909:24 |
| 747:17 749:3 | 849:2 851:11 | opinions $864: 2$ | oversight | 910:9 911:1,7 |
| 749:18 750:5,9 | 852:1,17 853:8 | 865:2,2 | 867:11,24 | 919:4 |
| 750:18,22,23 | 853:11 858:20 | opponent | 892:11,25 | paid 810:5 |
| 752:9 755:23 | 858:21 859:2 | 692:17,18 | 896:13 | 856:16 889:24 |
| 756:15,15,20 | 860:4 861:23 | opportunity | overview 869:7 | 893:4 910:17 |
| 756:23 757:6 | 863:8,9,16,18 | 694:4,15,17 | owed 890:4,10 | 912:13 913:14 |
| 757:11,16 | 866:15,18 | 695:6,7 762:6 | owes 888:21 | Palermo 688:18 |
| 758:1,6,15,18 | 875:3,8,12 | 854:16 863:22 | 889:10 | 861:18,22 |
| 759:1,21 | 878:25 880:4 | 919:19 | owned 790:13 | 862:1,17,19 |
| 760:13 762:4 | 883:10 890:24 | oppose 692:23 | 791:13 | 863:4,14,15 |
| 762:12 763:21 | 891:12 897:18 | opposed 776:12 | owner 791:18 | 875:6 879:8 |
| 764:15 765:11 | 903:1,5 905:3 | 866:7 | 792:8,22 | 891:2 895:19 |
| 765:14,15,16 | 905:9 906:18 | opposing 878:24 | 793:12,14 | 899:3 901:19 |
| 767:7,18 768:1 | 906:21 907:3 | optional 754:11 | 884:8 | 901:23 902:17 |
| 769:4,12,13,19 | 907:20,25 | order 747:10,11 | owners 796:25 | 904:8 |
| 770:14 771:8 | 908:5,15,24 | 823:13 836:7 | 797:7 883:25 | palladium 730:8 |
| 775:24 776:17 | 909:2 910:8,12 | 838:14 840:10 | 885:9 | 730:12 830:11 |
| 776:23 777:20 | 911:11 912:5 | 884:17 906:23 | ownership | 830:15 |
| 779:16 780:23 | 912:11 913:16 | 913:14 919:23 | 759:13 790:12 | pancake 855:1,2 |
| 780:24 781:15 | 913:23 914:21 | ordered 836:14 | 790:23 791:2 | pancakes 855:3 |


| paper 701:16,23 | particularly | 885:23 886:1,3 | 840:16 841:9 | 723:11 861:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 701:25 702:3,5 | 710:19 | 886:16 888:2,4 | 841:13 861:17 | 904:20 |
| 804:25 859:1 | parties 688:11 | 890:14,15,18 | 861:19,24 | permitted 740:2 |
| 867:3 888:3 | 693:15 | 899:11 901:11 | 862:14 863:2,6 | 879:16 |
| 897:22 906:24 | partly 749:13 | 903:7,9,12,13 | 863:11,17 | peroxide 730:6 |
| papers 693:16 | parts 855:2,2,3 | 903:20 904:5,7 | 866:5 873:20 | person 748:17 |
| 700:17,22,23 | party 692:17,17 | payable 888:17 | 877:8 878:9 | 748:21 792:18 |
| 781:9 789:6 | 743:6 777:3 | 888:21 889:7 | 885:18,24 | 815:19 915:10 |
| 828:9 | party's 692:18 | 889:19 890:4 | 886:9,16 888:2 | personal 901:6 |
| paperwork | pass 851:9 | paying 878:9 | 888:4 890:16 | personally |
| 895:23 897:8 | 890:23 | 886:9 888:23 | 890:19 903:8 | 760:15 |
| paragraph | passage 873:15 | 890:1 | 903:10,14,17 | personnel 897:8 |
| 736:10 737:1,8 | passed 831:7,9 | payment 900:17 | 903:21 904:6 | perspective |
| 737:15,17 | 835:16 837:4 | peanut 893:8 | 907:6,8,14 | 730:15 848:16 |
| 738:13 811:12 | 838:1 | pecans 855:3 | pending 903:4 | pertinent |
| 823:7,8 857:21 | passenger | pen 784:15 | Pennsylvania | 906:16 |
| 883:17 | 845:18 | penalized | 688:19 | phase 804:10 |
| paragraphs | pause 695:23 | 825:16 | people 710:11 | phonetic 912:14 |
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| 762:2 763:6,11 | 823:14,23 | representing | resolve 698:8 | 780:10 789:3 |
| 763:14 764:13 | 824:1,4,4,16 | 692:14 846:1 | resolved 693:17 | 789:19 834:1,5 |
| 764:17 765:19 | 825:12 826:3,4 | 848:9 869:24 | resources | responsive |
| 765:20,25 | 826:16 856:24 | 872:9 892:10 | 897:14 | 750:16 751:4 |
| 766:2,8 768:7 | 856:24 857:9 | 901:12 | respect 725:15 | 783:7 |
| 768:10,11 | 858:1 864:5,23 | represents | respond 716:18 | rest 717:12 |
| 771:12,14 | 875:18 876:8 | 872:3,4 889:9 | 721:2 761:7 | 780:13 852:5 |
| 777:25 778:17 | 877:6,13 | request 714:3 | 778:4 | 908:1 911:2 |
| 791:21,22 | 881:25 882:5 | 760:18,19 | respondent | 919:8,9 920:5 |
| 792:2,17,24 | 882:20,23,25 | 821:23 822:4 | 690:8 706:10 | restate 802:18 |
| 793:11 795:2,4 | 887:1 891:8 | 851:3 905:13 | 786:13,14 | restricted |
| 795:5 796:4 | 895:18 899:10 | 916:5 917:5 | 813:3 865:17 | 840:24 841:6 |
| 811:11 818:21 | 900:25 901:16 | requested 716:3 | 914:11 | 841:10 877:24 |
| 822:3,5 827:25 | reported 885:2 | 735:20 744:10 | Respondent's | rests 853:13 |
| 850:18 885:7 | 887:15 889:18 | 744:11,12 | 692:1,4,8 | result 729:22,24 |
| 889:11 | 921:11 | 745:15 789:7 | 695:21 696:7 | 735:22,23 |
| remembering | reporter 697:21 | 800:7 826:23 | 696:11,14,20 | 751:16 756:17 |
| 893:19 894:19 | 851:19 853:9 | 894:7 | 696:23 852:24 | 868:19 871:7 |
| 903:13,17 | 860:22 921:17 | requesting | 874:12 894:23 | 879:2 881:6,7 |
| remind 763:8 | REPORTER'S | 743:11 747:19 | 907:18 911:6 | 884:5 886:16 |
| 851:3 | 921:1 | 906:20 916:21 | 911:16 912:21 | 897:24 903:8 |
| removed 807:24 | reporting | requests $822: 6$ | 914:5 916:10 | 904:5 |
| 817:13 | 857:15 882:14 | 826:23 827:1 | 919:4 | resulted 870:7 |
| renewal 735:1 | 921:17 | require 882:15 | Respondents | 874:5 |


| resulting 730:6 | 899:19,22,24 | 775:11 776:20 | rule 692:16 | saw 707:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 730:10 | 900:19,23 | 779:8 781:7,12 | 806:18 866:3 | 744:13 764:15 |
| results 728:20 | 901:1 904:3 | 782:22 783:9 | 866:17 878:21 | 773:5 792:2,25 |
| 747:20 750:13 | revenue 773:22 | 783:17 786:23 | ruled 907:10 | 828:23 |
| 751:3,13,20,24 | 773:24 | 787:6791:21 | rules 692:15 | saying 694:16 |
| 754:8,15 | review 854:16 | 794:3 796:5,13 | 723:22,25 | 695:7 702:4 |
| 768:18,20,22 | 863:22,25 | 796:22 798:1 | 724:18,25 | 714:21 717:24 |
| 768:23 769:20 | reviewed 701:17 | 798:21 799:15 | 845:9 909:7 | 723:10 731:19 |
| 769:24 770:6 | 875:23 876:12 | 804:20 805:21 | 916:4 | 742:9,25 743:3 |
| 770:15 790:5 | revolves 854:11 | 805:25 806:25 | ruling 752:12 | 744:17 745:2 |
| 814:18,21 | rhodium 730:8 | 807:4,19 | 786:2 | 751:18 763:2,4 |
| 827:8 835:15 | 730:12 | 811:19 814:5 | run 864:24 | 773:19 774:2 |
| 835:15,20 | Rick 921:17 | 817:17 818:20 | 878:1 880:9 | 778:17 783:14 |
| 836:5,14 837:3 | right 695:11 | 819:13 827:3 | 881:1 | 785:17,19 |
| 837:17,22,22 | 699:14,18 | 827:25 831:21 | running 880:10 | 786:24 787:8 |
| 837:24 838:7 | 700:8,15 | 832:1 833:14 | runs 880:20 | 787:11,19,24 |
| 838:13 855:21 | 701:15 702:25 | 839:14 841:16 | RX 908:19 | 793:23 801:9 |
| 858:23,24 | 703:9 705:25 | 842:2 848:19 | RX-18 912:11 | 801:10 805:22 |
| 865:22 866:20 | 706:2 707:10 | 849:7,15,15 | RX-6 908:20 | 824:4 850:2 |
| 868:14,20 | 709:14 710:18 | 850:14,20 | RX-7 908:20 | 863:12 880:17 |
| 869:6,21 871:3 | 711:2,16,18 | 852:1 853:11 |  | 886:15 888:8 |
| 872:4,4 873:3 | 714:17 715:15 | 864:5 875:8 | S | 892:5 896:12 |
| 873:7 877:1 | 716:8 718:9 | 884:21 889:14 | s 689:1 690:1,8 | 897:7,14,25 |
| 880:21,25 | 719:17 720:9 | 893:12 894:19 | 843:1,1,1 | 906:11 917:15 |
| 881:4 903:6 | 720:19 722:16 | 897:11 899:12 | 860:6 861:9 | 917:23 918:5,7 |
| resume 805:18 | 722:22 723:7 | 902:19,21 | S-H-E-F-F-T-Z | 918:8,14 |
| resumed 698:16 | 724:1,16 | 903:10,11 | 861:10 | says 699:20 |
| retail 847:3,9 | 726:21 728:11 | 917:23 918:17 | safe 784:18 | 728:20 735:6 |
| retailers 900:17 | 728:17 729:18 | 919:17 920:11 | salary 884:9 | 750:12 751:2 |
| retain 814:25 | 731:11,14 | ring 758:16 | sales 886:12,18 | 751:10,13 |
| 815:3 | 732:1 734:7 | 766:21 | Salina 688:23 | 753:1 777:9,10 |
| retained 815:11 | 736:3,6 740:1 | RMA 888:6 | 747:4 | 780:5 785:23 |
| 815:13 816:1 | 740:19,25 | ROBERT | sample 728:21 | 791:20 793:14 |
| 820:16 865:12 | 741:2,12,23 | 688:17 | 732:8,9 | 825:9,20,21,25 |
| 865:16 875:14 | 742:9,13,23 | role 856:13 | samples 822:18 | 826:11,14 |
| 894:9 | 743:18,22 | roll 702:13 | 830:25 855:8 | 835:19,23 |
| retainer 899:8 | 745:18,20 | Room 688:7 | SanbornOfficial | 837:6 838:6 |
| retaining 898:12 | 746:15 749:7 | root 721:14 | 921:17 | 839:6 840:19 |
| retrofitted | 749:19,22 | rough 867:17 | satellite 729:14 | 856:3 857:19 |
| 847:22 | 750:1,4 751:7 | 868:8 887:21 | satisfy 760:17 | 882:6 883:17 |
| return 792:25 | 752:23 754:16 | 897:15 | 760:24 858:8 | 892:16 906:24 |
| 884:2 887:15 | 755:2,3 756:18 | roughly 820:12 | satisfying | scaling 831:23 |
| 899:16 | 756:21 757:8 | 869:5 879:1 | 748:18 | scenario 742:5 |
| returned 708:21 | 758:23 759:2,5 | 884:4 889:21 | save 696:25 | 746:15 866:14 |
| returns 792:9,10 | 759:7,8 760:14 | 892:2 903:16 | saved 913:21 | 866:23 870:16 |
| 792:15 793:1 | 761:10 765:4 | rounded 870:18 | saves 806:9 | 870:21 874:3 |
| 846:6,9,14,15 | 765:18 766:10 | 874:9 | savings 869:25 | 890:8 892:10 |
| 877:11 882:2 | 766:18 769:8 | row 874:11,19 | 870:8,13 | 895:21 896:18 |
| 882:12 884:8 | 770:1,24 | rows $868: 18$ | 872:25 874:4 | 897:4,8,17,25 |
| 887:14,18 | 774:23 775:2,6 | 872:16 897:6 | 874:19 | scenarios |


| 864:20,20 | 747:9 750:12 | sensible 699:20 | 738:13 796:20 | 791:22,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 866:19 868:12 | 751:14 752:6 | 700:4 860:10 | 910:1 | 792:1 817:8 |
| 868:20 869:6,7 | 761:22 765:1 | 887:19 | Seventy 750:2 | 836:2 854:12 |
| 873:8 895:16 | 773:1,4 784:6 | sent 744:14,19 | Seventy-one | 854:14,24 |
| 896:21 898:1 | 784:8 785:6,6 | 745:5,17 | 750:1 | 855:22 856:1,5 |
| 898:13 | 785:6,13,16,17 | 746:17 748:19 | severally 903:16 | 856:6,11,19,21 |
| scene 717:24 | 792:5,7 793:14 | 752:7 753:25 | severe 802:24 | 857:19,22 |
| scenes 878:17,20 | 793:18,18 | 754:12 760:21 | SGS 758:7,16 | 858:6,11,16 |
| scheduled | 799:7 811:5 | 761:9,13 | 759:6,6 816:17 | 859:1,9,13,20 |
| 873:14 | 824:11 827:23 | 804:11,23 | 820:25 821:18 | 860:6,9,12 |
| scheme 699:24 | 857:18 865:18 | 817:21 819:7 | 822:16 827:3 | 905:1 917:15 |
| 699:25 703:1 | 867:17 871:22 | 820:2 821:4 | 858:20 | 918:8 |
| 723:6,12,20 | 872:23 876:7 | 822:8,11 851:3 | shaking 697:14 | showed 726:17 |
| 839:1 840:20 | 876:23 888:19 | 915:13 916:5,6 | shape 725:17 | 748:11 835:15 |
| 840:24 841:7 | 889:19 890:13 | 917:12 | shareholder | 838:1 903:7,9 |
| 841:11,15 | 895:3 900:11 | sentence 705:5 | 791:20 792:3 | showing 773:15 |
| 854:1 | 906:23 | 883:17 | shareholders | 774:18 790:23 |
| scholars 800:18 | seeing 745:16 | sentences | 883:21 | 824:24 871:19 |
| school $755: 1,6,8$ | 792:6,13 | 738:10 | shares 885:12 | 874:13 892:6 |
| schools 800:17 | seek 787:20 | separate 796:25 | sheet 698:1,3 | showly 855:7 |
| science 729:2 | 840:10 | 803:21 813:18 | 883:2 887:20 | shown 739:24 |
| scooters 734:15 | seeking 734:25 | 832:12 834:22 | sheets 709:17,19 | 854:24 |
| 773:8 | 786:25 787:17 | 886:19 | 744:13 | shows 735:11 |
| scope 761:6 | seen 695:5 | separated | Shefftz 689:5 | 754:21 790:25 |
| screen 742:12 | 706:15,25 | 730:16 731:6 | 691:11,12,23 | 791:2 855:5,7 |
| 742:13 793:9 | 745:19 763:6 | separately $832: 2$ | 696:1 860:21 | 855:10,19 |
| 823:11 893:7 | 794:3 819:21 | separating | 861:2,10,20 | 874:7 881:13 |
| screens 760:10 | 849:6 871:7 | 717:11 858:13 | 862:15,21 | 906:14 |
| se 755:8773:24 | 881:21 893:5 | September | 863:9 864:8 | shutting 886:10 |
| 878:15 | seizure 716:22 | 823:13 825:25 | 875:9 879:9,13 | sic $855: 7856: 8$ |
| search 738:16 | 718:12 | 826:9,11,12 | 879:16,22 | side 740:8 |
| seated 691:4 | select 712:8,9,11 | series 806:12,21 | 891:3 901:24 | 766:25 769:2 |
| 762:20 861:5 | 712:18,18,20 | set 737:18 | 904:12 | 803:23 848:3 |
| second 795:2 | 713:11,13 | 751:25 866:19 | Shefftz' 851:24 | 865:18 908:13 |
| 818:19 823:7 | 716:5 721:1 | 874:4 889:17 | 879:21 | 908:13 |
| section 728:20 | selected 712:6 | 919:23 | Shefftz's 691:21 | sidebar 901:20 |
| 887:4 891:6 | 712:23 | setting 717:11 | 691:24 697:4 | sides 913:22 |
| sections 736:15 | selection 855:11 | 840:11 881:22 | shipment | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}$ 699:17 |
| secure 886:8 | self- 917:20 | settlement | 717:19 | 719:16 724:7 |
| sediment 730:5 | sell $847: 9$ | 749:11 772:5 | shipping 901:8 | 724:11 |
| see 694:18 | selling 773:8 | 772:16,17 | short 755:13 | signed 697:22 |
| 699:20 704:9 | 886:7 900:16 | 778:7,8 807:19 | 900:24 902:25 | 697:22,25 |
| 705:14 707:22 | send 744:17 | 807:22 808:10 | shorten 780:18 | 698:2 719:13 |
| 708:23 724:7 | 803:24 804:16 | 809:11,24 | shortfall 869:22 | 719:13 744:24 |
| 724:10,11,12 | 919:22,22 | 810:10 813:23 | 872:19 | 749:10 752:23 |
| 724:14 729:20 | 920:1 | 821:19 826:25 | shortfalls | 856:23 857:3 |
| 730:1 731:4 | sending 916:4 | 837:8 | 870:10,17,22 | 915:14,21 |
| 733:6 737:1,3 | sense 716:10,11 | settlements | 871:5 874:21 | significance |
| 737:23 742:13 | 787:2 870:20 | 777:14 | show 736:10 | 787:11 |
| 742:14,15,16 | 871:2 900:6,22 | seven 721:7 | 742:17 791:21 | significantly |


| 825:3 832:5,6 | 893:16 | 806:20 808:3,6 | specific 708:14 | spoke 708:13,15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| signing 899:8 | smaller 884:25 | 808:20,25 | 739:11 769:7,8 | 708:17 709:23 |
| similar 747:21 | so-699:23 | 809:1,15,16 | 780:20,21 | 760:2 |
| 810:17 855:4 | 800:18 | 810:12,24 | 785:21 803:16 | sponsor 909:3 |
| 868:13 872:15 | so-called 917:5 | 817:3 819:25 | 820:5 874:25 | spreadsheet |
| 886:22 889:19 | society 703:1 | 822:9,25 | 893:14 | 871:19,24 |
| similarities | sodium 730:6 | 823:10 827:12 | specifically | 872:5,7,21 |
| 704:2,17 | softer 893:22 | 828:20 832:9 | 700:21 708:14 | 874:13 877:3 |
| simple 854:11 | sold 847:3,9 | 833:16,21 | 736:3 739:11 | 902:8 903:2,24 |
| simplify 826:19 | 850:10 886:14 | 836:8 837:5 | 746:18 768:13 | staff 716:2 |
| simply 866:2 | solution 730:7 | 841:5 851:4 | 803:13 821:6 | 815:18,19 |
| 870:13 871:14 | 730:10,18 | 852:13 866:21 | 874:3 877:10 | 862:14 878:22 |
| 871:22 873:17 | solvent 731:1 | 874:5 875:11 | 882:12,21 | staffing 873:22 |
| 884:1 885:10 | somebody | 875:12 882:22 | 884:7 885:7 | 891:13 895:21 |
| 889:3 892:16 | 780:12,13 | 882:24 889:7 | 888:14 889:1 | 896:13,18 |
| 895:7 | 910:22 917:22 | 900:15 907:7 | 896:19 899:10 | 898:14 |
| sir 863:22 891:8 | 918:2 | 910:4 | specification | stamp 883:13 |
| 895:20 903:4 | something's | sort 743:8 845:5 | 830:2,5,9 | 908:9 |
| site 757:23,24 | 835:1 | 871:20 885:7 | 831:5 832:23 | stand 698:17 |
| situation 695:1 | somewhat | 885:25 892:18 | 833:3,23 | 701:7 762:16 |
| 707:1,6 745:20 | 703:12 705:12 | 901:14 | 854:19 906:15 | 782:20 787:22 |
| 753:3 778:15 | 706:24 707:5 | sought 734:12 | 907:11 | 842:3 849:3 |
| 796:11 856:20 | 759:17 777:1 | 786:18 | specificity | 914:25 915:15 |
| 859:7 860:13 | 800:5 874:16 | sound 719:21 | 792:16 793:1 | standard 768:9 |
| 878:13 879:17 | 890:17 894:14 | sounded $881: 3$ | specifics 749:17 | 771:3 859:5 |
| 881:15 885:12 | soon 860:6 | sounds 720:20 | 812:3 | 860:5 867:20 |
| 894:2 906:16 | sorry 705:25 | 720:22 726:22 | specified 813:6 | standards |
| situations | 709:15,18 | 729:25 796:5 | 815:4 872:20 | 771:11,16 |
| 881:18 | 710:15 713:1 | 817:17,20 | 897:1 | 795:8 837:4 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }} 713: 5,6$ | 713:21,24 | 833:14 | spectrometer | 859:20 |
| 735:20 743:12 | 714:5,11 | source 702:10 | 730:11 | stands 701:9 |
| 817:22 819:23 | 720:21 722:15 | 703:24 845:9 | speculate 770:2 | start 699:25 |
| 827:7 830:5,8 | 724:23 727:2 | 885:17 886:7,9 | 796:9 888:12 | 732:13,15,16 |
| 830:22 831:16 | 728:2 731:12 | 888:5 890:18 | speculating | 732:16 747:4 |
| 831:18 832:21 | 731:23 735:8 | sources 869:10 | 704:19 850:8 | 776:14 779:16 |
| 832:22 833:2,5 | 739:3 740:13 | 883:16,18 | 850:11 | 784:3 852:12 |
| 834:7 919:25 | 744:23 745:10 | South 700:24 | speculation | 852:14,16 |
| Sixteen 911:13 | 746:6,7 750:1 | speak 710:13 | 704:4,8 773:12 | 865:5 878:1 |
| Sixty-seven | 750:3,6 752:13 | 746:21 753:5 | 774:23 805:1 | started 702:15 |
| 764:24 | 756:20 760:16 | 798:10 801:5 | 819:17,18 | 718:6,11 |
| size 725:17 | 760:20 763:18 | 805:17 808:3 | 835:5 | 752:18 796:7 |
| slash 705:22 | 767:12 769:3 | 828:9 833:9,10 | speculative | starting 784:14 |
| slight 710:15,16 | 771:6775:12 | 868:10 | 888:17 890:10 | 795:3,6 796:3 |
| 864:21 | 775:19 778:12 | speakers 800:9 | spell 757:3,5 | 828:14 |
| slightly 896:23 | 779:3 780:6 | speaking 710:20 | spelled 756:23 | starts 760:13,16 |
| slowly 808:4 | 781:17 783:4 | 849:18 892:1 | 757:1 861:10 | 760:20 |
| slurry 855:5 | 785:5 786:8 | 893:20 913:25 | spending 789:8 | state 788:7 |
| small 866:21 | 792:10 793:2,4 | speaks 798:15 | spent 860:13 | 809:19 861:8 |
| 869:13 884:3 | 800:13 802:14 | special 856:16 | split 889:8 | statement |
| 884:16,24 | 802:16,18 | 864:11 | 903:14 | 768:19 854:7 |


| 876:10,14,14 | strategy 694:24 | subsequent | 878:7 881:22 | 797:4 798:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 876:15 917:19 | Street 921:18 | 708:18 710:3 | 905:13 | 799:4 835:6 |
| 917:24 918:2 | strict 893:23 | 836:23 | supported | SUVs 734:15 |
| statements | strictly 692:16 | subsidiary | 790:17 890:11 | swear 860:22 |
| 692:21 846:10 | 892:1 893:20 | 790:13 | supporting | Swinke 912:14 |
| 846:21 876:6,6 | Strike 765:12 | substance 731:1 | 784:19 | 912:25 913:3,7 |
| 876:22,23 | 846:14 | subsumed | supports 750:24 | switch 806:17 |
| 877:4 899:20 | strikes 890:10 | 868:19 897:5 | 777:11 | 890:21 |
| 899:21 904:1 | strong 856:10 | sudden 858:21 | suppose 765:9 | sworn 698:16 |
| states 721:10 | 889:2 | suffices 917:16 | 775:2 799:22 | 861:3 |
| 734:5 772:5 | struggle 699:8 | sufficient 863:7 | 811:16 834:24 | symbol 733:4 |
| 843:12 844:19 | 699:10 | suggested 816:5 | 839:13 | 872:24 |
| 847:25 868:1 | student 743:16 | 816:6 | supposed |  |
| 876:8 | students 800:18 | suggestion | 774:19 803:9 | T |
| stating 772:9 | studied 720:23 | 856:17 | sure 691:11 | T 689:1,1 690:1 |
| statistical | 728:24 | suggestions | 697:12 708:6,9 | 843:1 |
| 878:19 879:3 | studies 796:2 | 707:12 856:15 | 708:17 714:15 | table 724:12 |
| statute 777:9,10 | 799:25 800:1,2 | Suite 688:24 | 717:2 729:24 | 869:13 870:7 |
| 780:5 854:15 | stuff 755:2 | 921:18 | 731:16 734:6 | 870:13 871:8 |
| statutes 905:14 | 803:25 901:6 | sum 781:21 | 740:5 748:22 | 872:3,15 873:6 |
| stay 741:4 | subject 737:18 | summarized | 751:3 761:11 | 891:20 896:4 |
| stayed 880:22 | 802:17,21,24 | 887:2 | 761:19 764:23 | 897:3 |
| stays 886:13 | 803:7 810:1,3 | summary 786:2 | 770:25 773:14 | tables 871:21 |
| 889:21 | subjected | 866:20 874:23 | 781:10 789:8 | 872:16 873:7 |
| Stein 758:4 | 694:10 854:18 | 887:4 | 805:9 818:3 | tabular 866:19 |
| stemmed 719:2 | submission | summer 702:17 | 832:7 835:25 | tag 802:6,7 |
| step 696:6 | 692:3 752:2 | 822:14 | 836:20 840:14 | tagged 802:14 |
| 718:23 805:9 | 768:18 | summing | 843:9 862:1 | 802:20 |
| 862:3 | submit 694:4,15 | 873:11 | 864:4,4 865:7 | tailored 896:19 |
| stick 739:15 | 694:25 742:1 | super 774:2,2 | 865:8 866:12 | take 694:1 |
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| 788:21 789:12 | 714:20 727:21 | 712:1,5,7,8,9 | 886:6,18 | 892:19 |
| 789:13 796:2 | 743:1 905:21 | 712:10,11,15 | 894:22 900:15 | violative 834:14 |
| 796:21 810:8,8 |  | 712:23 713:5,6 | vendor 769:10 | violator 837:8 |
| 812:8,10,13,14 | V | 713:7,12,13,24 | verdict 853:18 | 837:23 |
| 813:11,13 | vague 703:3 | 713:25,25 | 853:23 | violator's |
| 814:1 815:15 | 714:25 727:3 | 714:2,20 | version 794:3 | 810:19 |
| 816:5 826:24 | 755:4 758:19 | 715:13,20,21 | 878:6 889:15 | violators 722:3 |
| 846:1,2,8 | 764:3 795:16 | 716:5 717:11 | 904:23 905:6 | Virginia 728:24 |
| 847:3 848:5,8 | 797:8 | 717:12 718:24 | versus 774:11 | 729:4,5,8,15 |
| 848:17 849:10 | vaguely $756: 11$ | 734:15,16,17 | 797:6 871:23 | visit 709:9 |
| 849:19 850:1 | 771:13 877:18 | 737:19 740:15 | 874:15,22 | visited 715:5 |
| 850:21 853:22 | valuation | 748:10 754:24 | 882:2 890:18 | vitae 805:19 |
| 856:12 858:8 | 887:12 | 754:25 765:20 | 898:1 904:3 | vocal $821: 14$ |
| 859:21 877:10 | value 718:3 | 766:7,8,17 | viability 774:11 | voir 689:1 862:4 |
| 878:10 882:1 | 730:13 766:9 | 767:4 768:23 | view 870:24 | volume 721:9,12 |
| 887:13 888:18 | 836:22,24 | 769:1,8,9,24 | VIN 716:4 | 721:23 883:5,8 |
| 889:25 890:4,8 | 837:2 844:8,9 | 770:2 779:20 | 732:24 733:1,2 | volumes 883:7 |
| 890:15 892:6 | 844:10,12 | 780:18 781:2 | 734:4,10,11 | voluntarily |
| 898:22 899:4 | 870:5 873:2 | 781:22,25 | 735:12 741:11 | 835:11,14,20 |
| 921:4 | 880:21 882:2 | 784:3,6,13 | 741:12 829:15 | 836:5,13 |
| USA's 766:15 | 884:15 887:6,7 | 785:21,25 | VINs 763:17,19 | 837:23 |
| 899:7,16,24 | 888:1 901:8 | 786:22 787:2 | violate 722:11 |  |
| usage 717:10 | 916:19 | 788:4,18 789:3 | 770:7 835:1 | W |
| 759:22 760:6 | variation 864:21 | 807:23 808:2 | 916:4 | W-A-N-G 710:5 |
| use 692:17,24 | 871:20 | 808:11,14,15 | violated 724:1 | wait 752:12,15 |
| 693:4 713:15 | varies 822:18 | 808:16,22 | 859:21 | 857:11 912:7 |
| 713:16 716:25 | 845:3,6 | 809:21,21 | violates 806:17 | waiting 883:14 |
| 721:24 722:3 | various 869:3 | 810:1 812:5,11 | violating 771:2 | walked 699:17 |
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| Wang 710:5,8 | 716:2 | 875:5 917:14 | 774:24,25,25 | 770:12 772:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 710:16,17 | warehousing | 917:19 918:9 | 789:12 798:20 | 772:25 777:1 |
| 716:1 744:9 | 900:16 | 919:22,22 | 856:14 858:19 | 778:7 781:16 |
| 755:13 760:2 | warning 802:9 | 920:1 | 858:20 869:8 | 783:22 784:21 |
| 907:22 | wash 695:6 | we're 691:23 | 869:18 870:4 | 785:3,7 789:11 |
| want 693:19,24 | 696:4 855:5,8 | 693:12,22 | 897:17 914:10 | 795:21 797:11 |
| 697:1 699:5 | 858:12 | 694:17 695:6 | weren't 708:7 | 798:15 799:12 |
| 720:1,4 723:8 | Washington | 695:13,24 | 769:7 778:10 | 802:14 805:12 |
| 728:2 732:10 | 688:8,20 | 698:4,7 700:1 | 778:13 782:7 | 805:24 821:12 |
| 732:14,16 | 774:12 921:7 | 703:1 723:6,8 | whichever | 824:10 826:5 |
| 734:9 746:12 | 921:18 | 723:10 724:16 | 713:16 | 826:14 828:20 |
| 752:22 757:2 | wasn't 719:9 | 733:25 745:22 | white 864:7 | 833:10,14 |
| 760:14,15 | 727:20 729:12 | 745:24 757:8 | wider 893:24 | 834:19 838:20 |
| 761:17,25 | 733:22 750:14 | 759:4 762:1 | wife 797:21 | 841:5 843:9,15 |
| 762:6,22 | 755:23 760:3 | 763:23 765:8 | wife's 797:18 | 843:19,21 |
| 768:16 769:11 | 770:19 771:24 | 765:14 770:15 | willful 752:19 | 844:2,5,8,11 |
| 776:7 782:6 | 795:25 797:20 | 770:18,20 | 752:19 753:6 | 844:16,22 |
| 785:8 788:1,7 | 856:17,17,18 | 780:21 782:2 | 765:13 823:17 | 845:1,11,25 |
| 788:9 791:25 | 859:3,22 | 791:5 800:24 | willfulness | 846:9,17,24 |
| 797:18,23 | 868:22 876:22 | 802:20 803:3 | 705:3,4,6,8,9 | 847:4,6,11,15 |
| 801:3,16 802:6 | 894:1 901:2,5 | 811:16 824:19 | 705:10,11,16 | 847:18,20 |
| 803:21 805:8 | 914:19 915:23 | 827:15 828:11 | 705:18,20,21 | 848:3,11,15 |
| 820:5 826:2 | 916:1 | 828:12,16 | 705:24 824:21 | 851:9,12,13,15 |
| 827:11 829:8 | water $724: 14$ | 841:20,21,23 | willfulness/ne... | 854:8 860:19 |
| 836:19 857:2,9 | 725:2 872:2 | 843:3 851:4 | 705:23 706:5 | 860:23 861:4 |
| 874:25 875:4 | way 695:2 705:9 | 854:6 860:17 | William 688:22 | 864:10 865:1,7 |
| 891:5,22,23 | 705:21 712:6 | 865:3 868:17 | 688:23 | 866:12,15,18 |
| 892:22 895:15 | 722:14,15 | 886:9 887:3,8 | willing 696:6 | 872:14 875:11 |
| 902:16,22,23 | 731:23,25 | 893:13,15 | Windows 878:6 | 879:6,10,24 |
| 904:18,21 | 752:25 757:1 | 902:13 906:5 | wisdom 855:12 | 880:5 882:24 |
| 905:16 906:25 | 769:23 791:5 | 908:13,13 | wise 705:16 | 883:1,4,6,10 |
| 907:4 913:20 | 798:1 802:5 | 912:5,11 | 768:8 | 883:12 884:24 |
| 916:4 918:18 | 813:19 825:10 | 914:21,24 | wish 918:22 | 890:23 898:25 |
| wanted 696:17 | 847:23 859:16 | 915:5 919:12 | wishes 802:7 | 899:2 902:13 |
| 706:25 715:15 | 865:4 874:16 | 919:13 | withdraw 724:4 | 904:9,13 909:3 |
| 716:5 739:8 | 875:13 878:17 | we've 694:19 | 759:1 768:1 | 911:3 913:2 |
| 783:23 840:22 | 878:18,25 | 741:21 827:18 | Withdrawn | 915:18 918:18 |
| 841:5 856:12 | 879:19 881:20 | 837:15 871:7 | 841:3 | witnesses 689:2 |
| 865:15 868:7 | 884:18 888:24 | 919:1,4 | witness 699:2 | 694:9,19 |
| 869:4 871:3 | 894:15 895:13 | web 757:23,23 | 703:20 704:7 | 805:14 851:17 |
| 884:14,18 | 900:20 | 779:18 790:24 | 706:20 714:24 | Wolf 755:15,18 |
| 887:21 892:24 | ways $714: 13$ | week 892:7 | 725:3 736:24 | 755:24 756:7 |
| 893:10,25 | 729:17 869:8 | weeks 827:7 | 738:4 741:16 | 756:17 758:1 |
| 894:19 898:4 | 886:15,21 | weight 879:19 | 742:19 753:12 | 815:16,17 |
| 902:22 906:7 | we'll 695:11 | welcome 791:22 | 753:15,18,20 | 816:1,1,5,7,9 |
| wanting 777:4,4 | 696:19 739:15 | went 712:12,12 | 753:22 755:8 | 816:12,18 |
| wants 774:4 | 749:3 762:16 | 732:6 733:17 | 756:11 757:5 | 817:23 820:24 |
| 776:6 879:19 | 825:21 826:14 | 733:18,22 | 759:12,25 | 821:23 822:1 |
| warehouse | 826:21 842:3 | 744:6 747:2 | 762:11,14,18 | 893:4,4 907:22 |
| 713:5 715:24 | 852:16 865:6 | 766:5 773:20 | 764:5 769:17 | 908:2 910:2 |


| Wolf's 818:20 | 887:4,7,9,14 | 828:25 832:20 | 727:25 729:16 | 10:42 762:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wonder 900:12 | 888:1 894:16 | 843:19 846:4 | 732:6 733:16 | 100 791:20 |
| word 704:11,13 | wouldn't 733:12 | 847:23 851:6 | 735:5,19 744:7 | 793:14 843:17 |
| 704:14 705:2,4 | 734:7 740:16 | 915:9,23 | 746:25 747:25 | 843:18 |
| 705:16 712:17 | 743:8 779:5 | year 701:23,25 | 748:3 752:1 | 100\% 849:16 |
| 712:18 713:14 | 796:8 819:22 | 702:1708:10 | 754:8,11 762:2 | 1000 693:9 |
| 713:16,17 | 827:5 837:1 | 708:14 711:1 | 763:9,22 | 1008 688:24 |
| 716:22,24,25 | 870:25 | 711:17 732:20 | 764:11 766:2 | 105,000 897:24 |
| 717:8,10,13,16 | writer 700:9,10 | 732:21 733:1,3 | 773:3,15 | 109,000 712:4 |
| 721:24,25 | writing 700:15 | 733:7 734:16 | 778:16 793:20 | 712:10,11,15 |
| 722:22 738:16 | 726:5 759:18 | 734:18,20,21 | 797:20 807:14 | 712:23 713:6 |
| 759:6 763:24 | 867:3 897:21 | 735:2,10,12,13 | 816:4 835:10 | 713:11,13,24 |
| 796:12 799:6,7 | 906:23 920:1 | 735:15,17,23 | 838:21 | 713:25 714:20 |
| 803:1 893:20 | writings 759:16 | 736:4,8,18 |  | 715:20 716:13 |
| wording 775:18 | 799:7 | 737:2,5,21 | Z | 718:24 780:18 |
| words 714:16 | written 700:19 | 738:11,14,21 | Z 804:1 | 847:1 |
| 720:25 721:1 | 759:17 761:4 | 738:22 739:18 | zero 870:18 | 10th 733:2,4 |
| 721:16 722:2 | 785:16 787:15 | 739:20,23 | 900:8 | $11735: 13$ |
| 723:4 732:2,3 | 856:22 890:1 | 740:4 741:24 | Zhejiang 812:16 | 883:12 |
| 737:5,9 777:3 | wrong 711:23 | 749:7 763:5,23 | 812:18,19 | 11:00 762:16 |
| 780:8 803:19 | 720:25 722:13 | 763:25 764:5,8 | 813:2 | 1152 688:7 |
| 872:21 876:7 | 735:4 739:23 | 764:12,13,14 | 0 | $12709: 22$ |
| 876:24 878:12 | 753:1,2,2 | 764:15,15,16 |  | 735:12 763:15 |
| 883:24 896:24 | 763:13 778:17 | 764:20 765:2 | 000198 827:20 000356 829:15 | 852:10,18 |
| 897:16 900:18 | 815:22 856:6 | 798:21 809:12 | 000356 829:15 <br> $006827 \cdot 11$ | 876:19,23,25 |
| work 696:5,25 | 894:19 903:18 | 817:22 820:10 | $006827: 11$ | 1200 688:19 |
| 704:8709:17 | wronged 860:13 | 821:4 845:3,3 | 1 | 1201 688:8 |
| 709:19 722:7 | wrongs 743:22 | 845:5 855:21 |  | 121,000 885:2 |
| 726:2 744:13 | wrote 700:17 | 857:10,15,24 | $\begin{array}{r} 1690: 10,11 \\ 602 \cdot 118 \end{array}$ | 122 852:20 |
| 753:3 826:15 | 877:13 | 858:3,3,24 | 693:9 823:5 | 1220921:18 |
| 853:9 856:9 | X | 859:23 860:3 | $841: 20 \text { 852:10 }$ | 13 709:22 740:9 |
| 879:21,23,25 | $\frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{X 6 9 0} 1780 \cdot 18}$ | 876:19,20,20 | $852: 18,24$ | 14 852:10 |
| 892:6,14 | X 690:1 780:18 | 876:21,23,24 | 864:13 911:1 | 867:18 891:20 |
| worked 722:5 | 804:1 | 876:25 904:4 | 914:12 919:1,4 | $140852: 21$ |
| 777:22 784:11 | Xiangyuan | year's 857:16 | $\begin{array}{r} 914: 12919: \\ \mathbf{1 , 2 9 0} 766: 21 \end{array}$ | 148 852:21 |
| 806:11 865:15 | 688:4 789:4,18 | 877:1 | 1,290 $\mathbf{1 , 3 7 5 6 7 6 . 2 1}$ | 15 780:10 866:3 |
| 885:3 | 790:6,13 792:8 | years 702:12 | 1,375,676.45 <br> $789 \cdot 14813 \cdot 16$ | 869:9 911:13 |
| working 702:8,9 | 921:5 | 708:19,21 | $\begin{array}{r} 789: 14 \\ \mathbf{1 . 6} 776: 7 \end{array}$ | 155 852:21 |
| 760:10,13,17 | Y | 721:7 735:16 | 1:05 842:4 | 156A 852:21 |
| 760:20 875:16 |  | 772:21 857:4,7 | 10 690:11 | 159 852:21 |
| 892:3 894:2 | yeah 696:3 | 858:2 868:10 | 829:11,22 | 15th 826:17 |
| worksheets | 729:8 749:16 | 889:4 894:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 829: 11,22 \\ & 852: 10,18 \end{aligned}$ | 16 869:12 906:3 |
| 748:13 | 729:8 749:16 | Yep 891:9 | $907: 18,21$ | 160,000 745:9 |
| workshops | 754:22 759:6 | yesterday | $908: 8,16,17$ | 814:17 |
| 755:9 | 762:14 776:4 $785: 23$ $789: 11$ | 691:20 700:6 | 909:22 910:13 | $161852: 21$ |
| worn 827:18 | 785:23 789:11 | 705:2 707:7,11 | 910:15 911:1,6 | 163 852:21 |
| worse 796:11 | 793:6 801:24 <br> 811:11,16 | 709:10 710:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 910:15 911:1,6 } \\ & 919: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $167852: 21$ |
| worst 700:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 811: 11,16 \\ & 817: 20819: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 716:25 717:14 | 10,000 800:11 | 168 852:21 |
| 746:3 | $817: 20819: 18$ 821.17823 .19 | 717:16 718:5 | 800:14 | 169 852:21 |
| worth $877: 1$ | 821:17 823:19 | 718:15 719:22 |  | 17 852:18 |
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| 870:17 906:3 | 812:16 813:7 | 889:20 899:6 | 219,000 874:11 | 855:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 171 852:22 | 857:5 | 905:7,21 | 22 852:10,19 | 360,000 745:8 |
| 18 690:12 | 2009s 711:20 | 907:22 | 220,000 874:22 | 38 690:15 696:9 |
| 871:22 907:18 | 2010 702:7 | 2013 709:23 | 220,731 874:10 | 696:11,14 |
| 911:10,17 | 708:16,20,24 | 715:24 817:19 | 221,000 874:9 | 794:3 852:24 |
| 912:6 | 709:1 710:23 | 819:8,15 820:4 | 225,472.50 | 919:2 |
| 183 852:22 | 719:12,21 | 820:6,10 821:5 | 788:9,25 | 39 690:16 |
| 188 852:22 | 720:3,13 | 823:16 832:17 | 225,473.50 | 696:20,23 |
| $189852: 22$ | 744:23 752:23 | 833:20,22,24 | 813:10 | 852:24 919:3 |
| 19 688:10 690:3 | 800:11,14 | 889:20,22 | 23 690:13 905:6 | 391 767:1 |
| 794:23 842:6 | 803:19 807:18 | 2014 708:19 | 907:18 912:13 | 392-9888 688:25 |
| 852:10,19 | 807:22 808:9 | 727:20 830:23 | 912:22 913:17 |  |
| 872:3,14 921:6 | 809:12,13 | 832:21 833:6 | 23,000 855:22 | 4 |
| 921:15 | 811:14 812:9 | 833:20,21 | 856:1,4 | 4 883:11 905:11 |
| 190A 852:22 | 813:7,23 | 859:3 889:20 | 24 820:6,10 | 4:06 920:13 |
| 191 852:22 | 848:17 857:3,4 | 889:23 | 25 852:11,19 | 40 904:16 905:5 |
| 192 852:22 | 2011 708:19 | 2015 803:20 | 907:22 | 905:17 |
| 194 852:22 | 726:24 727:6 | 833:7,21 850:7 | 2586 883:13 | 42 852:19 |
| 194,000 874:22 | 727:12 735:9 | 885:2 889:18 | 26 690:14 | 4455 688:24 |
| 197 793:6,6 | 739:25 741:5 | 889:21 | 907:18 913:23 | 45 828:14 |
| 852:22 | 741:18,22 | 2016 766:15 | 914:6,9,13 | $46910: 9$ |
| 1981 854:15 | 743:18 749:7 | 850:7 | 915:5,12 | $479811: 5$ |
| 904:15,23 | 822:13 857:7,8 | 2017 688:10 | 260,000 810:5 | 480 811:12 |
| 905:17 | 857:11,12 | 734:17 842:6 | $2610793: 7$ | 4A 870:7 |
| 1st 823:13 | 2012 717:21,23 | 905:6,19 921:6 | 27 907:19 908:4 | 5 |
| 825:22,25 | 718:20 719:2 | 921:15 | 909:4 |  |
| 826:10,11,12 | 731:14 732:19 | 2018 734:19 | 28 690:4 719:21 | 50 768:8 811:21 |
| 826:15 | 732:21 733:7 | 202 688:20 | 720:3 840:3,7 | 3:17 901: |
| 2 | 733:15 734:12 | 203 852:23 | 852:11,19 | 55 855:1 |
| 2 690:11 841:21 | 735:10,23 | 205 852:23 | 3 | $550728: 19$ |
| 891:20 911:1 | 740:8 741:18 | 206921:18 | $3752: 6883: 11$ | 732:12 741:8 |
| 919:4 | 741:19,22 | 209 852:23 | 905:11 | 742:20 |
| 2.3 889:22 | 742:4,5,7 | 21 866:21 | 3,768 712:1 | 564-5805/4133... |
| 2:02 842:5 843:2 | 743:2 745:6,7 | 868:17 873:5,6 | 3.2 903:8,10,14 | 688:20 |
| 20752:19 | 747:6,7 748:24 | 895:18,20 | 903:19 | 5815 829:17,20 |
| 807:16 812:4 | 749:1 752:6 | 21,275 821:11 | 3.3 776:6 |  |
| 812:12 814:2 | 763:5,17,19 | 821:15 | 30 814:10,12 | $\frac{\mathbf{6}}{\mathbf{6} 827: 21829: 22}$ |
| 20/20 867:7 | 793:15 814:16 | 213 781:20,21 | 847:21 852:11 | 6 827:21 829:22 <br> 872.315 |
| 2000 709:21 | 814:19,21,22 | 852:23 | 852:19 919:21 | $\mathbf{6 . 5 7 6 7 : 1 1 . 2 2}$ |
| 20005-4018 | 816:19 817:9 | 215751:16 | 300-plus 767:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5767: 11,22 \\ & 770: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 921:18 | 817:12,16,18 | 763:15 852:23 | 31 852:11,19 | $\begin{gathered} 70: 6 \\ \mathbf{6 0} 768: 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2006 702:14 | 818:4,5 821:4 | 911:18 | 31st 876:24 | $\mathbf{6 0 0 6} \text { 827:12 }$ |
| 2007 702:15 | 822:14 823:5 | 216 690:5 | 32 692:17 | 6006 827:12 |
| 708:3 796:4,23 | 825:12,13 | 695:14,17 | 320,000 840:10 | $61 \text { 852:19 }$ |
| 2009 708:11 | 826:4,8 854:18 | 852:23 | 33 852:24 | $64 \text { 852:19 }$ $66 \text { 847:24 }$ |
| 710:23,25 | 854:20 855:10 | 217 690:6 697:4 | 914:12 919:1 | 66 847:24 <br> 850.13 851 |
| 711:1,10 | 855:21 856:3 | 697:8 852:23 | $332829: 7$ | 850:13 851:8 |
| 720:13 766:15 | 857:12,13,14 | 218 690:7 697:4 | $35811: 9,18,20$ | $\begin{gathered} 67711: 15 \\ 852: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 809:12,13 | 858:20 889:18 | 697:8 852:23 | 812:2 852:19 | 852:20 |



